



W.A.No.834 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.04.2026

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

W.A.No.834 of 2026

T.V.Balasubramanian (Deceased)

T.V.Mohan(Deceased)

1. T.V.Mala

D/o.T.V.Venkatarangan

Plot No.16, No.11/5, Saradambal Street

Saidapet, Chennai-600 015

2. Suseela Rajalakshmi

D/o.Venkatarangan

Plot No.975, Third Main Road

Ram Nagar South, Madipakkam

Chennai-600 091

3. B.Latha

W/o.Late T.V.Balasubramanian

(P1 in W.P.No.34731 of 2019- died, substituted as LRs
in W.M.P.No.24466 of 2024)

Plot No.16, No.11/5, Saradambal Street

Saidapet, Chennai -600 015

4. B.Vigneswaran

S/o.Late T.V.Balasubramanian

(P1 in W.P.No.34731 of 2019- died, substituted as LRs
in W.M.P.No.24466 of 2024)

Plot No.16, No.11/5, Saradambal Street

Saidapet, Chennai -600 015



W.A.No.834 of 2026

5. M.Vijayalakshmi
W/o.Late T.V.Mohan
(P2 in W.P.No.34731 of 2019- died, substituted as LRs
in W.M.P.No.24466 of 2024)
Door No.34, First Floor
M.K.Amman Koil Street, Mylapore
Chennai -600 004

6. Anuradha
D/o.Late T.V.Mohan
(P2 in W.P.No.34731 of 2019- died, substituted as LRs
in W.M.P.No.24466 of 2024)
Door No.34, First Floor
M.K.Amman Koil Street, Mylapore
Chennai -600 004

7. M.Sriram,
S/o.Late T.V.Mohan
(P2 in W.P.No.34731 of 2019- died, substituted as LRs
in W.M.P.No.24466 of 2024)
Door No.34, First Floor
M.K.Amman Koil Street, Mylapore
Chennai -600 004

Appellant(s)

Vs

1.The Chief Secretary to Tamil Nadu
Secretariat, Fort St. George
Chennai -600 009

2.The Additional Chief Secretary and
Commissioner of Land Administration
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Ezhilagam Chennai -600 005

3.The Collector
Office of the Collectorate
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram -631 501



W.A.No.834 of 2026

4.The Special Tahsildar
Land Acquisition
Irungattukottai Scheme,
Irungattukottai Sriperumbudur,
Kancheepuram District

5.Managing Director
SIPCOT, Irungattukottai
Sriperumbudur
No.19A, Rukmani Lakshmipathi Road,
Egmore, Chennai -600 006
(R5 impleaded as per order dated
27.01.2020 made in W.M.P.No.2317
of 2020 in W.P.No.34731 of 2019)

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent to set aside the order passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.34731 of 2019 dated 15.09.2025.

For Appellants : Mr.V.Kannan
For Respondents : Mr.K.Karthik Jagannath
Government Advocate for RR1 to 4
Mr.Abishek Murthy
Standing Counsel for R5

JUDGMENT

(Delivered by G.ARUL MURUGAN,J.)

This intra-Court appeal assails the order of the writ Court dated 15.09.2025 made in W.P.No.34731 of 2019, whereby the challenge to the declaration under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1984 (in short "the Act"), dated 03.10.1996, came to be rejected.



W.A.No.834 of 2026

2.The learned counsel for the appellants/writ petitioners contended that the land measuring an extent of 2400 sq.ft. in plot No.102, survey No.604/1/15A was never acquired by the Government. He further submitted that the land till date remains vacant and therefore, the declaration under Section 6 of the Act, issued in G.O. (2D) No.276, Industries (MID-II), dated 03.10.1996, is liable to be quashed. The learned Single Judge had not considered this issue and therefore, seeks intervention of this Court.

3.Mr.K.Karthik Jagannath, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents No.1 to 4 and Mr.Abishek Murthey, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the fifth respondent, contended that the lands were acquired at least three decades ago for the purpose of establishing a SIPCOT industrial park by the fifth respondent and the same has been already put to use. It is further submitted that since the lands were acquired and the award was passed as early as in the year 1998, the writ petition itself is not maintainable.

4.Heard the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record.

Page 4 of 9



W.A.No.834 of 2026

WEB COPY

5.The Government had issued G.O.Ms.No.252(2D), Industries (MID-II) Department, dated 09.09.1996, granting administrative sanction for acquisition of 1465 acres of patta lands and alienation of 354 acres of Government lands in three villages viz., Irungattukottai, Thandalam and Katrambakkam of Sriperumbudur Taluk, for establishment of a SIPCOT industrial park. Pursuant to the administrative sanction, land acquisition proceedings were initiated and a notification under Section 4(1) of the Act was issued. Thereafter, the declaration under Section 6 of the Act via G.O.(2D) No.276, Industries (MID-II), dated 03.10.1996, was also published. The declaration under Section 6 of the Act, came to be challenged before the writ Court.

6.It is the vehement contention of the learned counsel for the appellants that the subject property never formed part of the acquisition. If that be so, the very basis of the challenge to the Section 6 declaration is itself not maintainable. However, from the materials placed, the learned Single Judge had observed that the subject property belongs to the writ petitioners mother Tmt.K.K.Kalyanikutty alias Kalyani Venkatarangan. The notice under

Page 5 of 9



W.A.No.834 of 2026

Section 5A of the Act was served on her and she also appeared for the enquiry. The writ petitioners mother had claimed compensation at Rs.20,000/- to 40,000/- per cent. However, since no materials documents were filed in support of her claim, the request was rejected and then, award was passed on 28.09.1998 in Award No.7/1998. The award amount has been deposited in the Government treasury and is pending, since the writ petitioners failed to produce any original documents required towards disbursement of compensation.

7.It is also to be noted that in fact, the writ petitioners themselves have submitted a representation on 29.11.2017, pursuant to which, they were asked to appear along with the documents on 31.01.2020 to substantiate their claim for compensation. The writ petitioners though appeared, had refused to receive the compensation.

8.The fact remains that the subject land was taken possession for the purpose of establishing the industrial park and also the same has been utilised and the property has been allotted in favour of M/s.Hyundai Motor India, which is in their possession and occupation. In such circumstances, the writ Court rightly found that the challenge to declaration under Section 6 of the Act, almost after three decades



W.A.No.834 of 2026

cannot be sustained and it is for the writ petitioners to make a representation for compensation with appropriate documents.

9.We see no error or infirmity in the findings arrived at by the learned single Judge warranting interference. Accordingly, the writ appeal is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI, CJ) (G.ARUL MURUGAN,J)
20.04.2026

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
gya



W.A.No.834 of 2026

To

WEB COPY

1.The Chief Secretary to Tamil Nadu
Secretariat, Fort St. George
Chennai -600 009

2.The Additional Chief Secretary and
Commissioner of Land Administration
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Ezhilagam Chennai -600 005

3.The Collector
Office of the Collectorate
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram -631 501

4.The Special Tahsildar
Land Acquisition
Irungattukottai Scheme,
Irungattukottai Sriperumbudur,
Kancheepuram District

5.Managing Director
SIPCOT, Irungattukottai
Sriperumbudur
No.19A, Rukmani Lakshmipathi Road,
Egmore, Chennai -600 006



WEB COPY



W.A.No.834 of 2026

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
G.ARUL MURUGAN,J.

gya

W.A.No.834 of 2026

20.04.2026

Page 9 of 9