



W.P.(MD) No.20344 of 2025

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.07.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

W.P.(MD) No.20344 of 2025

Rengapanchanathan

... Petitioner

/vs./

1.The Executive Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Karaikudi Distribution Circle,
Karaikudi, Sivagangai District.

2.The Assistant Executive Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Karaikudi Town/South Karaikudi,
Sivagangai District.

3.The Assistant Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Karaikudi Town/South Karaikudi,
Sivagangai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's application for providing electricity service connection vide application No.2000540207251542 dated 04.07.2025.



W.P.(MD) No.20344 of 2025

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.VA.Shanmugaraj

For Respondents : Mr.S.Deenadhayalan
standing counsel

ORDER

This writ petition is disposed of at the time of admission itself, after hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned standing counsel for the respondents, in terms of the order passed by this Court in W.P.(MD) No.9842 of 2024, dated 25.04.2024.

2.Relevant portion of the order reads as under:-

“3.The respondent could not consider the petitioner's request because the Commissioner, Karaikudi Municipality has raised objection. According to the local body, the land has been earmarked as “park”. If in a layout, certain extent of land has been earmarked as “park” by the promoter, it cannot be converted to any other use. But that is not a case here. The extract from TSL register shows that the land was classified as “Ryotwari Manai”. Of course, it is in the name of the Municipal Commissioner, Karaikudi. Since even in the revenue record, the land has been classified as "manai", the petitioner's occupation cannot be characterised as objectionable.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner draws my attention to the decision reported in 2013 (6) CTC 849 (T.M.Prakash & others Vs The District Collector, Tiruvannamalai District, Tiruvannamalai & Another) and the order dated 25.08.2020 made in W.P.No.10501 of 2020 (S.Babu Vs The Assistant Engineer). It has been held therein that electricity supply being a basic amenity cannot be



W.P.(MD) No.20344 of 2025

WEB COPY

denied to occupiers of poramboke lands. TANGEDCO was directed to obtain necessary undertaking and indemnity bond from the applicants and grant supply of electricity.

5.I am of the view that the very same approach can be adopted in this case also. The third respondent shall provide electricity supply to the petitioner herein after obtaining undertaking affidavit and indemnity bond from the petitioner. It is however made clear that grant of electricity supply to the petitioner herein by virtue of this Court's order will not come in the way of the local body from initiating any action against the petitioner. I have to make this clarification because the local body is not before me.

6.With this clarification, this writ petition is allowed. There shall be no order as to costs."

3.The Writ Petition stands disposed of, in terms of the above lines. The respondents shall accordingly provide the electricity service connection to the petitioner within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
mm

25.07.2025



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.20344 of 2025

C.SARAVANAN, J.

mm

W.P.(MD) No.20344 of 2025

25.07.2025