



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 22.01.2026

WEB COPY

Coram:

The Honourable Mr.Justice V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

**W.P.No.14413 of 2018
and W.M.P.No.17016 of 2018**

A.K.Ahemed Hussain

...Petitioner

Versus

1.The Commissioner,
Land and Estates,
Corporation of Chennai,
Rippon Building, Chennai – 3.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
Land and Estates,
Corporation of Chennai,
Rippon Building, Chennai – 3.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of certiorari calling for the records pertaining to the notice issued by the 1st respondent directing the petitioner to hand over the vacant possession under Ni.Ma.Oo.Thu.Na.Ka.NLE4/4756/2000 Dated 22.05.2018 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Sidharthan

For Respondents : Mr.G.T.Subramanian



ORDER

WEB COPY

The issue involved in this Writ Petition is an extremely narrow one. The Petitioner's father viz., K.A.Abdul Khader and one Mr.A.K.Habibullah had jointly purchased a property situated at No.6-61, Rikington Road, Ayanavaram, Chennai – 600 079 in the year 1990. The Petitioner and his father, Abdul Khader had built a super structure in the said property. While so, Petitioner's father had passed away. After the demise of Petitioner's father, the property came in the name of Petitioner and thereafter, Petitioner had been in possession and enjoyment of the said property. The Petitioner claims that he is doing dry fish business in the super structure erected in the property. The Petitioner is aggrieved by the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent, in and by which, the rent has been enhanced retrospectively for the property from the year 1989 to 2018.

2. The power of retrospective enhancement of rent is not available to a landlord be it private or under the ownership of the Corporation of Chennai.

3. Mr.P.Sidharthan, submits that considering the area where the property is situated is a prime commercial area, the Petitioner has no objection for enhancement of the rent from January, 2018 onwards. The learned counsel pleads that the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent may be quashed and the matter may be remitted back to the 1st Respondent for fixing the rent from the date of impugned order.



4. Considering the relationship between the parties and how the parties have been regularly approaching the Courts, I am of the opinion that quashing the impugned proceedings will only lead to one further round of litigation. Hence, I am of the view that both the parties can meet, negotiate and fix the rent for the property situated at No.6-61, Rikington Road, Ayanavaram, Chennai – 600 079.

5. Mr.G.T.Subramanian, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Respondents, states that he would instruct the officer, who is competent to take a decision on this issue to come before this Court on 28.01.2026.

6. The Petitioner is directed to appear in person before this Court on 28.01.2026.

7. List the case on 28.01.2026.

22.01.2026

mrr

Index: Yes/No

To

1.The Commissioner,
Land and Estates,
Corporation of Chennai,
Rippon Building, Chennai – 3.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
Land and Estates,
Corporation of Chennai,
Rippon Building, Chennai – 3.

3/4



WEB COPY



V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

mrr

W.P.No.14413 of 2018
and W.M.P.No.17016 of 2018

22.01.2026