



W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.7325 to 7327 of 2026

K.Madeswaran

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Director,
Tamil Nadu Green Energy Co-Operation Limited,
10th Floor Western Wing,
Anna Salai,
Chennai.
- 2.The Chief Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Green Energy Co-Operation Limited.
10th Floor Western Wing,
Anna Salai,
Chennai.
- 3.The Superintending Engineer,
Non Conventional Energy Source,
Aripalayam Post,
Udumalpet,
Dindigul District.
- 4.The Executive Engineer,
Wind Form Project,
Aripalayam Post,
Udumalpet,
Dindigul District.



W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

5.The Chief Electrical Inspector,
Thiru.Vi.Ka.Industrial Estate,
Guindy,
Chennai - 32.

6.The Jindal Green Wind 1 Pvt. Limited,
DSM-648, 6th Floor,
DLF Towers, Shivaji Marg,
Najafgarh Road,
Moti Nagar, Delhi West,
New Delhi - 110 015.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records relating to the impugned proceedings of the first respondent dated 18.03.2026 made in Lr.No.002866/L-12/F.M/s.Jindal Green Wind 1 Pvt Ltd/WEG.No.287(U-W)/25-26, D.No.147 granting location clearance approval to the sixth respondent in S.F.No.167/1 at Thethupatti Village, Aravakuruchi Taluk, Karur District to install 3150 kilowatt wind electrical generator in favour of the sixth respondent as illegal, arbitrary and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Shanmuga Selvam

For R1 : Mr.M.Lingadurai
Special Government Pleader

For R2 to R5 : Mr.S.Deenadhayalan
Standing Counsel

For R6 : No Appearance

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned proceedings of the first respondent dated 18.03.2026, whereby clearance



W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

approval has been granted to the sixth respondent in respect of S.F.No.

WEB C

167/1, Thethupatti Village, Aravakuruchi Taluk, Karur District, for installation of a 3150 kilowatt wind electric generator, and seeking to quash the same as being illegal and arbitrary.

2. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the materials available on record, the grievance of the petitioner is that he is the owner of adjacent land in S.F.No.69/1, situated at Thethupatti Village, Aravakuruchi Taluk, Karur District. It is his case that, pursuant to the impugned permission, the sixth respondent is erecting a windmill tower at a location which is only 112.66 meters away from the high-voltage electrical line passing through the petitioner's land in S.F.No.69/1.

3. The petitioner contends that such installation is in violation of the micro-siting guidelines issued by the Ministry of New and Renewable Energy, Government of India, vide Memorandum dated 22.10.2016.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would specifically rely upon the micro-siting condition contained in Clause V(iv), which is extracted hereunder for ready reference:



W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

"iv. Developer(s) shall maintain a distance of $HH + \frac{1}{2}RD + 5m$ (Hub Height + Half Rotor Diameter + 5 meters) from Public Roads, railway tracks, highways, buildings, public institutions and EHV lines."

5. Thus, taking into account the hub height of 140 meters, along with half of the rotor diameter (72 meters) and an additional clearance of 5 meters, the required minimum distance between the windmill tower and the high-voltage electrical line ought to be 217 meters.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner, relying upon the Google Map produced along with the typed set of papers, would submit that the installation has been made at a distance of only 112.66 meters. Therefore, it is contended that the same is in violation of the applicable guidelines and, on that ground, the petitioner seeks to quash the impugned permission granted to the sixth respondent.

7. Per contra, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents 2 to 5 would submit that the approval itself stipulates that commissioning of the windmill is subject to further inspection by the respondents 2 and 3. It is submitted that, upon completion of erection and



W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

prior to commissioning, the authorities would inspect the site to verify compliance with the micrositing criteria and, if any violation is found, appropriate directions would be issued to the sixth respondent, including relocation of the tower, if necessary.

8. Despite specific allegations having been made and notice having been served, the sixth respondent has chosen not to contest the writ petition.

9. I have considered the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record.

10. The submission made by the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents 2 to 5 appears to be reasonable to the extent that compliance verification is ordinarily undertaken prior to commissioning. However, in the present case, the requirement of maintaining a minimum distance of 217 meters from the high-voltage electrical line is not in dispute, and the petitioner has specifically asserted that the tower is being erected at a distance of only 112.66 meters. Significantly, this assertion has not been denied by the sixth respondent.



W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

11. In such circumstances, this Court is of the view that the matter need not be deferred to a later stage of commissioning. Accordingly, within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a web copy of this order, the respondents 1 and 2, either by themselves or through authorised officers, including the respondents 3 and 4, shall inspect the site in question. If it is found that the siting of the tower is in violation of the applicable micrositing guidelines, appropriate orders shall be passed directing the sixth respondent to relocate the tower. The order so passed, irrespective of the outcome, shall be communicated to the petitioner. Prior notice of inspection shall be given to both the petitioner and the sixth respondent, and the inspection shall be conducted in their presence. The final order shall be passed as expeditiously as possible, and in any event, within a period of two weeks from the date of inspection.

12. The writ petition is ordered accordingly. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

09.04.2026

Neutral Citation : No
smn2



W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Director,
Tamil Nadu Green Energy Co-Operation Limited,
10th Floor Western Wing,
Anna Salai,
Chennai.
- 2.The Chief Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Green Energy Co-Operation Limited.
10th Floor Western Wing,
Anna Salai,
Chennai.
- 3.The Superintending Engineer,
Non Conventional Energy Source,
Aripalayam Post,
Udumalpet,
Dindigul District.
- 4.The Executive Engineer,
Wind Form Project,
Aripalayam Post,
Udumalpet,
Dindigul District.
- 5.The Chief Electrical Inspector,
Thiru.Vi.Ka.Industrial Estate,
Guindy,
Chennai - 32.
- 6.The Jindal Green Wind 1 Pvt. Limited,
DSM-648, 6th Floor,
DLF Towers, Shivaji Marg,
Najafgarh Road,
Moti Nagar, Delhi West,
New Delhi - 110 015.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

smn2

W.P.(MD)No.9142 of 2026

09.04.2026