
(2006) 06 MAD CK 0111

In the Madras High Court

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

Savithiriammal

APPELLANT

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-06-2006

Acts Referred:

Land Acquisition Act, 1894 — Section 4(1), 6

Citation : (2006) 3 MLJ 389

Hon'ble Judges : V. Dhanapalan, J;P. Sathasivam, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : A.S.Vijayaraghavan, for the Appellant; M. Dhandapani, Addl. Govt. Pleader, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

P. Sathasivam, J.—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 u/s 6 of the Land Acquisition Act and permitted the

Government to proceed further by issuing another Declaration u/s 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 u/s 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, ie., Thiruvengkatasamy. 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 u/s 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; *V. Devaraj, V. Sundararajan, V. Damodarasamy, Dr. V. Ramachandran and V. Lakshminarayanamsami Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu*, ; *Miss. Asiya Mariyan Vs. The Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu*. *Adi- Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, Fort St. George, Madras* and another, ; 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 u/s 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.