



WEB COPY

WP No. 50692 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-01-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

WP No. 50692 of 2025

M/s.New Jeyam Bricks
Rep by Managing Partner
S.Jeyaraj Nanaratnam, S/o. Samuel
No.6/5, 4th Street, Kurunji Nagar,
West Tambaram, Chennai - 600 045.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The District Collector
Kanchipuram District,
Office of the District Collector of Kanchipuram.
2. The Tahsildar
Uthiramerur Taluk
Kanchipuram District
Office of the Tahsildar, Uthiramerur.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying to direct the respondents to permit the petitioner firm to remove the manufactured bricks stored in M/s.New Jeyam Bricks situated at in Survey Nos. 16/1, 16/2, 16/3A, 17/1, 17/2, 17/3, 17/4, 17/5, 17/6, 17/7, 21/4B, 21/5A, 21/5B, 35/5, 24/7A and 24/9B, Chithanakavur Village, Uthiramerur Taluk, Kanchipuram District.



For Petitioner(s):

M.L.Ramesh

For Respondent(s):

Mr.Staling Abhimanyu
Additional Government Pleader for
R1 & R2

ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed seeking a mandamus to the respondents to permit the petitioner firm to remove the manufactured bricks stored in M/s.New Jeyam Bricks, situated in Survey No.16/1, 16/2, 16/3A, 17/1, 17/2, 17/3, 17/4, 17/5, 17/6, 17/7, 21/4B, 21/5A, 21/5B, 35/5, 24/7A and 24/9B of Chithanakavur Village, Uthiramerur Taluk, Kanchipuram District and pass orders.

2. The case of the petitioner is that he had taken the subject property with business, on lease in the month of January, 2025. The petitioner had carried out renovation of the premises in February 2025, by following the guidelines of Ministry of Environment and a formal lease agreement was entered into only on 19.06.2025. Be that as it may, one A.Panneerselvam has submitted a petition before the District Collector, Kanchipuram on 24.02.2025, alleging that the unit run by the petitioner is causing traffic hazard and also causing health hazard to the villagers by polluting the environment. As a consequence, the authorities have initiated action against the petitioner. Since the petitioner was found to



have stored the manufactured bricks more than the permitted limit, proceedings were issued by the first respondent 20.03.2025 and accordingly, the petitioner firm came to an halt and no production was done thereafter. The petitioner would submit that necessary taxes have been paid by him to the village panchayat, without any default.

3. According to the petitioner, necessary requisite permissions were sought from the authorities viz., Department of Geology and Mining, Directorate of Industrial Safety and Health, Directorate of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Tamil Nadu Fire and Rescue Services and Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board etc., to proceed with the business and necessary registration certificates were issued by the aforementioned authorities, except the Pollution Control Board. The Tamil Pollution Control Board had rejected the petitioner's application by its proceedings dated 09.12.2025, stating that the petitioner's business was located within 0.80 kms from the habitants and this is in violation of Environmental Conditions. The petitioner would contend that the Pollution Control Board had ignored the fact that his lessor had started the business in the year 2007 in the said premises and was running the unit till then. Further, the subject property was constructed more than a kilometer away from the main village, however it was only the migrants and strangers who have occupied the areas in vicinity of the petitioner's premises. Aggrieved by the



proceedings of the TNPCB, the petitioner has preferred an appeal before the appellate authority.

WEB COPY

4. The petitioner would submit that that there has been no production in his premises since initiation of the proceedings of the first respondent dated 20.03.2025. However, prior to that, in the course of his business, he had manufactured around 1,50,000 bricks and same was in cold storage for more than a year. The manufacturing of these bricks involved huge cost and labour, and if the stocks are stored any further, it would be of economical waste. Hence, the petitioner had submitted his representation dated 17.11.2025 to the respondents, to permit him to remove the stock from his business premises. Since, his representation was not considered to date, the petitioner is before this Court.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the Sub Collector has initiated proceedings under 36(A) of the Tamil Nadu Minor Minerals Act, and by proceedings dated 30.06.2025, had directed the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.18,22,352/- and the same was duly paid by the petitioner on 08.07.2025. Further, on instructions, the learned counsel would submit that the petitioner would not involve in any manufacturing activities in the firm other than removing the stocked materials. Hence, the relief claimed by the petitioner may be considered.



WEB COPY

6. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents has produced the communication dated 07.01.2026 addressed to the office of the Government Pleader by the Assistant Director, Geology and Mining, Kancheepuram, wherein he has stated that the brick manufacturing unit of the petitioner, the subject property, was sealed on 19.06.2025 and the seal would be revoked only upon the petitioner producing the registration certificate and license issued by the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board. Therefore, on this ground, the claim of the petitioner seeking removal of bricks from his premises, cannot be permitted.

7. Heard the rival submissions and also perused the materials placed before this Court.

8. The penalty imposed on the petitioner has been paid and the same is not disputed. Without going into the merits of the case and also considering the fact that keeping the bricks in the subject premises would bring down its value, the petitioner is permitted to remove the bricks and sell it, after intimating the authorities concerned, and 50% of the sale amount shall be deposited before the first respondent.



9. With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

08-01-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

DS

To:

1. The District Collector
Kanchipuram District,
Office of the District Collector of Kanchipuram.
2. The Tahsildar
Uthiramerur Taluk
Kanchipuram District
Office of the Tahsildar, Uthiramerur.



WEB COPY

WP No. 50692 of 2



P.T.ASHA, J.

DS

WP No. 50692 of 2025

08-01-2026



WEB COPY

WP No. 50692 of 2

