

Veerapandi Vs The Superintending Engineer

Veerapandi Vs The Superintending Engineer

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1530298

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Jan-21-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice R.Vijayakumar

Appeal No. : WP(MD)/1284/2026

Appellant : Veerapandi

Respondent : The Superintending Engineer

Judgement :

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT DATED :
21.01.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR W.P(MD)No.1284
of 2026 and W.M.P(MD) No.1016 of 2026 Veerapandi ... Petitioner Vs.

1. The Superintending Engineer,
2. The Executive Engineer
3. The Assistant Engineer,
4. M.Thirunavkarasu

5. M.Gopal ... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the proceedings pertaining to the impugned order passed by the third respondent vide Office/ f.vz;; ckpngh/g/eh.Nfh/t.M/m.vz; 208/25, dated 26.12.2025 and quash proceeding in the same as illegal and subsequently direct the respondents 1 to 3 to consider the representation dated 30.12.2025 and conduct proper enquiry and consequently forbear the respondents 1 to 3 to give EB Connection to the suit schedule properties till the disposal of the suit. For Petitioner : Mr.C.Rajagopal For R1 to R3 : Mr.S.Deenadhayan Standing Counsel

ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed seeking to quash the order

passed by the third respondent dated 26.12.2025 wherein, the request of the petitioner not to grant any service connection to the fourth respondent has been rejected.

2. From the records, it could be seen that the petitioner along with two others have filed a Civil Suit in O.S.No.133 of 2021 on the file of the Sub Court, Sivagangai, seeking partition.

3. According to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the

fourth respondent does not have any title to the property and he is now trying to draw electricity line through the private property of the writ petitioner. He further submits that the fourth respondent is not a co-owner along with the writ petitioner.

4. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the fourth respondent

has produced certain records to establish his title in the suit schedule property. The impugned order further reveals that in case, if the petitioner is able to get a

favourable order from the Civil Court, they will take initiate appropriate action as against the fourth respondent.

5. In view of the such circumstances, this Court is of the considered

view that granting agricultural service connection to the fourth respondent would not in any way affect the rights of the writ petitioner in the partition suit. The respondents 1 to 3 are directed to get appropriate indemnity bond from the fourth respondent before effecting service connection.

6. With the above said observation, this writ petition stands disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently connected Miscellaneous Petition stands closed. 21.01.2026 NCC : Yes/No Index : Yes / No Internet : Yes / No ebsi To

1. The Superintending Engineer,

2. The Executive Engineer

3. The Assistant Engineer,

R.VIJAYAKUMAR,J.

ebsi W.P(MD)No.1284 of 2026 21.01.2026

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