

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

Savithiriammal Vs. the State of Tamil Nadu, Rep. by Secretary to Government, Housing and Urban Development Department and Special Tahsildar (Land Acquisition), Housing Scheme No. li

Savithiriammal Vs. the State of Tamil Nadu, Rep. by Secretary to Government, Housing and Urban Development Department and Special Tahsildar (Land Acquisition), Housing Scheme No. li

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/839355

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Jun-17-2006

Reported in : (2006)3MLJ389

Judge : P. Sathasivam and ;V. Dhanapalan, JJ.

Acts : Land Acquisition Act - Sections 4(1) and 6

Appeal No. : Writ Appeal No. 2105 of 2004 and W.A.M.P. No. 3865 of 2004

Appellant : Savithiriammal

Respondent : The State of Tamil Nadu, Rep. by Secretary to Government, Housing and Urban Development Department a

Advocate for Def. : M. Dhandapani, Addl. Govt. Pleader

Advocate for Pet/Ap. : A.S.Vijayaraghavan, Adv.

Disposition : Appeal allowed

Judgement :

P. Sathasivam, J.

1. The above Writ Appeal has been filed against the order of the learned single Judge, dated 07.02.2004, made in W.P.18730 of 1996, in and by which, the learned Judge quashed the declaration issued under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act and permitted the Government to proceed further by issuing another Declaration under Section 6 within the prescribed time limit. Not satisfied with the limited relief granted, the Writ Petitioner has filed the above Appeal.

2. Heard Mr. A.S. Vijayaragavan, learned Counsel for the appellant and learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents.

3. At the foremost, learned Counsel for the appellant submitted that the writ petitioner/appellant is the daughter of one Thiruvengkatasamy, who owned lands in S. Nos. 267/5 and 268/3, Ganapathi Village, Coimbatore Taluk. According to him, the said lands and other surrounded lands were sought to be acquired at the instance of the Tamil Nadu Housing Board for construction of houses under Ganapathi Neighbourhood scheme, Phase-II. It is further pointed out that the petitioner's father Thiruvengkatasamy died way back on 06.3.1987, however, Notification under Section 4(1), which was published in the Government Gazette on 14.06.1995, was issued in the name of the said Thiruvengkatasamy-dead person. It is also brought to our notice that the petitioner/appellant, on hearing the news that the authorities are taking steps to acquire her father's lands, submitted her objection, wherein, it is specifically stated that her father died long back leaving behind herself as the only legal heir. She also mentioned that the notice/Notification issued on dead person is illegal, improper and void. She further stated that though this aspect was specifically pointed out during the 5-A enquiry, even in the subsequent declaration, the respondents did not carry out necessary changes and issued the same only in the name of dead person, i.e., Thiruvenkatasamy. In such circumstances, according to the counsel, the learned Judge, having accepted the case of the petitioner, ought to have quashed the entire proceedings including Notification under Section 4(1).

4. We verified the 4(1) Notification, 5-A enquiry proceedings and Section 6 Declaration. As rightly pointed out, in the Notification and Declaration, it is stated

that Thiruvengkatasamy is the owner of the lands in S. Nos. 267/5 and 268/3. We have already referred to the written objection filed by the petitioner, who is none else than the daughter of the said Thiruvengkatasamy, to the effect that her father died on 6.3.1987. In such circumstances, it is but proper on the part of the Land Acquisition Officer to rectify the mistake in all the proceedings including 4(1) Notification. The Notification issued in the name of dead person is a nullity and the proceedings cannot be continued based on the said Notification.

5. This Court, in *Muthusamy v. The State of Tamil Nadu* 1993 1 M.L.J. 217; *Devaraj v. State of Tamil Nadu* ; *Asiya Mariyan v The Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu* ; and in series of other decisions, held that Notice/Notification issued in the name of dead person and the proceedings with respect to the said lands cannot be sustained. By applying the said principle, we accept the contention of the learned Counsel for the appellant and quash the Notification issued under Section 4(1), dated 14.06.1995. Consequently, Writ Appeal is allowed. No costs. Connected Miscellaneous Petition stands closed. It is made clear that the respondents are free to proceed with the acquisition, if they so desire, by initiating fresh proceedings in accordance with law.

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