



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Reserved on	31.07.2024
Pronounced on	20.08.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.7433 and 7434 of 2020 and W.M.P.(MD)No.14347 of 2024

N.Jeevarathinam,
S/o.Nagupillai
Represented by his Power of Attorney
K.Kamaraj Pandian,
S/o.Kamaraj Kannadiar

(Petitioner is amended vide Court Order
dated 05.07.2024 in W.M.P.(MD)No.11762 of 2024
in W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by its Secretary,
Environment and Forest Department,
St. George Fort, Chennai.
- 2.The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
St. George Fort, Chennai.
- 3.The District Collector,
Theni District.
- 4.The District Revenue Officer,



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

Theni District.

5.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Uthamapalayam Division,
Theni District.

6.The Thasildhar,
Bodinayakkanur Taluk,
Theni District.

7.The District Forest Officer,
Theni District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating with the Government Notification in G.O.Ms.No.160, dated 26.11.2009 issued by the first respondent and published on 12.05.2010 in No.5, in Theni District Gazette, declaring the land in Survey Number measuring 28 cents in S.No. 589/1, and 13 Acre 79 Cents in S.No.589/3 in Agamalai Village, Bodinayakkanur Taluk, Theni District, as “Reserve Forest” and quash the same as it is illegal and contravene to Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act and in consequence to direct the fourth respondent to reclassify above said lands, as private land instead of Forest on the basis of the Settlement Land Register and to carry out the same in all the revenue records.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Suriya Narayanan

For Respondents : Mr.S.P.Maharajan
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this Writ Petition for the following relief:



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

WEB COPY

“Calling for the records relating with the Government Notification in G.O.Ms.No.160 dated 26/11/2009 issued by the 1st respondent and published on 12/05/2010 in No.5 in Theni district Gazette declaring the land in Survey Number measuring 28 Cents in S.No.589/1, and 13 Acre 79 Cents in S.No.589/3 in Agamalai Village, Bodinayakanur Taluk, Theni District, as “Reserve Forest” and quash the same as it is illegal and contravene to Section 3 of the Tamilnadu Forest Act and in consequence to direct the 4th respondent to reclassify above said lands as private land instead of Forest on the basis of the Settlement Land Register and to carry out the same in all the revenue records.”

2. The land in question is said to have been purchased by one Mr.M.Nagupillai from Mrs. Chinnathayi aliases Veerammal on **07.03.1949** in Zamin Pymash No.1061, in respect of which, Patta transfer was made in the name of Mr.M.Nagupillai on **28.06.1949**. Similarly, On **10.03.1949** Mr.M.Nagupillai also purchased another extent of land from Mr.Periyakaruppa Thevar in Zamin Pymash No.1058 with which we are not concerned in this case.

3. The land, in question stood vested with the Government of Tamil Nadu , vide **G.O.Ms.No.3157** of the Revenue Department, dated **09.12.1950**, under the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, hereinafter referred to as the Tamil Nadu Estates Abolition Act,1948 after it came into force on **19.04.1949**.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

4. The entire extent of land was also notified in Madurai District Gazette on **02.06.1954** under Section 26 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882.

Meanwhile, during 1963, the Revenue Settlement Proceedings were completed under the provisions of the Estate Abolition Act, 1948.

5. The subject land was later notified under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882, to constitute the land as “Reserve Forest” on **30.04.1977**. Thereafter, proclamation under Section 6 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 was issued by the Forest Settlement Officer (FSO) on **14.06.1978** in the District Gazette in English and on **20.04.1978** in Tamil. Meanwhile, the Forest Conservation Act, 1980 was enacted, which came into force on **25.10.1980**. The subject land has been classified as forest land.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its order dated **07.05.1999** in I.A.No. 418 in W.P.(C).No.202 of 1995 and in T.N.Godhavarman vs. Union of India (1997) 2 SCC 267, had issued series of omnibus Order restraining the Government from issuing patta over the reserved forest land.

7. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner is the power of attorney holder of one Mr.N.Jeevarathinam (since deceased), the son of late Mr.M.Nagupillai. It appears that earlier, the said Mr.N.Jeevarathinam had entered into a Sale Agreement dated **01.08.2008**, with the petitioner's wife



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

Mariammal for sale of the subject land.

WEB COPY

8. Later, Mr.N.Jeevarathinam (since deceased) had purportedly executed a registered Power of Attorney dated **23.12.2008** which was registered as Document No.1519 of 2008, before the Joint Sub-Registrar No.II, Dindigul in favour of the petitioner. During the interregnum, Mr.N.Jeevarathinam has also died. Thus, the Petitioner is not the owner of the subject land.

9. Initially, the present writ petition was filed by the deponent, K.Kamaraj Pandian as the petitioner in his personal capacity and not as Power of Attorney of Mr.N.Jeevarathinam. Thereafter, the petitioner prayed for amending the cause title in the present writ petition in the name of Mr.N.Jeevarathinam, S/o.M.Nagapillai. Thus, the Writ Petition is now in the capacity of a Power of Attorney Holder of Mr. N.Jeevarathinam (since deceased).

10. It appears that no claim was made by Late Mr.N.Nagupillai, the father of Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam, for issuance of Settlement Patta under the provisions of the Estate Abolition Act, 1948, though Patta No.825 was earlier issued to Late Mr.N.Nagupillai, which is said to have been issued to the latter under the relevant Revenue Standing Orders as in force during that period.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

11. After coming to know that the subject matter lands were classified as “Kaadu” (Forest), the Petitioner made a representation before the 3rd Respondent/District Collector in the year 2009 stating that the land was wrongly classified as a forest land. The representation was forwarded to the then Forest Settlement Officer, who had given a report dated **26.08.2009** stating that the classification of the land as ‘Kaadu’ was wrong and that it was only a patta land, since ryotwari patta was issued during the Settlement Period in the name of Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam during his life time, which was overlooked. However, there are no documents to show that Mr. N.Jeevarathinam was instead issued with a Settlement Patta under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Estates Abolition Act, 1948. Relevant portion of said report dated **26.08.2009** of the then Forest Settlement Officer as under:

“ஆக மேற்படி புலங்கள் இரண்டும் UDR “அ” பதிவேட்டின்படி “காடு” என பாகுபாடு செய்யப்பட்டுள்ளது. இந்நிலத்தில் காமராஜ்பாண்டியன் என்பவர் மாரியம்மாள் பெயரில் பட்டா வழங்க கேட்டுள்ளார். இது குறித்தான புலத்தணிக்கையில் டைடி புலத்தில் 40 வயதுள்ள 35 உலகு மரங்கள் வளர்ந்துள்ளன. நிலம் சற்று சரிவாக உள்ளது.

மேற்படி அகமலை கிராம ச.எண்.589/1 மற்றும் 589/3 நிலவரி செட்டில்மெண்டுக்கு முன்பு திரு.நாகுபிள்ளை என்பவரால் ஜமீன் பைமாஸ் எண்.1061-ன் படி அனுபோகம் செய்யப்பட்டுள்ளது. இது தொடர்பாக ஜமீன் பைமாஸ் எண்.1061-ன் படி திரு.நாகுபிள்ளை என்பவருக்கு பசலி 1358-ல் ஜமீன் பட்டா வழங்கப்பட்டுள்ளது.

பைமாஸ் எண்.1061-க்கு தற்போதைய UDR ச.எண்.581/1, 3-க்கு



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

பட்டா எண்.825 என போடிநாயக்கனுர் செட்டில்மெண்ட் அலுவலரால் கடந்த 12.03.1962-ல் நகல் வழங்கப்பட்டுள்ளது.

WEB COPY

இப்பலத்திற்கு (589/1, 3-க்கு) செட்டில்மெண்ட் FMB வரைபடம் இருந்துள்ளது. எனவே இவ்வினத்தில் UDR பதிவேட்டிற்கு முந்தைய செட்டில்மெண்ட் பதிவேடு மற்றும் SLR நகல் ஆகியவற்றை நில உரிமை தொடர்பான ஆவணமாக கருதி, அகமலை கிராம ச.எண்.581/1, 3-ல் UDR “அ” பதிவேட்டில் “காடு” என தவறுதலாக வகைப்பாடு செய்யப்பட்டதை நீக்கி “பட்டா” என மாற்றம் செய்யலாம் என்பதைப் பணிபுடன் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.

இத்துடன் தற்போதைய UDR கிராம கணக்கு நகல்கள், செட்டில்மெண்ட் கிராம கணக்கு நகல், SLR நகல் மற்றும் ச.எண்.589/1, 3 FMB மனுதாரரது பவர் பத்திரம், கிராம நிருவாக அலுவலரின் அறிக்கை, புலத்தணிக்கை குறிப்பு ஆகியன சமர்ப்பித்துள்ளேன்.”

12. The translation of the relevant portion of the above Report of the Forest Settlement Officer (FSO) reads as under:-

“I am submitting herewith a Report after conducting an Enquiry as sought for by the District Collector in the letter 2nd cited under reference, wherein, a Report has been called for after conducting an Enquiry on the petition submitted by one Tr.K.Kamarajpandian.

The land in Survey Nos.589/1 and 3, Agamalai Village, Bodinaickanur Taluk are comprised in Zamin Patta No.825. As per the Settlement Register, the aforesaid lands are found as mentioned below :

S.No.	Extent Are Cent
589/1	0.28



589/3

13.79

WEB COPY

As per UDR A Register it is found as mentioned below :

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Extent</i>	<i>Classification</i>
589/1	0.11.5	Forest
589/3	5.57.5	Forest

Hence, both the aforesaid lands have been classified as per UDR 'A' Register. Tr.Kamarajpandian has requested for issuance of Patta in the name of one Mariammal for the aforesaid land. During the land survey, 40 years old 35 numbers of 'Ulagu' Trees were found to be grown in the aforesaid land. The land was found to be slightly sloping.

*Before the Land Settlement for the land in Survey Numbers 589/1 and 589/3 in the aforesaid Agamalai village, it was under the possession of one Tr.Nagupillai as per **Zamin Pymash** No. 1061. In this connection, **Zamin Patta** in Fasli 1358 has been issued to Tr.Nagupillai as per **Zamin Pymash** No.1061.*

*The Settlement Officer, Bodinaickanur, had issued a copy on **12.3.1962** assigning Patta No.825 for the Paimash Number 1061 and present UDR S.No.581/1 & 3.*

There is a Settlement FMB Rough Sketch for this land (S.No. 589/1 & 3). Therefore, I humbly inform that, on considering the Settlement Register and SLR copy as previous document to the UDR Register as the document related to land ownership pertaining to this Forest, the classification which was made wrongly as 'Forest' in the UDR 'A' Register with regard to the S.No.581/1, 3 in Agamalai Village may be removed and classified as 'Patta'."



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

13. It is submitted that, the 3rd Respondent however did not reclassify the status of the subject land in the Official Land Records. The deponent has made atleast two attempts earlier before this Court for re-classification of the forest land into patta land. In the first instance, the deponent had filed **W.P.(MD).No. 4741 of 2010** for a “Writ of Mandamus” to direct the District Collector, Theni and the District Forest Officer, Bodinayakanur Circle, Theni, to consider the deponent’s representation dated **13.01.2009** and to forbear the respondent to not to disturb the peaceful possession from the deponent. The said Writ Petition was dismissed on **30.11.2012** with the following observations:-

“2. A counter affidavit had been filed on behalf of the third respondent stating that the lands in question are forest lands, as per the provision of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882, and therefore, no patta can be granted in favour of the petitioner, as prayed for by him, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court, in T.N.Godhvarnan vs. Union of India and others, reported in (1997) 2 SCC 267.

3. In view of the statements made in the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the third respondent, this Court is of the view that the relief prayed for by the petitioner, in the present Writ Petition, cannot be granted. Hence, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs.”

14. Long after **W.P.(MD).No.4741 of 2010** was dismissed on **30.11.2012**, yet another representation sent by the deponent on **06.01.2018**



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

before the District Revenue Officer viz., fourth respondent herein, for reclassifying land, measuring an extent of 28 cents in S.No.589/1, 18 cents in S.No.589/2 and 13 Acre 79 cents in S.No.589/3 in Agamalai village, Bodinayakanur Taluk, Theni District as patta land, which according to the deponent was erroneously classified as “forest” land during UDR Exercise without considering the Settlement Register and Revenue Patta issued in the name of late Mr.M.Nagupillai, the father of late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam.

15. The deponent thus approached this Court in **W.P.(MD) No.27291 of 2019** for the following relief:-

“To direct the 2nd respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on the petitioner representation, dated 06.01.2018, for rectifying the mistake in the classification of the land, measuring 28 cents in S.No. 589/1, 18 cents in S.No.589/2 and 13 Acre 79 cents in S.No.589/3 in Agamalai Village, Bodinayakanur Taluk, Theni District, which was erroneous classified as “Forest” during UDR scheme without considering the Settlement Register and subsequent patta in the name of Jeevarathinam.”

16. This Hon'ble Court in its order dated **02.01.2020** in **W.P.(MD) No. 27291 of 2019** ordered as follows:

“3. Having regard to the limited scope of the prayer that is now sought for before this court, without expressing any opinion on merits of the petitioner's representation, dated



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

WEB COPY

06.01.2018, the second respondent is directed to consider the petitioner's representation, dated 06.07.2018 and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with Law after hearing the 5th respondent or anyone who is found necessary and interested within period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order."

17. Pursuant to the above directions of this Hon'ble Court, the fourth respondent/ District Revenue Officer, Theni conducted an enquiry and recorded the submissions of the petitioner on **28.02.2020** and passed an order dated **23.03.2020** in his proceedings bearing reference in **C.No.D4/3127/2020**. Relevant portion of the said proceedings reads as under:

“3. SLR-ன் படியும், UDR-ன் படியும், போடிநாயக்கனுர் வட்டம், அகமலை கிராமம் ச.எண்.589/1 “காடு” எனவும், ச.எண்.589/2 “பாதை” எனவும், ச.எண்.589/3 “காடு” எனவும் தாக்கலாகியுள்ள சர்கார் புறம்போக்கு நிலங்களில் பதிவு ஆவணங்களின்படி பட்டா கோருவது என்பது ஏற்படையது அல்ல.

4. மேலும், தேனி மாவட்ட அரசிதழ் சிறப்பு வெளியீடு எண்:10 நாள்: 28.05.2010-ன்படி தமிழ்நாடு வனச்சட்டம், 1882 பிரிவு 16(2)-ன்படி காப்பு வனமாக அரசு அறிவிக்கை செய்யப்பட்டுள்ளது. மேற்காணும் விபரங்களின் அடிப்படையில், நிலவரித்திட்ட (SLR) பதிவேட்டின்படியும், நிலவுடமைப்பதிவு மேம்பாட்டுத்திட்ட (UDR) பதிவேட்டின்படியும் மனுதாரர் வழக்கில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ள அகமலை கிராமம் ச.எண்.589/1-விஸ்தீரணம் 0.11.5 ஷெறக்டேர், ச.எண்.589/2-0.07.5 ஷெறக்டேர் மற்றும் ச.எண்.589/3-விஸ்தீரணம் 5.57.5 ஷெறக்டேர் ஆகிய புலங்கள் “காடு” மற்றும் “பாதை” எனத் தாக்கலாகியுள்ளதால், இதில், நிலவுடமைப்பதிவு மேம்பாட்டுத்திட்ட தவறுகள் ஏதும் ஏற்படவில்லையென்பது ஊர்ஜிதமாகின்றது, மேலும்,



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

மனுதாரர் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ள புல எண்.589/1-0.11.5 ஷெற்க்டேர் மற்றும் 589/3-5.57.5 ஷெற்க்டேர் ஆகியவைகள் தேனி மாவட்ட அரசிதழ் சிறப்பு வெளியீடு எண்.10 நாள்: 12.05.2010-ன்படி தமிழ்நாடு வனச்சட்டம், 1882 பிரிவு 16(2)-ன்படி காப்பு வனமாக அரசு அறிவிக்கை செய்யப்பட்டு, “அ” (“A” Register) பதிவேட்டில் காப்பு வனம் என பதிவுகள் செய்யப்பட்டுவிட்டது.

எனவே, தேனி மாவட்டம், போடிநாயக்கனூர் வட்டம், அகமலை கிராமம் புல எண்.589/1, 589/2 மற்றும் 589/3 ஆகியவைகளில் நிலவுடமைப்பதிவு மேம்பாட்டுத்திட்டத்தின்போது தவறுகள் ஏதும் இல்லையென்ற விபரத்தினை இதன் மூலம் மனுதாரருக்கு தெரிவித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.”

18. In the above Order dated **23.03.2020**, the fourth respondent has stated as follows:-

“According to the Settlement Register (SLR), Bodinayakkanoor Taluk, Agamalai Village Survey No. 589/1 Circar poromboke 0.28 acre having been classified as “Kaadu” (Forest), Survey No. 589/2 Circar poromboke 0.18 acre having been classified as “Paathai” (Passage), Survey No. 589/3 Circar poromboke 13.79 acres have been classified as “Kaadu” (Forest)

According to the Up-Dation of Registry (UDR) Scheme Register, the said village Survey No. 589/1 - 0.11.5 ha having been classified as “Circar Poromboke Kaadu” (Govt. Poromboke Forest), Survey No. 589/2 - 0.11.5 ha having been classified as “Circar Poromboke Paathai” (Govt. Poromboke Passage), Survey No. 589/3 - 5.57.5 ha having been classified as “Circar Poromboke Kaadu” (Govt. Poromboke Forest), later on Survey No’s. 589/1 and 3 have been stand converted as “Reserve Forest” vide G.O. (Ms.) No.160, dt. 26.11.2009 and the Proceedings of the Forest Settlement Officer, Bodi, in R.C.No.59/76 dt. 2.12.2010.

The representation seeking grant of Patta in terms of Registered documents in Circar Poromboke lands which have been classified



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

as “Kaadu” (Forest) in respect of S.No.589/1, as “Paathai” (Passage) in respect of S.No.589/2 and as “Kaadu” (Forest) in respect of S.No.589/3 in Agamalai Village, Bodinayakkanoor Taluk in both SLR and UDR is not liable to be admitted.

Moreover, they have been notified u/s. 16 (2) of Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882, as “Reserve Forest” vide Theni District Gazette Extraordinary Issue No.10 dt. 28.05.2010.

Based on the above said particulars, since the lands comprised in Agamalai Village Survey no. 589/1 – extent 0.11.5 ha, 589/2 – extent 0.07.5 ha and 589/3 – extent 5.57.5 ha, which are adverted to in the Proceedings initiated by the petitioner are found to be settled as “Kaadu” (Forest) and “Paathai” (Passage), any instances of discrepancies occurred in UDR Scheme can be ruled out for sure. Moreover, Survey no's 589/1 – extent 0.11.5 ha and 589/3 – extent 5.57.5 ha, as referred to by the petitioner, stands notified in Theni District Gazette Extraordinary Issue No.10 dt. 28.05.2010 u/s. 16 (2) of Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882.

Therefore, I hereby makes the petitioner known that any inconsistencies and discrepancies have no place in respect of the lands comprised in Agamalai Village S.No's 589/1, 589/2, 589/3 of Bodinayakkanoor Taluk, Theni District, during the course of the implementation of the UDR Scheme.”

19. It is in this background, the deponent representing the petitioner has now challenged the impugned notification in **G.O.Ms.No.160** of the **Environment and Forest (F14) Department**, **26.11.2009** published on **12.05.2010**. The petitioner has questioned the very basis, on which the aforesaid notification in **G.O.Ms.No.160** of the **Environment and Forest (F14) Department** has been issued on **26.11.2009** wherein, the subject lands



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

have been declared as “**Reserved Forest**” in the exercise of power conferred under Section 16 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882. Relevant portion of the impugned **G.O.Ms.No.160** of the **Environment and Forest (F14) Department** reads as under:-

“தமிழ்நாடு வனச்சட்டம், 1882, தமிழ்நாடு சட்டம் (எண்.5/1882), பிரிவு 16-ன் கீழ் வழங்கப்பட்டுள்ள அதிகாரங்களைக்கொண்டு தமிழ்நாடு ஆளுநர் கீழே விவர அட்டவணையில் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ள நாற்புற எல்லைக்குள் அடங்கிய நிலப்பகுதியை 29.09.2010 ஆம் நாளிலிருந்தும் அந்நாள் முதற்கொண்டும் காப்பு வனமாக அறிவிக்கிறார்.

விவர அட்டவணை

1. மாவட்டத்தின் பெயர் : தேனி
2. வட்டத்தின் பெயர் : போடிநாயக்கனூர்
3. கிராம எண்ணனும் பெயரும் : 2, போடி வடக்குமலை
3, அகமலை
4. வன வட்டாரத்தின் பெயர் : போடி வடக்குமலை
5. வன வட்டாரத்தின் பரப்பு :

	செக்டர்
போடி வடக்குமலை கிராமம்	6675.62.0
அகமலை கிராமம்	11365.18.5
மொத்தம்	18040.80.5

20. Translated copy of **G.O.Ms.No.160** of the Environment and Forest



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

(F14) Department dated **26.11.2009** reads as under:-

GOVERNMENT NOTIFICATION

RESERVE FOREST NOTICE

Environment and Forest (Va-14) Department

G.O.(Ms.)No.160

Dated : 26.11.2009

The Governor of Tamil Nadu has declared the land as Reserve Forest w.e.f. 29.09.2010 with the four boundaries in the detailed table mentioned below as per the powers vested under Sec. 16 of Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 (No.5 of 1882).

Detailed Table

1. Name of the District : Theni
2. Name of the Circle : Bodi Naickanur
3. Village Number and Name : 2, Bodi Vadakkumalai
3, Agamalai
4. Name of the Forest area : Bodi Vadakku Malai
5. Extent of the Forest area:

	<i>Hectare</i>
<i>Bodi Vadakkumalai Village</i>	<i>6675.62.0</i>
<i>Agamalai Village</i>	<i>11365.18.5</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>18040.80.5</i>

21. In this Writ Petition, it is the case of the petitioner that a wrong entry has been made about the land in the Revenue records as 'Kaadu' (காடு) viz., forest.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

22. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that as per Section 11 of the 1948 Act, the Ryot i.e. farmers or cultivators can get the patta. Likewise, as per Section 12 of the said Act the land owners can also get the patta but before getting the patta, the said Mr.Periyakaruppa Thevar sold out the lands to Late Mr.Nagupillai. Hence Late Mr.Nagupillai was entitled to get the patta as his predecessor was not the zamindar but a principal landholder.

23. It is submitted that the SLR in the year 1962 prepared under the Act, 1948 clearly shows that the settlement proceedings was initiated and the subject land was shown as a Ryotwari Punja and its owner's name is shown as Mr.M.Nagupillai. Hence it is submitted that Mr.M.Nagupillai was entitled to get the patta as he was in possession and enjoyment of the same by raising cotton trees.

24. It is submitted that the subject land is not a land at the disposal of the Government as per Section 3 of TN Forest Act, 1882, and hence Section 4 notification, followed by declaration under Section 16 of the TN Forest Act, 1882 was not available to the Government and therefore **G.O.Ms.No.160** of the **Environment and Forest (F14) Department** dated **26.11.2009** is liable to be quashed.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

25. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner further submits that if the land holder is not entitled to get the patta under Section 12 of the 1948 Act, if the land holder was in possession of the Ryoti land for non-agricultural purpose, Section 19 of the 1948 Act will be applicable and not Section 19A of the 1948 Act. It is submitted that Section 19A is applicable, which deals with non-ryoti lands.

26. It is submitted that the 1962 SLR, shows the status of the land as Ra.Pu. ie., Ryotwari Punja. Hence, it is submitted that it incorrect to state that proceeding under Section 19A was pending. It is submitted that, even otherwise under Section 19 of the Act, 1948, a person cannot be evicted if such a person is in possession of a Ryoti land for “non-agricultural purpose”. It is submitted that there are cotton trees in the said land and is used only for “agricultural purpose”.

27. It is submitted that though there are no related orders as to the result of the said pending proceedings and therefore the claim of the department is only based on the 1969 SLR which is disputed and ambiguous. Hence, Section 4 notification on the basis of the 1969 SLR extract was in contravention to 1962 SLR extract. Hence, it is submitted that Section 4 notification of the 1948



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

Act was unsustainable.

WEB COPY

28. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner further submits that in the 1969 SLR, proceedings under Section 19A of the 1948 Act were interpolations and hence it's authenticity is questionable as no proceeding or order for the alleged rejection is produced.

29. It is further submitted that, though the petitioner's request for patta was rejected, since the Government initiated the proceeding under Sec.19 of the 1948 Act, which relates to the possession by the land holder. It is an admitted fact that till today the possession is with the deponent/petitioner and has interim order from this Court.

30. It is submitted that, without producing the rejection order under the Act, 1948, the Government cannot claim that the subject land was taken over by the Government by merely showing a wrong Revenue Entry. Hence, it is submitted that it clearly shows that there is a title dispute between the parties as the land is not vested with the Government as under the 1948 Act and only the Civil Court only can determine the said fact.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

31. It is the contention of the Learned Counsel for the petitioner that the land was a private ryotwari land and not a land which was available at the disposal of the Government as defined under Section 2 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act 1882.

32. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that it is clear that the subject land was never vested with the Government so as to claim the same as it is under their disposal. Further Chapter III of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 deals with the protection of the land at the disposal of the government not included in 'Reserve Forest'.

33. It is submitted that the Chapter-III of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 is not applicable to this case. Chapter-IV deals with the control over the forests and lands not at the disposal of Government or in which the Government has a limited interest.

34. It is submitted that if a person is a holder of Ryot land, then the Department can formulate guidelines for controlling the same and if still it is required for the Government, then the Government can take over the land by way of acquisition proceedings by paying the compensation to landholder. In



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

this case though the land is private land, no acquisition proceeding has been made for taking it as a Reserve Forest.

35. It is submitted that the first respondent has not adhered to Section 16 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 by making proclamation, while declaring the subject land as a forest land, and hence it suffers illegality.

36. It is submitted that the fourth respondent failed to see that only during the UDR the subject lands have been classified as Forest and hence the same has to be reclassified as per the Survey Land Register (SLR), which names Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam as Pattadar.

37. It is submitted that even assuming without admitting that the first respondent notified the subject lands as forest as under Section 4 of the Act, proclamation under Section 6 of the Act and conduct the enquiry under Section 8 of the Act, all vitiated as the lands are private lands.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

38. It is submitted that the seventh respondent, during the writ petition may interfere with the Petitioner's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the subject lands in view of the impugned gazette notification and so it becomes necessary to restrain the seventh respondent by way of injunction otherwise the Petitioner will be prejudiced. A reference was made to the said Report of the Forest Settlement Officer dated **26.08.2004** addressed to the third respondent the District Collector.

39. It is submitted that the deponent has been running from pillar to post to vent out his grievances. However, the respondents have rejected the request and therefore, the petitioner has been constrained to challenge the impugned **G.O.Ms.No.160** of the **Environment and Forest (F14) Department**, dated **26.11.2009** declaring the subject land as 'Forest'.

40. It is submitted that the impugned Government notification is arbitrary, illegal and against Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882. Hence, it is submitted that this Writ Petition is liable to be allowed.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

41. The learned counsel for the first respondent, on the other hand, would submit that this Writ Petition is devoid of merits and it is liable to be dismissed on account of laches.

42. It is submitted that the definition of "Forest land" is in Section 2 of the Forest Conservation Act 1980. The definition not only include "Forest" as understood in the dictionary sense, but also any area recorded as "Forest" in the Government records irrespective of the ownership. In this case, the said land had already been classified as "Forest" as per Revenue records (Agamalai Village "A" Register). If the petitioner had any right over the land, the petitioner should have filed a claim petitions before the Forest Settlement Officer during the settlement process.

43. The petitioner had merely sent representation belatedly on **13.01.2019** which served no purpose as the settlement process had already been completed and proposal under Section 16 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act 1882 was under active consideration of the Government in 2009. As per the Forest Act, no new claims could be accepted and considered once the proposal under



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

Section 16 of the said Act had been prepared. The petitioner's claim is belated, unlawful and is only an afterthought.

44. It is submitted that as per orders dated 02.01.2020 of this Hon'ble Court in W.P.(MD) No.27291 of 2019, District Revenue Officer, Theni in his C.No.D4/3127/2020 Dated: 23.03.2020 had informed the petitioner that there are no mistakes in UDR in respect of S. Nos. 589/1, 589/2 and 589/3 of Agamalai village duly confirming the classification made as Forest. But the petitioner is repeatedly representing before this Hon'ble Court to treat the said lands are "Patta land" which is illegal.

45. It is submitted that the petitioner claiming Patta in favour of Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam for the said lands in S. No. 589/1, 589/2 and 589/3 of Agamalai village itself proves that the said lands are owned by a private party without any legal document.

46. Adding further, the learned SGP for the first respondent would



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

submit that the Lands in S.Nos.589/1, 2 & 3 of Agamalai Village originally belonged to Bodi Zamin and was reportedly under the enjoyment of one Chinnathayee @ Veerammal of Bodinayakkanur in **Zamin Patta No. 2178** of **Pymash No:1061**.

47. It is submitted that the said property was under the possession of one Late Mr.M.Nagupillai of Agamalai Village from **07.03.1949** and **Patta No.825** was issued. Consequent to the enactment of the Estate Abolition Act, 1948 vide G.O.Ms.No.3157, Revenue Department dated **09.12.1950**, the entire Zamin forest was notified under Estate Abolition Act, 1948. Thereafter, a notification Section 26 of Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 was issued in the Madurai District Gazette on **02.06.1954**.

48. It is submitted that a notice under Section 26 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 is an enabling provision. It is submitted that Section 26 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 empowers the Government to frame rules to implement the provisions of the said Act and that the Government could exempt any person or class of persons from the operation of all or any of such



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

WEB COPY

49. The Learned SGP for the Respondents further submitted that Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam's father Late Mr.M.Nagupillai claimed that he acquired the land by purchasing it on **07.03.1949**. It is submitted that he could not have been in possession of land from **1st July, 1945**. It is submitted that the petitioner is not entitled to get Ryotwari Patta as per Section 12 (b) (ii), second proviso to Section 19 and Section 19-A of the Act, 1948.

50. The Learned SGP for the Respondents further submitted that Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam's father Late Mr.M.Nagupillai was in possession of land only by way of lease "Ilavu 15 vadudam" and the Petitioner had accepted the same through his affidavit and "he paid the kist". It is submitted that this is admitted in Para No.3 of the affidavit. The Assistant Settlement Officer in his proceedings in SR 230/PKM/55 declared the said land as a "Tharusu" and thereafter as "Kaadu".

51. It is submitted that the Revenue Settlement was introduced to deal with the claims in the said Forest block and the same was completed in the year



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

1963 as per entries made in Settlement Land Register (SLR). Document (No:6) produced by the petitioner in the Typed set of the documents states that the said lands were in the name of Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam Pillai, son of the Late Mr.M.Nagupillai of Agamalai Village. It was however with a caveat that the entry in the Settlement Land Register (SLR) was a provisional entry and was not a final entry. It is submitted that the land was later notified under section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 vide **G.O.Ms.No.453, Forest and Fisheries Department** dated **30.04.1977**.

52. It is submitted that as per section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, statutory powers is vested with the State Government to issue Notification whenever it is decides to constitute any Land as a “reserved forest” specifying as nearly as possible the extent and limits of such lands.

53. It is submitted that the Proclamation under Section 6 of Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 was made by the then Forest Settlement Officer which was published in the District Gazette Extraordinary dated **20.04.1978** in **Tamil** and in **English** on **14.06.1978**.

54. It is submitted that, after the issuance of a notification under Section 6, no right can be acquired over the Land comprised in such notification except by under a grant or contract in writing made or entered into by or on behalf of



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

the Government or some person in whom such right was vested when the notification was issued. It is submitted that no fresh clearing for cultivation or for any other purpose can be made in such land except in accordance with such rule as may be made by the State Government in this behalf.

55. It is submitted that the effect of such notification is that new rights cease to accrue and the State Government acquires rights over the notified land.

56. It is submitted that the Forest Settlement Officer, Bodi had received and disposed the claims during the Settlement period and thereafter sent revised proposal under Section 16 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 vide District Forest Officer, Theni reference **No:1351/1994 D1** dated **25.05.1999**. It is submitted that pursuant to the above, the Government had issued the impugned notification vide **G.O.Ms.No.160** of the **Environment and Forest (F14) Department** dated **26.11.2009** declaring an extent of **18040-80-5 hectares** of Land in Bodi North Hills Forest Block, Theni District as Reserved Forest with effect on and from **29.09.2010** under section 16 of the said Act, duly following the provisions of Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882.

57. It is submitted that the impugned **G.O.Ms.No.160** of the **Environment and Forest (F14) Department** dated **26.11.2009** was also published in Theni District Gazette Extra ordinary bulletin No: 5 dated



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

12.05.2010.

WEB COPY

58. It is submitted that, the lands to the extent of **0.11.5 hectares** in **S.No:589/1** and the extent of **5.57.5 hectares** in **S.No:589/3** of Agamalai village had been included in the total extent of Lands declared as Reserved Forest.

59. It is submitted that the Registered Sale Agreement dated **01.08.2008** is said to be in the name of the wife of the petitioner. The Power of Attorney is dated **23.12.2008** executed by Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam as the owner of the said property. It is submitted that both the documents are illegal and cannot be sustained at any cost, since they had been made after the lands were notified under Section 4 (i.e. after **30.04.1977**) of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882. Moreover, following the declaration of the said land as Reserved Forests, action also was initiated to vacate the possession of the land by Forest Range Officer, Bodi and to bring it under the control of Forest Department.

60. It is submitted that the status of the said land in **S.No.589/1** and **S.No. 589/3** of Agamalai Village is "Forest" as per 'A' Register of Agamalai village maintained by the Revenue Department. Though the petitioner has no right over



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

the notified land, he made a representation dated **31.01.2009** requesting to reclassify the said land and to issue patta in the name of original owner for his personal gain. Moreover, the petitioner had filed a writ petition seeking direction to consider the representation and forbearing the respondents not to disturb the peaceful possession of the petitioner in **W.P. (MD) No. 4741 of 2010**. The Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High court in its order dated **30.11.2012** had dismissed this Writ petition.

61. It is submitted that the so called original owner namely Late Mr.M.Nagupillai or his son Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam did not claim any right over the Land as pattadar during the Revenue Settlement proceeding, which was completed in the year 1963. It is submitted that they failed to raise any objection to classification of the lands as 'Forest Land' in revenue records and to prove the lands were under his or their enjoyment during the Forest Settlement process, which was completed in the year 1998.

62. It is submitted that despite the orders of Hon'ble Court dated **30.11.2012**, the Department used to send representation again and again for the reclassification of the said Land and for the issuance of patta in favour of the original owners. The petitioner had approached this Hon'ble Court in his representation dated **06.01.2018** in **WP (MD) No. 27291 of 2019**. In his



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

representation dated **06.01.2018**, the petitioner had requested the District Revenue Officer, Theni District to rectify the mistake in the classification of the Land, measuring **28 cents** in **S.No.589/1**, **18 cents** in **S.No.589/2** and **13 Acre 79 cents** in **S.No.589/3** in Agamalai Village, which was erroneously classified as "Forest" during UDR scheme without considering the Settlement Register and subsequent to issue patta in the name of Later Mr.N.Jeevarathinam. This Court in its order dated **02.01.2020** directed the District Revenue Officer to consider the representations of the Petition and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law.

63. It is submitted that on receipt of such directions of this Hon'ble court, the District Revenue officer, Theni had conducted hearing on **28.02.2020** and recorded the Statement of the deponent. The Forest Settlement Officer and Forest officials were also present during the said enquiry. After examining the statement of the deponent and report of the Forest Settlement Officer, Bodi dated **28.02.2020** with reference to the entries in Settlement Land Register (SLR) and updated - Land Development Register (UDR) of Agamalai village, the District Revenue officer, Theni had come to a conclusion that the classification of the lands were correct.

64. It is submitted that the petitioner had been informed in



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

C.No.D4/3127/2020 dated: **23.03.2020** of the District Revenue Officer, Theni,

there were no mistakes in **UDR** of **S.No.589/1**, **S.No.589/2** and **S.No.589/3** of Agamalai Village, Bodinayakkanur Taluk, Theni District. As per Section 3 of Tamil Nadu Forest Act 1882, the Government may constitute any land at the disposal of Government a Reserved Forests.

65. It is submitted that the seventh respondent has taken possession of the said lands to the Government on 20.06.2020 only after giving due response to the petitioner's representation dated 06.01.2010, by the District Revenue Officer, Theni in his **C.No.D4/3127/2020** dated **23.03.2020** as directed by this Court in **W.P. (MD) No.27291/2019** vide order dated **02.01.2020**.

66. It is submitted that according to the provisions of the Forest Conservation Act 1980, no forest land can be utilized for non-forestry purpose without the prior permission of the Government of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the order dated 07.05.1999 in I.A.No.418 in W.P.(C)No. 202/1995 issued that no patta should be granted in any of forest land and no encroachment in forest land should be regularized. Therefore, it is clear that issue of patta on forest land, which will be against the provisions of the Forest Conservation Act 1980, the Tamil Nadu Forest Act 1882 and orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

WEB COPY

67. It is submitted that there is absolutely no merit in the Writ Petition and the same is liable to be dismissed as devoid of merits.

68. I have considered the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Special Government Pleader for the respondents.

69. Admittedly, the lands in **S.No.589/1**, **S.No.589/2** and **S.No.589/3** of Agamalai Village were purchased by Late Mr.M.Nagupillai of Agamalai Village, from Chinnathayi alias Veerammal and Periyakaruppa Thevar on **07.03.1949** and **10.03.1949** respectively, as mentioned elsewhere. After purchase of the land Late Mr.M.Nagupillai, was also issued **Patta No.825**.

70. The sale was made after the said Estate Abolition Act, 1948 was passed but before it was notified and came into force on **19.04.1948**. The sale itself was made with the view to defeat the rights of the beneficiary and the Government under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Estate Abolition Act, 1948.

71. After **G.O.Ms. No. 3157** of the **Revenue Department** dated



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

09.12.1950 was issued under the provisions of the Estate Abolition Act 1948, entire land in Zamin of Bodinayakkanur stood vested with the Government of Tamil Nadu.

72. It is evident that the above Sale Deeds dated **10.03.1949** and **7.03.1949** were executed few days before the Estate Abolition Act, 1948, as the said Act came into force on **19.04.1949**.

73. Consequent to the enactment of the Estate Abolition Act 1948, entire Zamin forests were notified under Section 26 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act 1882 in Madurai District Gazette on 02.06.1954. Section 26 is an enabling section to empower the Government to frame rules to implement the provisions of the Act. Meanwhile, Revenue settlement proceedings started and were completed in the year 1963. The name of Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam Pillai of Agamalai Village was shown as owner of lands as the legal heir of Late M.Nagupillai in the Settlement Register dated **12.03.1962**.

74. The extract of the Settlement Register dated **12.03.1962** filed before this Court indicate that only a provisional entry was made in the Survey Land Register (SLR) in the name of Late Mr.M.Nagupillai and Late



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

Mr.N.Jeevarathinam. However, no patta was issued in the name of Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam Pillai or his deceased father Late Mr.M.Nagupillai so as to have any claim over the said lands as a Ryot in the capacity as a “land holder”.

75. Since the land came under the purview of the Government with effect from **09.12.1950** under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, Mr.M.Nagupillai ought to have applied for Patta under Section 12(b)(ii) of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948.

76. As per Section 12(b)(ii) of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, all lands which were properly included, or which ought to have been properly included, in the holding of a ryot, which were acquired by the landholder by purchase, exchange or gift, which were cultivated by the landholder himself or by his own servants or by hired labour, with his own or hired stock in the ordinary course of husbandry and was in direct and continuous possession of the lands from **01.07.1945** are entitled to Ryotwari Patta.

77. Section 12(b)(ii) of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, reads as under:-



“12. Lands in Zamindari estate in which landholder is entitled to ryotwari patta.-

(a)

(b) (i)

(b) (ii) all lands which were properly included, or which ought to have been properly included, in the holding of a ryot and which have been acquired by the landholder by purchase, exchange or gift, but not including purchase at a sale for arrears of rent, provided that the landholder has cultivated such lands himself, **by his own servants or by hired labour, with his own or hired stock in the ordinary course of husbandry from the 1st day of July 1945** and has been in direct and continuous possession of such lands from that date;

(b) (iii)”

78. It appears no such claims were sanctioned by the concerned authorities during the Revenue Settlement Process. This is evident from the SLR Extract of 1969 and the claims made towards patta over the subject lands in **S.No.589/1** and **S.No.589/3** were rejected. The contentions of the deponent regarding interpolations in the SLR extract of 1969 and non-submission of rejection order are in the nature of a fishing expedition. It cannot be entertained at this juncture, after a delay of 55 years. The Court has to presume the legality of Government Records and Orders. Unless, contrary evidence is shown, onus cannot be shifted to the respondent.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

79. As per entries in Settlement "A Register" the lands have been classified as "Forest" and "Path" without the title of ownership in favour of any private individuals.

80. As far as the facts of the present case is concerned, no such evidence rebutting the case of the Government was adduced by the deponent. The Court is not willing to unsettle the existing state of affairs at this distant point of time merely on conjectures and surmises, while exercising its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

81. That apart, as per Section 3 of the said Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882, the Government may constitute any land at the disposal of Government as "Reserved Forests". In Section 3, two kinds of lands are mentioned which could be declared as Reserved Forests, they are (1) Forest Land and (2) Wasteland. The lands in **S.No.589/1**, **S.No.589/2** and **S.No.589/3** of Agamalai Village have been classified as Poramboke Forest and path in Revenue Settlement Records without ownership of the land.

82. Thus, the lands were at the disposal of the Government and the same is legal. The lands in various survey Numbers in Zamin of Bodinayakkanur



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

were notified under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882. The works of Forest Settlement are said to have started in the year 1978 and were completed in the year 1998.

83. Further, as per Section 7 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 transfer between the proclamation of the land under Section 6 and notification under Section 16 of the Act would be barred under law. No rights over the land will accrue. Section 7 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 reads as under:-

“7. During the interval between the publication of such proclamation and the date fixed by the notification under section 16, no right shall be acquired in or over the land included in such proclamation, except under a grant or contract in writing made or entered into by, or on behalf of the Government, or by, or on behalf of, some person in whom such right, or power to create the same, was vested when the proclamation was published, or by succession from such person; and no fresh clearings for cultivation or for any other purpose shall be made on such land. No patta shall, without the previous sanction of the 1 [Board of Revenue], be granted on behalf of Government in such land, and every patta granted without such sanction shall be null and void. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit any act done with the permission in writing of the Forest-settlement-officer”.

84. Further, the Government had issued the notification declaring an



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

extent of **18040-80-5 Ha.**, of land in Bodi North Hills Forest Block, Theni District as Reserved Forests with effect on and from **29.09.2010** under Section 16 of the said Act, duly following the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act 1882 vide **G.O. Ms. No. 160** Environment and Forests (FR-14) Department, Dated: **26.11.2009** which had been also published in Theni District Gazette Special Bulletin No. 5 Dated **12.05.2010**. Hence, the so called Sale Agreement executed on **01.08.2008** and the Power of Attorney obtained **23.12.2008** are illegal and not enforceable. As such, the petitioner or deponent have no right to send representations and even to file cases before the Hon'ble Courts in respect of said lands.

85. As such, there were no such claims from any persons claiming to be the owners of the land. No person was seeking any right over the said lands during the Process of Revenue and Forest Settlement. Only, one Mariammal, who is said to be the wife of the deponent is said to have entered into a registered Sale Agreement on **01.08.2008** with Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam S/o.Late Mr.M.Nagupillai.

86. Later the deponent had obtained a Power of Attorney on **23.12.2008** from Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam S/o. Late Mr.M.Nagupillai, who claimed to be



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

the owner of the lands.

WEB COPY

87. Both the documents have been made after the land in question were notified under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882 i.e., after **30.04.1977** and a proclamation was made under Section 6 was in Tamil on **20.04.1978** and in English on **14.06.1978**. The effect of proclamation issued under Section 6 is that new rights cease to accrue and the State Government acquires rights over the notified land. The notified land comprised therein become a Reserved Forests after notifications are issued in that behalf.

88. Therefore, the deponent has claimed rights over the land based on the aforesaid Sale Agreement dated 01.08.2008 for Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam S/o. Late Mr.M.Nagupillai executed in favour of the deponent's wife and thereafter on the strength of the Power of Attorney dated 23.12.2008 in favour of the Petitioner. It was impermissible as the lands never stood vested either with Late Mr.M.Nagupillai or his son, Late Mr.N.Jeevarathinam.

89. That apart, the petitioner claims to have obtained another Power of Attorney from, one J.Rajalakshmi, claiming to be the wife of deceased Mr.N.Jeevarathinam, son of Late Mr.M.Nagupillai. However, no documents



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

have also been filed to substantiate that the said donor Mrs.J.Rajalakshmi is indeed the wife of the deceased Mr.N.Jeevarathinam. Thus, the present writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

90. Further, as directed by this Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 02.01.2020, the District Revenue Officer, Theni had also examined the relevant records and had issued orders dated **23.03.2020** in his proceedings **C.No. D4/3127/2020** stating that there are no mistakes in classification of **S.No.589/1**, **S.No.589/2** and **S.No.589/3** of Agamalai Village as "Forest" and "Path". The seventh Respondent also had resumed and taken possession of the said lands to the Government on **20.06.2020** duly following the procedures as per law, which was delayed in the past years due to litigation pending before the Court.

91. That apart, there are serious questions raised by the Government, the respondent, regarding the veracity of the Sale Agreement as well as also the Power of Attorney. Therefore, even on this ground, the writ petition filed in the capacity of Power of Attorney Holder, the deceased N.Jeevarathinam is liable to be dismissed.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

92. In the light of the above reasons, this Writ Petition is liable to be dismissed. Accordingly, it is dismissed. No costs. Connected Writ Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

20.08.2024

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
Speaking Order / Non-Speaking Order

apd/arb

To

- 1.The Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Environment and Forest Department,
St. George Fort, Chennai.
- 2.The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
St. George Fort, Chennai.
- 3.The District Collector,
Theni District.
- 4.The District Revenue Officer,
Theni District.
- 5.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Uthamapalayam Division,
Theni District.
- 6.The Thasildhar,
Bodinayakkanur Taluk,
Theni District.



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

7.The District Forest Officer,
Theni District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

C.SARAVANAN, J.

apd

Pre-delivery order in
W.P.(MD)No.7995 of 2020

20.08.2024