



WP No.41153 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.11.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA,
CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

WP No.41153 of 2025

Rajini Balasubramaniam : Petitioner

Vs

- 1.The Additional Secretary (Technical)
Housing and Urban Development Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009
- 2.The Commissioner
Greater Chennai Corporation
Rippon Building, Park Town, Chennai 600 003
- 3.The Assistant Executive Engineer
Unit 30, Great Chennai Corporation
No.64, NSK Salai, Kodambakkam,
Chennai 600 024

4.Veda Padmapriya : Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to remove the lock and seal affixed on 14.08.2025 in respect of the premises at New Door No.33, Old No.13, Old No.30, Sarojini Street T.Nagar Chennai 600017 and to permit the petitioner to re-occupy and vacate the premises peacefully on or before February 2026.



WP No.41153 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mahendran

For Respondents : Mr.M.Habeeb Rahman,
Government Advocate,
for respondent No.1

Mr.A.Arun Babu,
Standing Counsel,
for respondents 2 and 3

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

Challenge to the lock and seal notice dated 14.08.2025 at the instance of the tenant is made on various grounds which are not required to be gone into for the reason that the owner of the premises/ building had already exhausted all available remedy. A writ petition was filed before this Court by the owner, which was closed on 14.11.2024. Letter dated 19.03.2025 also shows that revision petition filed against the lock and seal notice and de-occupation notices were assailed before the revisional authority under Section 80A of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act, by the owner, which was also dismissed. Again, notice has now been issued on 14.08.2025, rejecting the application filed by the owner.



WP No.41153 of 2025

2. In that view of the matter, now the tenant cannot be allowed to initiate fresh round of litigation challenging those very actions which were challenged, though unsuccessfully by the owner.

3. The petition is misconceived and it is dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.

(MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA, C.J.) (G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.)
05.11.2025

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
tar

To

- 1.The Additional Secretary (Technical)
Housing and Urban Development Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009
- 2.The Commissioner
Greater Chennai Corporation
Rippon Building, Park Town, Chennai 600 003
- 3.The Assistant Executive Engineer
Unit 30, Great Chennai Corporation
No.64, NSK Salai, Kodambakkam,
Chennai 600 024



WEB COPY



WP No.41153 of 2025

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.

(tar)

WP No.41153 of 2025

05.11.2025