2026:MHC:3258

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON: 16.07.2026

PRONOUNCED ON : 05.08.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE **C.V.KARTHIKEYAN**
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE **R.SAKTHIVEL**

W.A(MD)Nos.2848 to 2851 of 2025
and
C.M.P.(MD)Nos.15932, 15933, 15935 and 15936 of 2025

W.A(MD)No.2848 of 2025:-

M.Sabapathi ... Appellant

vs

1.The District Collector – cum -
Arbitrator,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.

2.The Competent Authority,
(Land Acquisition – cum District Revenue Officer),
National Highways – 209,
Collectorate, Dindigul District.

3.The Divisional Engineer,
National Highways Division,
19A, Jawahar Street,
Madurai – 20.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

4.The Project Director,
National Highways – 209,
National Highways Authority of India,
Project Implementation Unit,
Plot No.1, Aishwaryam Heights,
Indira Nagar, Sennamanaickenpatti (PO),
Thadikombu Road, Dindigul – 624 004.

5.The Special Tahsildar,
(Land Acquisition),
National Highways – 209 (By-pass),
1st Floor, Sakthi Complex,
Opp.to Krishna School,
Ottanchathiram, Dindigul – 624 619. ...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, to set aside the impugned order, dated 04.04.2025 made in W.P.(MD)No.10166 of 2024 on the file of this Court and allow the Writ Appeal.

W.A(MD)No.2849 of 2025:-

C.Karuppusamy ... Appellant

vs

1.The District Collector – cum -
Arbitrator,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.

2.The Competent Authority,
(Land Acquisition – cum District Revenue Officer),
National Highways – 209,
Collectorate, Dindigul District.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

3.The Divisional Engineer,
National Highways Division,
19A, Jawahar Street,
Madurai – 20.

4.The Project Director,
National Highways – 209,
National Highways Authority of India,
Project Implementation Unit,
Plot No.1, Aishwaryam Heights,
Indira Nagar, Sennamanaickenpatti (PO),
Thadikombu Road, Dindigul – 624 004.

5.The Special Tahsildar,
(Land Acquisition),
National Highways – 209 (By-pass),
1st Floor, Sakthi Complex,
Opp.to Krishna School,
Ottanchathiram, Dindigul – 624 619. ...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, to set aside the impugned order, dated 04.04.2025 made in W.P.(MD)No.10167 of 2024 on the file of this Court and allow the Writ Appeal.

W.A(MD)No.2850of 2025:-

C.Murugesan ... Appellant

vs

1.The District Collector – cum -
Arbitrator,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

2.The Competent Authority,
(Land Acquisition – cum District Revenue Officer),
National Highways – 209,
Collectorate, Dindigul District.

3.The Divisional Engineer,
National Highways Division,
19A, Jawahar Street,
Madurai – 20.

4.The Project Director,
National Highways – 209,
National Highways Authority of India,
Project Implementation Unit,
Plot No.1, Aishwaryam Heights,
Indira Nagar, Sennamanaickenpatti (PO),
Thadikombu Road, Dindigul – 624 004.

5.The Special Tahsildar,
(Land Acquisition),
National Highways – 209 (By-pass),
1st Floor, Sakthi Complex,
Opp.to Krishna School,
Ottanchathiram, Dindigul – 624 619. ...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, to set aside the impugned order, dated 04.04.2025 made in W.P.(MD)No.10168 of 2024 on the file of this Court and allow the Writ Appeal.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

W.A(MD)No.2851 of 2025:-

K.Thirumalaisamy ... Appellant

vs

1.The District Collector – cum -
Arbitrator,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.

2.The Competent Authority,
(Land Acquisition – cum District Revenue Officer),
National Highways – 209,
Collectorate, Dindigul District.

3.The Divisional Engineer,
National Highways Division,
19A, Jawahar Street,
Madurai – 20.

4.The Project Director,
National Highways – 209,
National Highways Authority of India,
Project Implementation Unit,
Plot No.1, Aishwaryam Heights,
Indira Nagar, Sennamanaickenpatti (PO),
Thadikombu Road, Dindigul – 624 004.

5.The Special Tahsildar,
(Land Acquisition),
National Highways – 209 (By-pass),
1st Floor, Sakthi Complex,
Opp.to Krishna School,
Ottanchathiram, Dindigul – 624 619. ...Respondents

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, to set aside the impugned order, dated 04.04.2025 made in W.P.(MD)No.10169 of 2024 on the file of this Court and allow the Writ Appeal.

For Appellants : Mr.M.Sricharan Rangarajan
Senior Counsel
for Mr.K.Muthu Ganesan Pandian
For R1 to R3 and R5: Mr.S.I.Muthiah
Counsel for State of Tamil Nadu
For R4 :Mr.Su.Srinivasan
Senior Central Government
Standing Counsel
(in all cases)

*****

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of this Court was delivered by **C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.**)

All these four Writ Appeals have been filed by the petitioners in W.P.(MD)No.10166 of 2024 (W.A(MD)No.2848 of 2025), W.P.(MD)No. 10167 of 2024 (W.A(MD)No.2849 of 2025), W.P.(MD)No.10168 of 2024 (W.A(MD)No.2850 of 2025) and W.P.(MD)No.10169 of 2024 (W.A(MD)No.2851 of 2025), aggrieved by the common order of a learned Single Judge of this Court, dated 14.04.2025, dismissing the four Writ Petitions.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

2.All the Writ Petitions had been filed in the nature of a Mandamus seeking a direction against the second respondent/Competent Authority (Land Acquisition)-cum-District Revenue Officer, National Highways, Dindigul District, to re-determine the compensation for acquisition of lands of the appellants/petitioners in Ottanchathiram, Dindigul District, according to the First Schedule of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and in compliance with Section 105(3) of the said Act and in terms of the guidelines 4.6(iii)(a) and (b) of the Comprehensive Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, Government of India, dated 28.12.2017 and consequently, to direct the 1st and 2nd respondents/District Collector-cum-Arbitrator, Dindigul and the Competent Authority (Land Acquisition)-cum-District Revenue Officer, National Highways, Dindigul District, to pay the re-determined compensation together with interest. The appellants/petitioners had given representations in this regard on 13.04.2024.

3.It had been contended by the petitioners/appellants herein that they were the owners of the lands at Ottanchathiram in Dindigul District which

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

had been acquired for formation of four lane, bye-pass road, etc., consequent to a notification issued on 17.07.2008, which had been published under Section 34(3) of the National Highways Act, 1956, and under Section 3D(1) of the Act 1956 and published on 31.08.2012 and gazetted on 06.09.2012. The second respondent had passed an award on 30.12.2013 determining the compensation payable to the Writ Petitioners.

4.It had been further stated that the Writ Petitioners, thereafter, initiated arbitration proceedings, as stipulated under the Act. They further claimed that the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, came into effect on and from 01.01.2014 and subsequently, some of the provisions of the said Act became applicable to other Acts as stated in the IV Schedule and one of the other Acts was the National Highways Act, 1956. The provisions of the said Act of the year 2013 became applicable to acquisition proceedings under the National Highways Act, 1956 on from 01.01.2015 consequent to Section 105(3) of 2013 Act. Subsequently, the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, Government of India, had issued guidelines on 28.12.2017, wherein, again, it had been reiterated that on compliance of certain

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

conditions, the compensation for land acquired under the National Highways Act, 1956, would be payable in accordance with the provisions of the 2013 Act. It had been further contended that the claims initiated by the Writ Petitioners seeking enhancement of compensation was dismissed by the first respondent. Thereafter, the Writ Petitioners filed Arbitration Original Petitions under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which, on the date of filing of the Writ Petitions, were pending before the Principal District Court at Dindigul.

5.The Writ Petitioners further contended that similarly placed land losers had sought redetermination of compensation and had filed Writ Petitions before this Court in W.P.(MD)No.14914 of 2020 and W.P.(MD)No.24052 of 2018. A learned Single Judge of this Court had allowed the Writ Petitions by order, dated 22.07.2021 and had directed the second respondent to re-determine the compensation in accordance with I schedule of the 2013 Act. It had been further contended that the Writ Appeal filed by the respondents had suffered an order of dismissal on 05.09.2023. It was, therefore, contended by the Writ Petitioners that they should also have the benefit of compensation for the land acquired to be determined under the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

provisions of the 2013 Act and it was under those circumstances that, they had filed the Writ Petitions.

6.The respondents however disputed the said contentions and contended that the Writ Petitioners have taken recourse to the law, as available to them and had also filed Arbitration Original Petitions under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. It had been further contended that after the lapse of nearly 11 years from the date on which the compensation had been initially determined, the Writ Petitions had been filed seeking redetermination. It had been contended that the Writ Petitioners are fence sitters, who had approached the Court after orders have been passed in parallel Writ Petitions and are taking advantage of the said order and therefore, are not entitled for the benefit. It had also been contended that a careful reading of Section 24 of 2013 Act, makes it clear that the acquisition under the National Highways Act, 1956, cannot be determined in entirety under the provisions of the 2013 Act and the compensation would still have to be determined only as already determined for the Writ Petitioners. It had, therefore, been contended that the Writ Petitions should be dismissed.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

7.The learned Single Judge on appreciation of facts had held that the Writ Petitioners have not explained the delay and laches in approaching the Court seeking re-determination of the compensation already determined. Reliance on this point was placed on a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***1996 (6) SCC 267 [State of Karnataka -vs.- S.M.Kotrayya and others]*** and also the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in reported in ***2011 (5) SCC 394 [Banda Development Corporation -vs-Motilal Agarwal]***. With respect to the notification issued by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, the learned Single Judge was of the opinion that an Executive Order cannot override the provisions of a Statute. The learned Single Judge, however, did not examine the entitlement of Writ Petitioners for determination of compensation in terms of I schedule of Act 2013. Holding as above, the learned Single Judge dismissed the Writ Petitions.

8.Heard arguments advanced by Mr.M.Sricharan Rangarajan, learned Senior Counsel for Mr.K.Muthu Ganesa Pandian for the appellants, Mr.S.I.Muthiah, learned Counsel for State of Tamil Nadu for the respondents 1 to 3 and 5 and Mr.Su.Srinivasan, learned Senior Central

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

Government Standing Counsel for the 4th respondent.

9.The Writ Appeals have been filed by the Writ Petitioners, who had filed the Writ Petitions in the nature of a Mandamus seeking a direction against the second respondent/Competent Authority (Land Acquisition – cum District Revenue Officer) at Dindigul District, to re-determine the compensation for acquisition of the lands of the appellants at Ottanchathiram, Dindigul District. This would indicate that the compensation had already been determined. We are informed that questioning the quantum of compensation, the appellants herein have filed appeals, as provided under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 and those appeals are now pending before the Principal District Court, Dindigul.

10.The appellants placed reliance on an earlier judgment of this Court in W.P.(MD)No.14914 of 2020 and 24052 of 2018 passed by a learned Single Judge of this Court, dated 22.07.2021. The order in W.P.(MD)No. 14914 of 2020 passed by the learned Single Judge was taken up before the Division Bench of this Court in W.A.(MD)No.92 of 2022 and the Division

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

Bench pronounced judgment on 05.09.2023 confirming the order of the learned Single Judge.

11.The learned Single Judge in the earlier Writ Petitions had taken note of the fact that the compensation amount, as determined by the Competent Authority, had not been deposited on or before 01.01.2015. In view of that particular fact, the learned Single Judge was of the opinion that the compensation determined should be re-examined in accordance with the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013/RFCTLARR Act, 2013. This opinion was on the basis of the comprehensive guidelines issued by the Government of India, dated 28.12.2017, wherein, among other guidelines, the applicability of RFCTLARR Act, 2013, was directed to be examined on the basis of the following conditions:

> *"4.6 Date of determination of market value of land*
> *(i).....*
> *(ii).....*
> *(iii) By now, it is also a settled proposition that the First, Second and Third Schedule of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 shall be applicable to the NH Act, 1956 with effect from 01.01.2015. As such, the following is clarified:*
>
> *(a) All cases of Land Acquisition where the Awards had not been announced under Section 3G of the NH Act till 31.12.2014 or*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

where such awards had been announced but compensation had not been paid in respect of majority of the land holding under acquisition as on 31.12.2014, the compensation would be payable in accordance with the First Schedule of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

(b) In cases, where the land acquisition process was initiated and award of compensation under Section 3G had also been announced before 01.01.2015 but het full amount of Award had not been deposited b yteh acquiring agency with the CALA, the compensation amount would be liable to be determined in accordance with the First Schedule w.e.f. 01.01.2015;

(c) In cases, where the process of acquisition of land stood completed (i.e. Award under Section 3G announced by CALA, amount deposited by the acquiring agency with the CALA, and compensation paid to the land owners in respect of majority of the land under acquisition) as on or before 31.12.2014, the process would be deemed to have been completed and settled. Such cases would not be re-opened."

12.Specific reliance had been placed on Clause 4.6(iii)(b), which provides that if the award amount had not been deposited on or before 01.01.2015, then, the compensation would have to be re-determined under the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

13.It is to be noted that the Writ Petitioners had filed the Writ Petitions after the judgment of the Division Bench confirming the opinion of the learned Single Judge. This fact had played upon the mind of the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

learned Single Judge while disposing the Writ Petitions and the said order is now put to challenge before us.

14.The learned Single Judge had come down heavily on the Writ Petitioners for their delay in seeking the relief which they sought. He had further observed that they can be termed as fence sitters, who had been watching the earlier proceedings as bystanders without making any effort to get into the arena and seeking parity and benefit after the result had been declared.

15.The learned Senior Counsel for the appellants pointed out that when the Statute provides a specific relief which is applicable to all those who seek such relief, then the appellants should not have been non-suited on the ground of delay and laches. The learned Senior Counsel argued that the appellants were only seeking the benefit of the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, and they, as land losers under the same notification and as the Writ Petitioners/Writ Appellants in the earlier round of litigations, were entitled to have the award re-determined in accordance with the provisions of RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

16.In this connection, the learned Senior Counsel pointed out that the judgments relied on by the learned Single Judge in ***2011 (5) SCC 394 [Banda Development Corporation -vs-Motilal Agarwal],*** would not be applicable, since the challenge in those proceedings were to the acquisition proceedings themselves. It had been held that the acquisition was for public purpose and there could not be challenge over the same. The learned Senior Counsel drew a distinction and pointed out that the appellants are not challenging the acquisition proceedings, but are only seeking compensation in accordance with the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

17.The learned Senior Counsel placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***2011 (5) SCC 394 [Banda Development Corporation -vs-Motilal Agarwal]*** wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had held that when a claim is legally sustainable, the delay should not be held against a litigant who approaches the Court seeking redressal of grievance. It was observed that non deliberate delay should not be held against the litigants.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

18.The learned Senior Counsel stated that the arguments of the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents regarding applicability of the guidelines of the year 2017 should be rejected, since even the learned Single Judge had not held that the said guidelines were not applicable, but had denied the relief to the appellants only on the ground of delay and laches.

19.We have carefully considered the arguments advanced the materials placed on record.

20.The acquisition proceedings by the second respondent for construction of National Highway was published under a Notification issued under Section 3D(1) of the National Highways Act, 1956 and published in the Gazette on 15.02.2012 covering 5,53,237 sq.meters of private lands across 6 villages in Dindigul District and an extent of 2,52,298 sq.meters of privates lands in Ottanchathiram Village which lands had been proposed to be acquired under the said Notification for forming of National Highway. The notification was published in the local dailies on 05.04.2012 under Section 3A(3) of the National Highways Act, 1956. It is an admitted fact that the lands of the appellants were also included for acquisition.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

Subsequently, a notification under Section 3D(1) of the Act 1956, was published on 31.08.2012 and in the Gazette on 06.09.2013. The compensation was determined under Section 3(G) of the said Act and award was passed vide Award No.1/2013/Ottanchathiram/Na.Ka. No. 36066/2009/E1/NH209, dated 30.12.2013 for grant of compensation of Rs. 29,14,737/-. The second respondent had issued proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 109/2013/A, dated 27.04.2015 for disbursement of compensation of Rs. 29,14,737/-. The appellants had filed appeals before the first respondent/District Collector and Arbitrator, under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which are now pending before the Principal District Court, Dindigul.

21.The learned Single Judge, as stated above, has held against the appellants on the ground of delay in approaching the Court. It had been repeatedly contended by the learned Senior Counsel that the issue of delay should not be held against the appellants, particularly, when their lands have been acquired and they should be granted compensation on par with those whose lands have also been acquired under the similar notification. But, however, a table had been filed on behalf of the appellants, which stated the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

details of the compensation awarded and the compensation that the appellants expected to be awarded under the 2013 Act. The table is as follows:

Appellant	Land Details	Compensation Awarded		Compensation as per 2013 Act
M.Sabapathy W.A.(MD)No. 2848 of 2025	S.No.505/1 Extent:6350 sq.mtrs	Rs.29,14,737/- After deducting IT: Rs.26,23,263/-	District Collector (Arbitrator) confirms the compensation awarded by CALA	Rs.92,20,164/-
C.Karuppusamy W.A.(MD)No. 2849 of 2025	S.No.505/2 Extent: 4450 sq.mtrs	Rs.35,41,966/- After deducting IT: Rs.31,87,769/-		Rs.91,03,474/-
C.Murugesan W.A.(MD)No. 2850 of 2025	S.No.505/3D1 Extent:286 Sq.mtrs S.No.505/3D2A Extent: 4158 sq.mtrs	Rs.56,80,997/- After deducting IT: Rs.51,12,897/-		Rs.1,87,20,434/-
K.Thirumalaisamy W.A.(MD)No. 2851 of 2025	S.No.593/1A Extent: 3000 Sq.mtrs S.No.600/1G Extent: 1750 Sq.mtrs	Rs.20,51,200/- After deducting IT: Rs.18,46,080/-		Rs.39,62,146/-

22.A perusal of the same shows that the appellants seek to gain substantially, if compensation is awarded under the 2013 Act. This is a factor, which has to be kept in mind, when examining the stand of the respondents that the appellants are fence sitters. This again should be examined in conjunction with the fact that in Ottanchathiram village, an extent of 2,52,298 sq.mts of land had been acquired. When the flood gates are opened overlooking the issue of delay, then there will be an avalanche

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

of claims seeking enhancement of compensation already received. It would result in re-determining the compensation again under RFCTLARR 2013 Act, when the claimants had acquiesced to the award already passed. Even in the instant case, the appellants have questioned the award of compensation by filing appeals under Section 34 of the Act, 1996 and the matters are pending consideration before the Principal District Court, Dindigul.

23.This Court will also have taken into account the budget, which had been allocated towards providing compensation for acquisition of lands and also for development and laying of the National Highways. If the claim of the appellants are acceded to, it would also cause prejudice and serious financial hardship to the respondents. This Court will have to balance both the facts, namely, the claim of the appellants seeking re-determination of compensation under the provisions of the 2013 Act and the financial hardship that would be caused to the respondents by such re-determination.

24.It is seen from the tabular column extracted supra that would be more than two times increase in the compensation for the lands of the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

appellants that had been acquired. When examined in the larger context of the entire acquisition is in small fraction. However, all other land owners were to seek parity and if the principle of fence sitters is given a go-by, then there would be substantial financial loss and as a matter of fact, fiscal collapse.

25.The learned Senior Counsel for the appellants claimed that the right to fair compensation had been violated, which was a fifth sub-right as stated in ***Kolkata Municipal Corporation -vs.- Bimal Kumar Shah***, reported in ***2024 SCC OnLine 968***.

26.It must be kept in mind that a right cannot be demanded to be granted particularly, when the seeker of the right slept over and watched parallel proceedings and on examining the result thereof, jumps into the fray claiming ignorance and innocence and thereby, seeking indulgence. The learned Single Judge had found as a fact that the appellants had approached the Court in 2024 nearly seven years from the date of the comprehensive guidelines being issued.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

27.In State of ***Uttar Pradesh and others vs Aravind Kumar Srivastva and others***, reported in ***(2015) 1 SCC 347***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had examined the issue of fence sitters, who had approached the Court after the relief had been granted to others and had held as follows:

> *"22.2.However, this principle is subject to well-recognised exceptions in the form of laches and delays as well as acquiescence. Those persons who did not challenge the wrongful action in their cases and acquiesced into the same and woke up after long delay only because of the reason that their counterparts who had approached the court earlier in time succeeded in their efforts, then such employees cannot claim that the benefit of the judgment rendered in the case of similarly situated persons be extended to them. They would be treated as fence-sitters and laches and delays, and/or the acquiescence, would be a valid ground to dismiss their claim.*

28.In view of the fact that we hold that the appellants are not entitled to succeed on the issue of delay and laches, it may not be required on our part to address the arguments advanced by the learned Senior Central Government Standing Counsel for the 4th respondent on the applicability of an Executive Circular qua a Statute.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

29.We hold that the appeals will necessarily have to suffer an order of dismissal and accordingly, they are dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

[C.V.K., J.] & [R.S.V., J.]
05.08.2026

Internet :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
NCC :Yes/No

cmr

To

1.The District Collector - cum -
Arbitrator,
Dindigul District, Dindigul.

2.The Competent Authority,
(Land Acquisition – cum District Revenue Officer),
National Highways – 209,
Collectorate, Dindigul District.

3.The Special Tahsildar,
(Land Acquisition),
National Highways – 209 (By-pass),
1st Floor, Sakthi Complex,
Opp.to Krishna School,
Ottanchathiram, Dindigul – 624 619.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)

WEB COPY

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.

AND

R.SAKTHIVEL. J.

cmr

Judgment made in
W.A(MD)Nos.2848 to 2851 of 2025

05.08.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 06/08/2026 11:28:43 am)