



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-06-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

WP No. 16164 of 2025

R.Vijaya Samundeeswari

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Chairman,
TANGEDCO, Anna Salai,
Chennai-600 002.

2.The Superintending Engineer (O & M)
TANGEDCO, Tindivanam,
Villupuram District.

3.The Assistant Executive Engineer (O & M)
TANGEDCO, Sendur,
Villupuram District.

4.Sivaselvam,

5.Tmt. Vijayalakshmi

Respondent(s)



PRAYER Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 & 2 to dispose petitioner representation dated 03.03.2025.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.D.Bharathy

For Respondent(s): Mr.Venkata Chsehiya
Standing Counsel
for R1 to R3

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for issue of writ of mandamus directing the 1st and 2nd respondents to deal with the representation made by the petitioner on 03.03.2025, wherein the petitioner has sought for the cancellation of the free EB connection that was given in favour of the private respondents.

2.Heard Mr.D.Bharathy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr.Venkata Chsehiya, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3.



3. It is seen from records that the dispute between the parties was pending by way of a second appeal in S.A.No.812 of 2013. Even earlier, a writ petition was filed in this regard and ultimately, the matter reached the Division Bench in W.A.No.183 of 2020. This writ appeal was disposed of by an order dated 29.07.2024 and the relevant portions are extracted hereunder:

Learned counsel for the appellants would submit that as far as the dispute between the parties are concerned, the parties have already entered into a compromise and filed a Joint Memo of Compromise dated 14.02.2020, which was recorded by the learned Single Judge in S.A.No.812 of 2013 dated 02.03.2020.

2. Therefore, the dispute between the parties have been settled. Thus, no further adjudication needs to be undertaken and consequently, the Writ Appeal stands closed. No costs. Connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

4. The grievance of the petitioner is that the patta stood in the name of the petitioner and hence, free EB connection ought not to have been granted in favour of the private respondents. It is brought to the notice of this Court that



the petitioner has filed an appeal before the District Revenue Officer to restore the patta in her name and the same is pending. The writ petition was filed in this regard in W.P.No.10156 of 2025 and this writ petition was disposed by an order dated 27.03.2025, directing the District Revenue Officer to dispose of the appeal after affording opportunity to the private respondents.

5.In view of the above, till the appeal is disposed of by the District Revenue Officer, the petitioner cannot straight away seek for the cancellation of the free EB connection given. Subject to the final result before the District Revenue Officer, the petitioner can revive her claim, if so advised.

6.This writ petition is disposed of in the above terms. No Costs.

02-06-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ssr



To
WEB COPY

1. The Chairman,
TANGEDCO, Anna Salai,
Chennai-600 002.
2. The Superintending Engineer (O & M)
TANGEDCO, Tindivanam,
Villupuram District.
3. The Assistant Executive Engineer (O & M)
TANGEDCO, Sendur,
Villupuram District.



WEB COPY

6/6

WP No. 16164 of 2



N.ANAND VENKATESH J.

SSR

WP No. 16164 of 2025

02-06-2025