



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.03.2026

CORAM

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

WP No.1016 of 2025

M/s Tripower Enterprises (private) Limited,
Represented by its Director,
G.Madhurambal

: Petitioner

versus

1.The Commissioner of Land Administration,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk, Chennai-600 005.

2.The District Collector,
Chennai District, Chennai-600 001.

3.The Revenue Tahsildar,
Alandur Taluk, Chennai-600 016

4.State Bank of India
Rep by its Chief Manager/Authorized Officer
Stressed Assets Management Branch
No 1112, Raja Plaza, 1st floor Avinashi Road,
Coimbatore-641 037

: Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for
issuance of a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

impugned order dated 12.07.2023 made in Roc.No.K5/2895962/2022 passed by the 1st respondent, thereby classifying the secured assets as "Sarkar Poramboke-House site" and quash the same as the impugned Order is perverse, illegal and contrary to his own Order dated 14.02.2023 of the 1st respondent and is in violation of the Orders of this court in the same issue, in order dated 09.09.2022 in WPs No.32535 of 2019 batch and order dated 27.4.2023 in WPs No.7735 of 2023 batch.

WP No.1023 of 2025

M/s Tripower Enterprises (private) Limited,
Represented by its Director,
G.Madhurambal

: Petitioner

versus

1.The District Collector,
Chennai District, Chennai-600 001.

2.The Revenue Tahsildar,
Alandur Taluk, Chennai-600 016.

3.The State Bank of India,
Rep. by its Chief Manager,
Stressed Assets Management Branch,
Coimbatore

: Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the impugned order dated 15.10.2024 made in Na.Ka.No.A1/489/2023 passed by the 2nd respondent, quash the same in view of the finality to the orders dated 09.09.2022 and 27.04.2023 made in W.P.No.32535 of 2019 and W.P.No.7735 of 2023 respectively.

Page 2 of 10



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

For Petitioner

: Mr.V.Raghavachari,
Senior counsel
for Mr.P.Krishnan

For Respondents

: Mr.R.Raman Laal,
Additional Advocate-General,
assisted by Mr.M.Habeeb Rahman,
Government Advocate,
for respondents 1 to 3
in WP No.1016/2025
& R-1 & R-2 in WP No.1023 of 2025

Mr.N.Ramesh,
for respondent No.4 in WP No.1016/2025

COMMON ORDER

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

Challenge to the order dated 12.07.2023 is premised mainly on the ground that the order is absolutely without jurisdiction and attempts to sit over and set at naught the order passed by a Division Bench of this Court in W.P.Nos.7735, 11186 and 11408 of 2023, on 27.04.2023, filed by the petitioner and other persons having claims, counter-claims in respect of the subject-matter of the property.



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that after purchase of the property by way of auction, way back in 2007, for a total sale consideration of Rs.60.25 crores, the petitioner has been struggling and being involved in one or the other litigation. It is submitted that time and again, though orders were passed in his favour, he is unable to get the fruits because of the various petitions filed and orders passed by the authorities. He would submit that earlier, when his application for patta was rejected by the Commissioner of Land Administration on 14.02.2023, a writ petition was filed, which was eventually allowed by this Court on 27.04.2023. The order was challenged by one A.R.Sridharan, by filing Special Leave Petition (SLP), which was ultimately withdrawn. The State did not file any SLP. However, number of review petitions were filed, which were also dismissed by this Court on 09.01.2026, and contentions regarding defect of title were not entertained by this Court. However, thereafter, in order to nullify the orders and proceedings of this Court, the authority has passed the impugned order on *suo motu* basis, on 12.07.2023, which again seeks to nullify all the earlier proceedings and declarations of the petitioner's entitlement to seek patta.



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

3. Learned State counsel would submit that orders which have been passed in the earlier round of litigations between the petitioner and the State and other parties did not examine the issue which has now been examined by the Commissioner in its order dated 12.07.2023. According to him, the main basis for issuance of the impugned order dated 12.07.2023 was the fraudulent and illegal activities of the Settlement Officer, Chennai-5, who had connived with the land grabbers, and paved the way to grab Government lands. The order passed by the Settlement Officer earlier on 02.09.2008, allowing patta under Section 13 of the Tamil Nadu Minor Inams (Abolition and Conversion into Royatwari) Act, 30 of 1963 in favour of M/s.Associated Trading Corporation Private Ltd, was cancelled as null and void. Therefore, the petitioner would not get any benefit of the various orders and proceedings, including the order passed by the Division Bench earlier.

4. Having considered the submission of the learned counsel for the parties, we find that the authority has passed the impugned order without hearing the affected parties. The order that settlement of land in favour of M/s.Associated Trading Corporation Pvt Ltd was bad in law,



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

could not have been passed without giving any opportunity of hearing to the petitioner because the petitioner is the purchaser of the land, which was placed as collateral security by M/s.Associated Trading Corporation Private Ltd, in the matter of grant of loan by the bank to another party, and which property ultimately came to be sold by way of auction in proceedings initiated under Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002, towards recovery of loan of the bank. The authority had full notice and knowledge that the property has not only been sold by way of auction in favour of the petitioner but thereafter, an order of possession has also been passed. This, we are saying in view of the fact that earlier, the very same authority had passed an order on 14.02.2023; in which proceedings, all these facts were brought to the notice of the authority. Therefore, the order impugned is liable to be set aside on this ground alone.

5. Otherwise also, we find that despite orders passed by this Court time and again, the authorities are re-opening the matter without challenging the earlier orders. Once order dated 14.02.2023, passed by the Commissioner was set aside by a Division Bench of this



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

Court in its order dated 27.04.2023, holding in favour of the writ petitioner, as regards his entitlement for grant of patta, it was not open for the Commissioner to reopen the matter. In fact, an attempt was made by filing review petition to seek reopening of the case on the same ground, which was rejected by this Court by dismissing the review petition on 09.01.2026.

6. The Division Bench passed the order on 27.04.2023. If the respondent State had any grievance, the order passed by the Division Bench could have been challenged in an higher forum. This was not done. The SLP filed by A.R.Sridharan was dismissed as withdrawn. Review petition has now been dismissed.

7. In these circumstances, the order otherwise appears to be more an attempt to set at naught and nullify various orders and proceedings drawn by the Court in the past.

8. For the aforesaid two reasons, the impugned order cannot be sustained and hence, the same is set aside. WP No.1016 of 2025 is allowed.



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

WEB COPY

9. In WP No.1023 of 2025, the petitioner has challenged the consequential order to the order impugned in WP No.1016 of 2025.

10. Since the order impugned in WP No.1016 of 2025 is set aside, the order impugned in WP No.1023 of 2025 is also set aside and WP No.1023 of 2025 is allowed.

11. There will be no order as to costs. WMP Nos.1266, 1271 and 1272 of 2025 are closed.

(MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA, CJ.) (G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.)
03.03.2026

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



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The District Collector,
Chennai District, Chennai-600 001.
- 2.The Revenue Tahsildar,
Alandur Taluk, Chennai-600 016.
- 3.The Chief Manager,
State Bank of India,
Stressed Assets Management Branch,
Coimbatore
- 4.The Commissioner of Land Administration,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk, Chennai-600 005.



WEB COPY



WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND

G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.

(tar)

WP Nos.1016, 1023 of 2025

03.03.2026