



WEB COPY

WP No. 16454 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 02-03-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G. JAYACHANDRAN**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED**

**WP No. 16454 of 2024**

Senthil Kumar  
S/o.Veerappan,  
No.3/106/2 Kottampatty,  
Akalampatti Village And Post,  
Thiruchengode Taluk,  
Namakkal 637212.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The District Collector  
District Collectorate,  
Namakkal.
2. The Assistant Director  
Department Of Geology And Mining,  
Namakkal.
3. The Block Development Officer  
O/o.The Block Development Officer,  
Elachipalayam, Namakkal.
4. P.S.K.Arun  
S/o.Kandasamy,  
No.32/1 Kamaraj Nagar,  
Pallipalayam Village And Town,  
Kumarapalayam Taluk, Namakkal 638006.

..Respondent(s)



WEB COPY

This Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of mandamus restraining the respondents 1 and 2 from granting the quarry licence to the 4th respondent in S.No. 375/2 situated in Akalampatti Village, Thiruchengode Taluk, Namakkal District and consider petitioners representation dated 19.07.2023, 02.02.2024 and 26.04.2024 sent to the 1st and 2nd respondents herein as objection letters.

For Petitioner(s): Ms. Varshini .V.  
for Mr. I Abrar Md Abdullah

For Respondent(s): Mr. M.Vijayaragavan,  
for R4

Ms.V.Rani , Spl.G.P.,  
for R1 to R3

### **ORDER**

**(Order of the Court was made by Dr.G.Jayachandran J.)**

The writ petition is filed seeking mandamus to restrain the respondents 1 and 2 from granting quarry licence to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent in Survey No.375/2 situated at Akalampatti Village, Thiruchengode Taluk, Namakkal District.



WEB COPY

2. According to the writ petitioner, apprehending that the respondents 1 and 2 likely to grant quarry licence to the private respondent, had given a representation on 19.07.2023, 02.02.2024 and 26.04.2024 objecting for considering the application for grant of quarry licence on the ground that the residence of the writ petitioner is situated within 300 meters from the proposed quarry site.

3. After notice, the private respondent, namely 4<sup>th</sup> respondent, has entered appearance.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the fourth respondent submitted that the writ petition is premature. The application made by the fourth respondent yet to be processed. Further more, she also contended that the petitioner is not residing in the land, which is alleged to be 300 meters from the proposed quarry site.

5. As far as the first contention regarding premature writ petition, we are fully in agreement with the counsel appearing for the private respondent. The



cause of action for the petitioner will arise only if her objection is considered and overruled, or if not at all considered, and any licence granted in violation of Section 36(1-A) of the Mines and Minerals Act.

6. Second ground of defence is purely based on facts. It is open to the authorities, while considering the application for grant of quarry licence, survey the land proposed for quarrying and the land of the writ petitioner, whether it is purely agricultural land or any dwelling units are available there.

7. With this observation, writ petition stands dismissed. No order as to costs.

**(G.J.,J.) (S.S.A.,J.)**

**02-03-2026**

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MRP



To

1. The District Collector  
District Collectorate, Namakkal.
2. The Assistant Director  
Department Of Geology And Mining, Namakkal.
3. The Block Development Officer  
O/o.The Block Development Officer,  
Elachipalayam, Namakkal.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY

WP No. 16454 of 2



**DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.**

**AND**

**SHAMIM AHMED, J.**

**MRP**

**WP No. 16454 of 2024**

**02-03-2026**