

G.Mohanraj vs Executive Engineer

G.Mohanraj vs Executive Engineer

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1912410

Court : Chennai Orders

Decided On : Sep-26-2025

Judge : Honourable the Chief Justice, Honourable Mr. Justice G. Arul Murugan

Appeal No. : WP/36537/2025

Appellant : G. Mohanraj

Respondent : Executive Engineer

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.09.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA, CHIEF JUSTICE AND THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G. ARUL MURUGAN
Mohanraj : Petitioner

versus

4.M. Rupchand : Respondents
Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the 1st respondent, 2nd respondent and 3rd respondent to consider the

complaints number 2025- 549JNK dated 29.01.2025 and 2025-725NLG dated 21.03.2025 by the petitioner inspect the site and verify the documents and erase the unauthorized / illegal construction grabbed by the 4th respondent and in consequence to dispose the representation dated 2025-549 JNK dated 29.01.2025 and 2025-725NLG dated 21.03.2025 before the respondents within a time-frame. For Petitioner : Mr.J.Mithera Paul For Respondents : Mr.D.B.R.Prabhu, Standing Counsel for respondents 1 to 3

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble Chief Justice) The petitioner has sought issuance of direction to the authorities to remove the construction of fourth respondent, which according to the petitioner, is an illegal construction by encroaching upon the petitioner's land.

2. What has been stated in paragraph 6 of the petition is reproduced herein below:

6. I submit that the 4th respondent have also erected a tower in the terrace which is in my place where it was illegally encroached and so I have demanded the rent for the area he has encroached from the day of construction of the building and a monthly rent which was received by the tower company from the day of installation of the tower and till now. The 4th respondent refused and started to abuse and threatened again.

3. Apparently, there appears to be a dispute of civil nature between the petitioner and the private respondent because the petitioner has stated that he demanded rent, which was not paid by the private respondent.

4. The petition is, therefore, misconceived. Giving liberty to the

petitioner to file a suit, this petition is dismissed. There will be no order

as to costs. (MANINDRA MOHAN SHRIVASTAVA, CJ.) (G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.)
Index : Yes/No Neutral Citation : Yes/No tar To THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND

G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.

(tar)

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