



Cont.P.No.31 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.11.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. SURESH KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.DHANABAL

Contempt Petition No.31 of 2025

T.Udayakumar

.. Petitioner

Vs.

S. Balachandar, IAS
Commisioner, Tambaram Corporation
(Peerkanaranai), Chennai – 600 063.

.. Respondent

Prayer : Petitions filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to punish the respondent to disobey the order of this Court for contempt of court order in W.P.No.20870 of 2022 dated 19.06.2023.

For the Petitioner : Mr.G.Palanikumar

For the Respondent : Mr.P.Srinivas
Standing Counsel

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by R. SURESH KUMAR, J.)

This contempt petition has been filed for the alleged disobedience of the orders of this Court dated 19.06.2023 made in W.P.No.20870 of 2022.



Cont.P.No.31 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. That the private respondents, namely *D.Kandavel* and *Chitra*, in the said writ petition have allegedly encroached upon the property or they constructed in deviation of the building plan, therefore, to remove such unauthorized construction only, the said writ petition was filed.

3. We passed orders on 19.06.2023, giving directions to the respondent, that is the Commissioner of Tambaram Corporation, to take steps to remove the unauthorized construction and the deviation of the approved plan. That order was not complied with is the complaint of the petitioner when moving the present contempt petition.

4.1. Today, it is submitted by *Mr.P.Srinivas*, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent Corporation that, on survey, it is found that not only the private respondents in the writ petition, but also the petitioner has deviated the building plan. Therefore, all the three buildings were put under lock and seal.



Cont.P.No.31 of 2025

WEB COPY

4.2. The deviated portion has to be demolished by the owners of the building themselves, as, if it is touched by the Corporation people by using heavy machines, it will endanger the very building itself, therefore, that job has been given to the owners of the building, including the petitioner, but, they have taken some time. In the meanwhile, none of the buildings are put under use, as they have been put under lock and seal and an affidavit to that effect has been filed by the respondent corporation.

5. In this context, *Mr.G.Palanikumar*, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that, even the petitioner has vacated the building belonging to the petitioner and it will take some time to remove such unauthorized portion, which has been constructed in violation of the building permission and therefore, at this juncture, no further coercive action needs to be taken against the respondent in this contempt petition, he contended.



Cont.P.No.31 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. Recording his statement, the present contempt petition is closed with liberty to the petitioner to revive the same, in case the need arises, that too, after rectifying himself by removing the encroached portion or unauthorized construction of his property.

(R.S.K., J.) (P.D.B., J.)
05.11.2025

Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
Internet: Yest/No
Index : Yes/No

(drm)



Cont.P.No.31 of 2025

To:

WEB COPY

1. S. Balachandar, IAS
Commissioner, Tambaram Corporation
(Peerankaranai), Chennai – 600 063.



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.31 of 2025

R. SURESH KUMAR, J.
AND
P.DHANABAL, J.

(*drm*)

Cont.P.No.31 of 2025

05.11.2025