



1

W.P.(MD)NO.30847 OF 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 13.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

W.P.(MD)No.30847 of 2024 AND

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.25925 & 25926 of 2024

Rameezal Begum

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Managing Director,
State Industries Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu,
19-A, Rukmani Lakshmipathy Road,
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.

2. The Project Officer,
State Industries Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu,
SIPCOT Industrial Complex,
Gangaikondan Village, Tirunelveli District.

3. M.Mohamed Anisha

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, calling for the records of the impugned proceedings of the first respondent in P-VI/SIP-GKN/Sinthamathar Enterprises-2012-24 dated 22.11.2024 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the first respondent to execute lease deed in favour of the writ petitioner in respect of the land in SC-1/A SIPCOT Industrial Growth Centre, Gangaikondan Village, Tirunelveli by considering her representations dated 28.12.2023 and 03.12.2024.



For Petitioner : Ms.H.Jasima Yasmin,
for M/s.Ajmal Associates.

For R-1 & R-2 : Mr.R.Baskaran,
Additional Advocate General,
assisted by,
Mr.M.Gangatharan,
Government Advocate.

For R-3 : Mr.R.L.Dhilipan Pandian

* * *

ORDER

Heard both sides.

2. The petition-mentioned plot was allotted in favour of Mr.Mohamed Khan, brother of the writ petitioner and the husband of the third respondent. Mohamed Khan passed away, thereafter. The leasehold rights were transferred in favour of the third respondent vide communication dated 22.11.2024. Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner reiterated all the contentions set out in the affidavit filed in support



of the writ petition. Her contentions are three fold. Firstly, the petitioner had obtained an order from this Court in W.P.(MD) No.1982 of 2024 dated 13.02.2024 for consideration of her application for transfer of leasehold right in her favour. Likewise the third respondent had also obtained the order dated 07.08.2024 in W.P.(MD)No.18841 of 2024 for consideration of her application. The petitioner's counsel would argue that without considering her application, the application of the third respondent had been straightaway accepted and endorsed.

4. I do not find any merit in this contention. If according to the petitioner the order dated 13.02.2024 passed by this Court was breached, the remedy open to the petitioner is to file contempt petition.

5. In fact, both the orders that were obtained by the petitioner as well as the third respondent are referred to in the impugned communication.

6. The second ground of attack is that it was the writ



petitioner who made all the investments and that the third respondent should not walk away with the same. The petitioner would further contend that the third respondent herself had given earlier application to the SIPCOT agreeing that the leasehold rights may be transferred in favour of the writ petitioner. These are matters which fall in the realm of private dispute between the writ petitioner and her sister-in-law. In writ proceedings, these issues cannot be adjudicated.

7. The petitioner's counsel would also point out that the third respondent had moved the civil Court and her application for interim injunction had already been dismissed. The dismissal of the injunction application can only mean that the third respondent is not armed with any judicial order in her favour. It does not fructify into a positive direction in favour of the writ petitioner. Notwithstanding such dismissal, SIPCOT can still pass an order in favour of the third respondent.

8. SIPCOT is a Government organization. It has a standing policy of transferring the allotment rights in favour of the legal heirs



whenever an allottee dies. Invariably, his widow is preferred. The writ petitioner is only a sister. The action of SIPCOT cannot be termed as arbitrary. The impugned order passed in favour of the widow of the allottee need not be interfered with. This writ petition stands dismissed. It is open to the writ petitioner to pursue her civil remedy against the third respondent in the manner known to law. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

13.10.2025

NCS : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes/ No

PMU

To:

1. The Managing Director,
State Industries Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu,
19-A, Rukmani Lakshmipathy Road,
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.
2. The Project Officer,
State Industries Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu,
SIPCOT Industrial Complex,
Gangaikondan Village,
Tirunelveli District.



WEB COPY



6

W.P.(MD)NO.30847 OF 2024

G.R.SWAMINATHAN,J.

PMU

W.P.(MD)No.30847 of 2024

13.10.2025