



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 06.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P(MD)No.6072 of 2026

V.Anandham

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Authorized Officer,
Indian Oil Corporation Limited,
Southern Region Pipeline Project,
Plot No.48, Sri Ram Nagar 3rd Street,
Karumandapam,
Trichy-620 001.

...Respondents

Writ Petition is filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent to disburse compensation amount of Rs.1,24,763/- with suitable interest in respect of the land measuring of 45 sq.mts is situated in Survey No.375/5B, of Kalari Village, Ramanathapuram District by way of consider the petitioner's representation dated 27.12.2025.

For Petitioner :Mr.S.Sivakumar

For Respondent :Mr.M.Mahaboob Athiff

**ORDER**

The writ Petition is filed with the prayer to direct the respondent to disburse the compensation amount of Rs.1,24,763/- with appropriate interest in respect of the land measuring 45 square meters situated in survey No. 375/5B of Kalari Village, Ramanathapuram District.

2.Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material records of the case, the case of the petitioner is that the property in question originally belonged to one Subramaniam. In the year 2019, the property is now handed over to the petitioner pursuant to the sale agreement. For the purpose of drawing a pipeline, 45 square meters have been acquired by the respondent corporation and the amount is also sanctioned but till date, the same is not disbursed and therefore, the petitioner is before this Court.

3.Per contra, Mr.M.Mahaboob Athiff, learned counsel taking notice on behalf of the respondent Corporation, would submit that even according to the petitioner, the acquisition took place in the year 2018, whereas he entered into the agreement only in the year 2019, therefore, he has no locus standi to demand the compensation from the respondent.



WEB COPY

4. I have considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the material records of the case.

5. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the respondent, if the petitioner is only the subsequent agreement holder in respect of the remaining extent in the year 2019, then he will not have any local standi to claim the compensation. But however, if there is an arrangement between his vendor and himself enabling him to receive the compensation even though, he is only an agreement holder, then the same can be looked into by the respondent Corporation.

6. In view thereof, let the representation of the petitioner dated 27.12.2025 shall be taken up for consideration by the respondent and the opportunity of hearing be given to the petitioner. The petitioner can also produce such affidavit or produce the original land owner himself before the authorities, conveying his consent to release the amount to the petitioner herein. Upon such affidavit being filed or the original owner himself appearing before the respondent authority and consenting for payment of the amount to the petitioner, the same shall be considered in accordance with



W.P(MD)No.6072 of 2



law and the speaking order be passed within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of the web copy of the order.

WEB COPY

06.03.2026

NCC:Yes/No
am



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.6072 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

am

W.P(MD)No.6072 of 2026

06.03.2026