WEB COPY

Order QR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-10-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

WP No. 30337 of 2026

CNR:{HCMA011738892026}

and

WMP NO. 33307 of 2026

Palaniammal
W/o Late. Jayaraj,
No 07, West Avenue Road,
Kamaraj Nagar (N173)
Thiruvanmiyur, Chennai 600 041

..Petitioner

Vs

1.The Assistant Executive Engineer (N13)
Greater Chennai Corporation,
Town Planning -Enforcement,
Chennai

2.The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Housing Board (TNHB),
CMDA Complex, E and C Market Road,
Koyambedu, Chennai 600 107

..Respondent

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying to pass an order in the nature of Writ, or direction or a Writ of certiorari calling for the records relating to the proceedings of the 1st respondent impugned Notice No I / N13/ N173/ 00586 / 2026 dated 03.07.2026 and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner: Mr. J. Ranjith Kumar

For Respondent(s): Ms.P.T.Ramadevi, Standing Counsel For R1
Mr. D. Veerasekaran Standing Counsel For R2

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

WEB COPY

Order

The notice dated 03.07.2026 passed by the first respondent is under challenge in the present Writ Petition. By the impugned order, the first respondent directed the petitioner to produce the following documents:

1. Planning Permission issued by the competent authority.
2. Building Permit issued by the competent authority.
3. Approved Plan issued by the competent authority.

2. Mr. J. Ranjith Kumar, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that, though the impugned notice ostensibly calls upon the petitioner to produce certain documents, it refers to Sections 56 and 57 of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act, which, according to the counsel, pertain to the issuance of a lock and seal notice.

3. Ms.P.T.Ramadevi, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the first respondent submits that the impugned notice was issued only for the purpose of verifying whether the petitioner had obtained the requisite planning permission and building permit and that it is not, by itself, a lock and seal notice.

4. Mr. D. Veerasekaran, learned standing counsel appearing for the second respondent, submitted that the second respondent is only a formal party

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

WEB COPY

and that the impugned notice was issued by the first respondent. The said submission is recorded.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. It is seen that, by the impugned notice, the petitioner has been directed only to produce certain documents. In such circumstances, the petitioner is directed to furnish the documents specified in the impugned notice to the first respondent within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. With the above direction, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

28-10-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

BGA

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

WEB COPY

To

1.The Assistant Executive Engineer (N13)
Greater Chennai Corporation,
Town Planning -Enforcement,
Chennai.

2.The managing Director
Tamil Nadu Housing Board (TNHB)
CMDA Complex, E and C Market Raod,
Koyambedu, Chennai 600 107

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

WEB COPY

N.SENTHILKUMAR J.

BGA

WP No. 30337 of 2026
and
WMP NO. 33307 of 2026

28-10-2026

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