



Cont.P.No.1135 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.01.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA,
CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

Cont.P. No.1135 of 2025

S.Natarajan

: Petitioner

versus

1.P.N.Sridhar, IAS,
Commissioner
HR & CE Department
119, Uthamar Gandhi Salai,
Nungambakkam, Chennai 34

2.T.Anitha,
Joint Commissioner,
HR & CE Department
Sathvachary Post, Vellore 632 009,
Presently having office at
308, First Floor, Arcot Road,
Kakithapattari, Vellore 632 012

3.S.Narasimha Murthy,
Inspector,
HR & CE Department,
Tirupathur District 635 601

4.M.Navaneetham,
Tahsildar, Tirupathur

: Contemnors/Respondents

(R-4 impleaded as per order dated 03.12.2025)



Cont.P.No.1135 of 2025

Prayer: Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act to punish the respondents for wilfully disobeying the orders of this Court in WP No.27455 of 2023 dated 20.09.2023.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Manoj Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.P.Kumaresan,
Additional Advocate General,
assisted by Mr.N.R.R.Arun Natarajan,
Special Government Pleader
and
Mr.S.Ravichandran,
Additional Government Pleader,
for respondents 1 to 3

Mr.E.Vijay Anand,
Additional Government Pleader,
for respondent No.4

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

Taking into consideration the allegation in the contempt petition that the order passed by this Court way back on 20.09.2023 was not being complied with, we issued notice to the respondents, initiating contempt proceedings, on a *prima facie* satisfaction of wilful disobedience of the order passed by this Court.

2. When the petition was taken up for hearing today, the following officers were present in court:



Cont.P.No.1135 of 2025

- (i) Mr. P. N. Sridhar, IAS, (First respondent)
- (ii) Ms. P. Vijaya, (Second respondent)
- (iii) Mr. S. Narasimhamurthy (Third respondent)
- (iv) Mr. Navaneetham (Fourth respondent)

3. The affidavits/status reports which have been filed before this Court by respondents 1 to 3 and the newly added fourth respondent, would reveal that though, belatedly, out of 41 cents of land which were required to be recovered in compliance of the order passed by this Court, 30 cents have already been recovered. As far as the balance 11 cents of land is concerned, it is stated that long before the order was passed by this Court on 20.09.2023, in a civil suit pending before a competent Court of civil jurisdiction, injunction was operating since 2014 and therefore, as long as the order of the Civil Court remains in force, the order passed by this Court in respect of 11 cents of land could not be enforced and the land recovered.

4. After having gone through the contents of the affidavits, we are of the view that though there was delay in implementation of the order of this Court, insofar as 11 cents of land is concerned, there is a clear justification as the matter is *sub judice* and an injunction operating.



Cont.P.No.1135 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. As far as the balance 30 cents of land is concerned, we find that though steps were initiated, they were not brought to a logical conclusion within the time stipulated by the Court. The respondents 2, 3 and 4 have come out with certain causes for delay.

6. We are of the view that the authorities are required to be more vigilant in ensuring conclusion of the proceedings as directed earlier, within a period stipulated by this Court i.e. six months.

7. However, taking into consideration that now the order of the Court to the extent it could be complied with, has already been complied with, we are not inclined to proceed further in the matter.

8. Rule discharged. Petition stands closed.

(MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA, CJ.) (G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.)
19.01.2026

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
tar



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.1135 of 2025

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND

G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.

(tar)

Cont.P.No.1135 of 2025

19.01.2026