

J.SUBBULAKSHMI Vs The District Development officer (DDO)

J.SUBBULAKSHMI Vs The District Development officer (DDO)

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1435121

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Apr-01-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice Abdul Quddhose

Appeal No. : WP/12243/2026

Appellant : J.Subbulakshmi

Respondent : The District Development officer (DDO)

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE AND WMP NO.
13368 OF 2026

1. J.Subbulakshmi W/o V. Jeyakumar, No 4/1 Sathiyamoorthi street,
kamaraj Nagar, avadi, Chennai 600 071 Petitioner(s) Vs

1. The District Development officer

(DDO) Villivakkam Panchayat, Chennai 2.The Special officer Block development officer, Village Panchayat, Palavaedu Panchayat, thiruvallur District Respondent(s) PRAYER Calling for the records of the Respondent dated 12.03.2026 in na.Ka. no 3320 / 2025 / A6 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to issue the license to the petitioner as per her application dated 13.02.2026 For Petitioner(s): B.Kumarasamy For Respondent: Mr. M. Shahjahan Special Government Pleader for R1 Mr. V. Manoharan Additional Government Pleader for R2

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed, challenging the impugned order dated 12.03.2026 passed by the second respondent, directing the petitioner to remove the pigs from the piggery farm operated by the petitioner in the properties morefully disclosed in the impugned order dated 12.03.2026.

2. The petitioner contends that on 10.03.2026, the respondents had

directed her to comply with certain requirements for the grant of licence in favour of the petitioner to run the subject piggery farm. According to the petitioner, despite the same, the respondents immediately on 12.03.2026 passed the impugned order, directing the petitioner to remove the pigs from the piggery farm operated by the petitioner, which according to the petitioner is arbitrary and illegal. The petitioner has challenged the impugned order dated 12.03.2026 on the ground of violation of principles of natural justice.

3. Mr. M. Shahjahan, learned Special Government Pleader accepts notice on behalf of R1 and Mr. V. Manoharan, learned Additional Government Pleader accepts notice on behalf of R2.

4. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the second respondent, on instructions, would submit that the pigs in the piggery farm operated by the petitioner have already been removed by the second respondent.

Therefore, according to him, the prayer sought for in this writ petition has now become infructuous. The same is disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner, who would submit that the petitioner continues to run the piggery farm.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that when the

petitioner had started the piggery farm, there was no requirement for obtaining licence. According to the petitioner, the notification was issued by the respondents, requiring a party who operate a piggery farm to obtain licence only on 04.02.2026. According to the petitioner, she has been running the piggery farm from April 2025 itself. Admittedly, the petitioners application seeking for grant of licence to run the piggery farm is still under consideration by the second respondent.

6. On a prima facie consideration, this Court also finds that the impugned

order dated 12.03.2026 was passed by the second respondent within two days

from the date of the communication sent by the second respondent to the petitioner dated 10.03.2026, calling upon the petitioner to produce the documents disclosed in the said communication dated 10.03.2026. The petitioner also claims that she has been running the piggery farm from April 2025 onwards. Admittedly, the notification issued by the respondents which requires any party who run a piggery farm to seek licence, was issued only on

04.03.2026.

7. The petitioner categorically contends before this Court that at the time

when the petitioner started the piggery farm, there was no requirement for the petitioner to obtain licence. The petitioner was also not afforded an opportunity of hearing by the second respondent before passing the impugned order dated 12.03.2026, directing the petitioner to remove the pigs from the piggery farm.

8. After giving due consideration to the aforesaid factors, this Court in the interest of justice, since the petitioner was not afforded sufficient opportunity of

hearing by the second respondent, deems it fit to quash the impugned order

dated 12.03.2026 and remand the matter back to the second respondent for fresh consideration on merits and in accordance with law.

9. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 12.03.2026 passed by the

second respondent is hereby quashed and the matter is remanded back to the second respondent for fresh consideration on merits and in accordance with law. The second respondent, after giving an opportunity of one personal hearing to the petitioner and after giving due consideration to the petitioners contentions as raised in this writ petition, shall pass final orders on the petitioners application dated 13.02.2026, seeking for grant of licence to run the piggery farm within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this

order. Till final orders are passed by the second respondent, in case the second respondent had not removed the pigs from the piggery farm operated by the petitioner, the second respondent shall maintain status quo.

10. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of. No Costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. 01-04-2026 Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes Neutral Citation:Yes/No ab To 1.The District Development officer (DDO) Villivakkam Panchayat, Chennai 2.The Special officer Block development officer, Village Panchayat, Palavaedu Panchayat, thiruvallur District ABDUL QUDDHOSE J. ab AND WMP NO. 13368 OF 2026 01-04-2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com