



W.A.No.810 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06.04.2026

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

W.A.No.810 of 2026

and C.M.P.Nos.8534 and 8535 of 2026

M.Muthulakshmi
W/o.Mathivanan,
SF. 646/1, Thottathu Salai,
Madathukulam, Karuvakkulam,
VTC Komaralingam (West),
Thiruppur District - 642 204.

Appellant

Vs

- 1.The Chairman-Cum-Managing
Director,
TANGEDCO, NPKRR Maligai,
No. 144, Anna Salai,
Chennai - 600 002.
- 2.The Superintending Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Thiruppur Road, Udumalai Pettai,
Thiruppur District - 642 126.
- 3.The Executive Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Udumalai Pettai Sub-Division,
Udumalai Pettai,
Thiruppur District - 642 126.



W.A.No.810 of 2026

WEB COPY

4.The Assistant Engineer,
Operation and Maintenance,
TANGEDCO,
Komaralingam,
Thiruppur District - 642 204.

5.A.Umamaheswari,
W/o.Granavadivelu,
No.10/20F, Reddy Street,
Virugambakkam,
Chennai – 600 092.

Respondents

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.3701 of 2021, dated 3.6.2024.

For Appellant: Mr.J.Jawahar

For Respondents: Mr.L.Jai Venkatesh
Standing Counsel
for R1 to R4

JUDGMENT

(Delivered by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

Heard.

2. The present intra-Court appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent assails the order dated 3.6.2024 passed in W.P.No.3701 of 2021, whereby the learned Single Judge dismissed the writ petition.



W.A.No.810 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. Brief facts are that the appellant is a cultivating tenant in respect of the land in S.F.No.646/1, situated at Thotta Sali, Madathukulam, Komaralingm, Tiruppur District. The appellant had constructed a shed to stay and look after the agricultural operations. The appellant sought electricity service connection for the said shed and the service connection was granted on 24.1.2020. While so, respondent No.5 claimed that she is the owner of the said land and requested disconnection of the electricity supply. When the service connection was disconnected, the appellant had fled W.P.No.5189 of 2020 before this Court seeking quashment of the proceedings dated 13.2.2020. Pending the said writ petition, the service connection was disconnected. Being aggrieved, the appellant has filed the writ petition.

4. The learned Single Judge, while dismissing the writ petition, observed that the electricity service connection was disconnected on 24.3.2020 and the service connection could be restored if the appellant approaches within two years of disconnection as per Regulation 22(7) of the Electricity Supply Code. The learned Single Judge has also observed that thrice orders have been passed against



W.A.No.810 of 2026

the appellant's claim. The authority after a detailed enquiry cancelled the residential certificate to the appellant and only after giving opportunity of hearing, the service connection was disconnected on 24.3.2020.

5. Assailing the order of the learned Single Judge, learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the learned Single Judge failed to see that the appellant had already enjoyed the benefit of electricity supply connection and it has been disconnected in an unlawful manner. Since the house was constructed to supervise and carryout agricultural operations, the supply of electricity is necessary and, therefore, pleaded that electricity connection be directed to be restored forthwith. He hastened to add that the appellant is still in possession of the land in question and she is ready to produce the residential certificate before the authority concerned.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for respondents 1 to 4 submitted that before cancelling the service connection, notice was given to the appellant. Since the appellant has failed to produce documents, the electricity service connection was disconnected on 24.3.2020. Upon appreciation of the factual aspects of the matter, the



W.A.No.810 of 2026

learned Single Judge dismissed the writ petition and there is no infirmity in the order of the learned Single Judge. Thus, prayed for dismissal of the writ appeal.

7. We have considered the rival submissions and also perused the materials available on record.

8. The appellant claims that she is the cultivating tenant in respect of the land comprised in S.No.646/1 and had filed the writ petition challenging the order of disconnection of electricity supply to her agricultural land.

9. The following facts emerge from the records. Qua transfer of patta in respect of the subject-land, the Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruppur had conducted a detailed enquiry and patta was transferred in the name of respondent No.5 based on the sale deeds dated 22.6.2014 and the said order was confirmed by this Court in W.P.No.7265 of 2017, vide order dated 28.8.2019. The appellant has never challenged the aforesaid sale deeds. In respect of the disputed land, respondent No.5 had filed a suit in O.S.No.213 of 2015 before the Sub-Court, Udumalpet, wherein an interim injunction was granted



W.A.No.810 of 2026

on 8.1.2016 holding that respondent No.5 and others are in possession of the property from the date of purchase. The appellant had filed an application to implead herself as defendant in the said suit, however, the said application was dismissed. No appeal was preferred by the appellant challenging the dismissal of the application. After filing of the suit by respondent No.5, the appellant has filed application before the Tahsildar, Madathukulam Taluk, to register her name as cultivating tenant in respect of the disputed land. The Tahsildar had rejected the claim after conducting a detailed enquiry. Against which, the appellant had filed appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruppur and the same was dismissed.

10. On consideration of the entire conspectus of the matter as well as the impugned order of the learned Single Judge, we find that the issue with regard to transfer of patta in respect of the subject property in the name of respondent No.5 was dealt with by this Court vide order dated 28.8.2019 in W.P.No.7265 of 2017. In the suit, which has been filed by respondent No.5, it is confirmed that respondent No.5 is in possession of the subject-property. The claim made by the appellant has also been rejected by the competent authority. Learned counsel for the appellant is unable to produce any modicum of



W.A.No.810 of 2026

material to show that the appellant is a cultivating tenant or she is in possession of the subject-property. With the aforesaid factual scenario, we are of the view that there is no error in the order of the learned Single Judge and, therefore, the writ appeal is bereft of substance. As to who is in possession of the land in question cannot be decided in writ proceedings.

The writ appeal is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

(SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI, CJ) (G.ARUL MURUGAN,J)
06.04.2026

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
bbr



W.A.No.810 of 2026

To:

WEB COPY

- 1.The Chairman-Cum-Managing
Director,
TANGEDCO, NPKRR Maligai,
No. 144, Anna Salai,
Chennai - 600 002.
- 2.The Superintending Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Thiruppur Road, Udumalai Pettai,
Thiruppur District - 642 126.
- 3.The Executive Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Udumalai Pettai Sub-Division,
Udumalai Pettai,
Thiruppur District - 642 126.
- 4.The Assistant Engineer,
Operation and Maintenance,
TANGEDCO,
Komaralingam,
Thiruppur District - 642 204.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.810 of 2026

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

bbr

W.A.No.810 of 2026

06.04.2026