



W.P.No.2217 of 2022

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.06.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.2217 of 2022

M/s.Saleem Skins Emporium,
Represented by its Managing Partners

1. K.M.Fathima
2. K.Muhayudin Ghani
3. Fazal Ghani
Registered Office at 1st Floor,
No.6, Kattur Sadayappan Street,
Periamet, Madras – 600 003.

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Small Industries Development
Corporation Limited (SIDCO),
Corporate Head Office,
9th Floor, Thiru Vi Ka Industrial Estate,
Chennai – 600 032.

2. The Branch Manager,
SIDCO Branch Office,
SIDCO Industrial Estate,
Ambattur,
Chennai – 600 058.



W.P.No.2217 of 2022

WEB COPY

3. The Superintending Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Small Industries Development
Corporation Limited (SIDCO),
Corporate Head Office, 8th Floor,
Thiru Vi Ka Industrial Estate,
Chennai – 600 032.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the third respondent pertaining to impugned order dated 22.01.2021 in R.C.No.5319/A6/1994 on the file of the third respondent and quash the same and further directing the respondents to carry out the entries in the register maintained by them.

For Petitioner : Mr.Pravin

For Respondents : Mr.M.P.Rajavelayutham

ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed seeking issuance of writ of certiorarified mandamus to quash the proceedings of the third respondent dated 22.01.2021 cancelling the allotment of the industrial plot allotted in favour of the petitioner Firm and consequently direct the respondents to carry out the entries in the register maintained by them.



W.P.No.2217 of 2022

WEB COPY

2. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner is a partnership firm engaged in the manufacture and export of finished leather. The petitioner Firm applied for allotment of an industrial plot development by Tamil Nadu Small Industries Development Corporation Limited (SIDCO) in Ambattur Industrial Estate. Pursuant to the application, Plot No.2E(NP) measuring about one acre was allotted in favour of the petitioner by proceedings dated 13.08.1979 subject to certain terms and conditions. It is the further case of the petitioner that the petitioner had executed the assignment deed on 09.09.1980, took possession of the plot on 20.09.1980 and paid the entire cost of the plot. Thereafter, the petitioner Firm had taken steps for construction of a shed and installation of machinery. However, the first respondent, by communication dated 21.04.1986, unilaterally cancelled the allotment on the ground that the construction had not been completed within the stipulated period. Therefore, the petitioner had submitted a representation explaining the reasons for the delay and also furnished all particulars called for by the respondents by letter dated 13.02.1987. Thereafter, the second respondent who is the competent authority, issued a notice dated 20.12.1988 directing the petitioner to handover the possession



W.P.No.2217 of 2022

WEB COPY

of the plot on or before 09.01.1989, failing which the possession would be resumed by the respondents. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner once again submitted a representation to the General Manager. Since the said representation was not considered, the petitioner approached this Court by filing a writ petition. The said writ petition was disposed in the year 1998. According to the petitioner, even thereafter, the petitioner Firm continued to carry on its industrial activity for several years. However, all of a sudden, the third respondent by proceedings dated 22.01.2021 enclosed a cheque for Rs.1,055/- towards refund of the plot cost and treated the allotment as cancelled. Challenging the said proceedings, the present writ petition has been filed.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the impugned order has been passed without issuing any notice and without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. Therefore, the same is liable to be set aside.



W.P.No.2217 of 2022

WEB COPY

4. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that the subject plot was allotted to the petitioner in the year 1979 for a sum of Rs.1,000/- per acre, subject to certain terms and conditions. As per the allotment order, the petitioner was required to complete the construction within six months. However, even till 1986, the petitioner had not undertaken any construction activity in the allotted plot. Since the petitioner had failed to comply with the conditions of the allotment and also failed to put up any construction even after several years, the respondents cancelled the allotment in accordance with the conditions of allotment. Therefore, the impugned order does not warrant interference by this Court.

5. This Court has carefully considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. Admittedly the plot was allotted to the petitioner subject to certain conditions. One of the conditions required the petitioner to put up construction within the prescribed period. However, the petitioner failed to



W.P.No.2217 of 2022

WEB COPY

comply with the said condition. Though the petitioner claims to have submitted representations, no materials has been placed before this Court to establish that the conditions of allotment were complied with. The respondents have therefore rightly cancelled the allotment for violation of the terms and conditions. That apart, it is brought to the notice of this Court by the learned counsel appearing for the respondents that subsequent to the cancellation of the petitioner's allotment, the subject plot has already been allotted to a third party. In such circumstances, at this distant point of time, no useful purpose would be served by interfering with the impugned proceedings and restoring the allotment in favour of the petitioner.

7. In view of the above, this Court does not find any infirmity in the impugned order passed by the third respondent. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

10.06.2026

NCC: Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Speaking Order : Yes / No
vji



W.P.No.2217 of 2022

WEB COPY

To

1. The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Small Industries Development
Corporation Limited (SIDCO),
Corporate Head Office,
9th Floor, Thiru Vi Ka Industrial Estate,
Chennai – 600 032.
2. The Branch Manager,
SIDCO Branch Office,
SIDCO Industrial Estate,
Ambattur,
Chennai – 600 058.
3. The Superintending Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Small Industries Development
Corporation Limited (SIDCO),
Corporate Head Office, 8th Floor,
Thiru Vi Ka Industrial Estate,
Chennai – 600 032.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.2217 of 2022

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

vji

W.P.No.2217 of 2022

10.06.2026