



W.P.No.2452 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11.03.2026

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,  
CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

W.P. No.2452 of 2026  
and W.M.P. Nos.2700 & 2704 of 2026

K.J.Ravichandran,  
S/o.K.N.Janakaiha Chetty,  
No.8, Murugesan Street,  
G-4, Rajayogalakshmi Flats,  
Choolai, Chennai - 600 112.

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The Greater Chennai Corporation,  
Rep. by its Commissioner,  
Ripon Building, Chennai - 600 003.

2.The Executive Engineer,  
Zone-V, Greater Chennai Corporation,  
No.61, Basin Bridge Road, Chennai - 600 021.

3.The Assistant Engineer,  
Greater Chennai Corporation,  
No.2, Memorial Hall Street,  
Park Town, Chennai - 600 003.

4.K.J.Raghavendra,  
S/o.K.N.Janakaiha Chetty,  
No.24, Surya Homes,  
First Cross Balaji Street,  
Vivekanandha Nagar,  
Kolathur, Chennai - 600 099.

.. Respondent(s)



W.P.No.2452 of 2026

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for the records of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent dated 08.01.2026 in LR No.Z.O.V.C.No.11576/2026 signed on 09.01.2026 pertaining to the petitioner's property at Old No.36, New No.15, Edapalayam Street, Park Town, Sowcarpet, Chennai 600 003 and quash the same and consequently forbearing the respondents 2 and 3 from in anyway interfering with the petitioner's aforesaid building particularly evicting, locking and sealing and demolition of any portion or portions thereof and pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and necessary under the circumstances of the case.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.G.V.Sridharan

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Gopinathan  
Standing Counsel  
For R1 to R3  
Mr.W.A.Abdul Azeez  
For R4

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.)

This writ petition is filed challenging the order of the second respondent dated 08.01.2026, calling upon the petitioner to vacate the premises, as it is required for immediate demolition for the sake of public safety.



W.P.No.2452 of 2026

**2.** Mr.G.V.Sridharan, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the impugned order came to be passed based on the stability certificate obtained from the Anna University, which cannot be made as a basis. The petitioner had got a certificate showing that the building is structurally sound and further no proper opportunity was afforded to the petitioner.

**3.** Per contra, Mr.S.Gopinathan, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents 1 to 3, by relying on the counter affidavit submitted that, in the earlier writ petition (W.P.No.26865 of 2023) based on the directions of this Court, they have obtained the structural stability certificate from the Anna University and pursuant to the report, direction came to be issued by order dated 09.10.2025 and the impugned order has been passed in consequence to the directions of this Court. The petitioner has neither challenged the stability certificate nor preferred any appeal as against the directions issued by this Court and challenge made in the present writ petition to the order impugned passed in compliance with the order of this Court, is not sustainable.

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



W.P.No.2452 of 2026

WEB COPY

5. The fourth respondent herein had earlier filed writ petition before this Court in W.P.No.26865 of 2023 seeking to take enforcement action for locking and sealing the building. Since the issue of structural stability was raised in the said writ petition, it is submitted that the Corporation was directed to obtain a structural stability certificate from the Anna University. Pursuant to the directions issued by this Court on 13.09.2023, the Structural Engineering Division of Anna University inspected the building on 01.11.2023 and 02.03.2024 respectively and submitted a structural stability report for the building on 05.03.2024 with the following recommendations:-

*"(i) It is suspected that, in case of any earthquake or any other vibration induced disturbances on or near the building, it will lead to catastrophic failure of the entire building without giving any warning. There will not be any time for the occupants to escape out since there is no ductility for the building.*

*(ii) The entire building is not structurally stable (As per the latest IS*

*Codes) and considering the safety of the occupants in the building, passer-by and general public, it is not suitable for functioning."*



W.P.No.2452 of 2026

**6.** The structural stability report has been served to the petitioner, which is acknowledged. Pursuant to the report filed, this Court had disposed of the writ petition, by order dated 09.10.2025, directing the Corporation to decide on the representation submitted by the fourth respondent after affording due opportunity to all the interested parties within a period of three months.

**7.** Admittedly, the petitioner who was in receipt of the structural stability certificate has not challenged the report nor preferred any appeal as against the order dated 09.10.2025 passed by this Court. In compliance to the orders passed by this Court on 09.10.2025, the Corporation had issued notice dated 02.12.2025, calling upon the parties to appear for enquiry on 08.12.2025. The petitioner had participated in the enquiry and after affording proper opportunity to the petitioner as well as the fourth respondent, the second respondent had passed the impugned order dated 08.01.2026, calling upon all the owners and tenants to vacate the premises so as to demolish the building for the sake of public safety.

**8.** When the building was inspected by the experts and report has been filed certifying that it is not structurally stable and that there



W.P.No.2452 of 2026

is a risk of the building getting collapsed due to its dilapidated condition and opined that it is not suitable for occupation, the Corporation had conducted enquiry as directed by this Court and had passed the impugned order. When the public safety is of paramount importance and the impugned order has been passed based on the expert report and after affording sufficient opportunity, we find no error or any illegality in the impugned order warranting interference.

**9.** In view of the above, the writ petition stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, interim applications stand closed.

(SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI, CJ) (G.ARUL MURUGAN, J)  
11.03.2026

Index : Yes/No  
Neutral Citation : Yes/No  
sri



W.P.No.2452 of 2026

To:

- 1.The Greater Chennai Corporation,  
Rep. by its Commissioner,  
Ripon Building, Chennai - 600 003.
- 2.The Executive Engineer,  
Zone-V, Greater Chennai Corporation,  
No.61, Basin Bridge Road,  
Chennai - 600 021.
- 3.The Assistant Engineer,  
Greater Chennai Corporation,  
No.2, Memorial Hall Street,  
Park Town, Chennai - 600 003.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.2452 of 2026

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

sri

W.P. No.2452 of 2026  
and W.M.P. Nos.2700 & 2704 of 2026

11.03.2026