WEB COPY

Order QR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.11.2026

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

WA No. 3379 of 2026
CNR:{HCMA010843442025}

WA No. 3380 of 2026
CNR:{HCMA010843432025}

D.Karunanidhi
S/o.L.Dhandapani
No. 20/1 Vaikundavasagar Street,
Villupuram

Appellant in
WA No.3379/2026

D.Kamalashree
W/o. S.Dhanasekaran,
D.No1/326, Gangaiamman Kovil Street,
Koliyanur Village, Villupuram.

Appellant in
WA No.3380/2026

Vs

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

1.The District Collector
Villupuram-605 502

2.The Commissioner of Municipality
Municipality Office,
Villupuram-505 602

3.The Director
Directorate of Town and
Country Planning,
2nd 3rd and 4th Floor,
C and E Market Road,
Koyambedu, Chennai-600 107

4.The Deputy Director
Town and Country Planning
Department,
GST Salai,
Periyar Commercial Complex,
Chengalpettu-603 001

5.The Joint Director
Town and Country Planning
Department,
No.56/A, TAHDCO Building,
Government Hospital Road,
Villupuram-605 602

6.The Block Development Officer
Block Development Office,
Koliyanur, Villupuram Taluk,
Villupuram

7.M.Arumugam
S/o.Munusamy
Ayanampalayam Thiruvamathur
Madura, Vikkravandi Taluk,
Villupuram-505 501

Respondents
in both WAs

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Appeals filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent to set aside the common order dated 4.9.2024 passed in W.P.Nos.20376 and 20379 of 2024.

For Appellants: Ms.J.Lavanya

For Respondents: Mr.C.A.Ramanan
Govt. Advocate
for RR1, 3 to 6

COMMON JUDGMENT
(Delivered by G.Arul Murugan, J.)

These intra-Court appeals assail the common order dated 4.9.2024 passed in W.P.Nos.20376 and 20379 of 2024, whereby the relief sought to cancel the layout approval granted in favour of respondent No.7 came to be rejected by the writ court.

2. We have heard learned counsel for the appellants and learned Government Advocate for respondents 1, 3 to 6, and have also perused the materials available on record.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

3. The appellants had acquired the subject-properties in the years 2021 and 2023, respectively. It is the grievance of the appellants that respondent No.7 had obtained layout approval in the year 1990 by showing the properties acquired by the appellants as forming part of the layout. In this regard, the appellants approached the writ court seeking to cancel the layout approval granted in favour of respondent No.7. The learned Single Judge, considering the fact that the relief was sought after a period of 34 years and that around 134 plots had been sold and constructions had been put up by the purchasers, ultimately, dismissed the writ petitions.

4. It is to be noted that admittedly the layout was approved in the year 1990 and it is the claim of the appellants that the lands purchased by them have been shown as part of the layout. Since the appellants acquired the properties only in the years 2021 and 2023, respectively, even assuming their claim to be true, it was for their vendors to take appropriate action against respondent No.7, who promoted the layout. While the vendors of the appellants had

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

remained silent for nearly 34 years and allowed respondent No.7 to get the layout approved pursuant to which sub-division of plots was made, plots were sold to individual purchasers, and houses were constructed, the vendors, who remained silent all along and did not raise any claim for a period of nearly 34 years, conveniently conveyed the property to the appellants.

5. The appellants cannot claim any right more than what their vendors possessed and, if at all, they have any claim, it will lie only against the vendors before the competent forum, either individually against the vendors or along with the vendors, subject to limitation and the nature of the claim to be made.

6. In view of the above, the learned Single Judge, considering the fact that 34 years have already elapsed and the appellants acquired the properties only in the years 2021 and 2023, respectively, dismissed the writ petitions. We find no error or illegality in the order passed by the learned Single Judge.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

7. In the result, the writ appeals are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI, CJ) (G.ARUL MURUGAN,J)
20.11.2026

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

To:

1.The District Collector
Villupuram-605 502

2.The Commissioner of Municipality
Municipality Office,
Villupuram-505 602

3.The Director
Directorate of Town and
Country Planning,
2nd 3rd and 4th Floor,
C and E Market Road,
Koyambedu, Chennai-600 107

4.The Deputy Director
Town and Country Planning
Department,
GST Salai,
Periyar Commercial Complex,
Chengalpettu-603 001

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

5.The Joint Director
Town and Country Planning
Department,
No.56/A, TAHDCO Building,
Government Hospital Road,
Villupuram-605 602

6.The Block Development Officer
Block Development Office,
Koliyanur, Villupuram Taluk,
Villupuram

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Order QR

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

bbr

W.A.Nos.3379 and 3380 of 2026

20.11.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis