



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14-08-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

Civil Revision Petition No.4830 of 2026
and C.M.P.No.21101 of 2026

Deivam
S/o.Late Vadivel

..Petitioner

Vs

1. Chinnasamy
S/o.Munusamy Kounder
2. The Village Administrative Officer,
Paiyur Village,
Krishnagiri Taluk and District.
3. The Firka Surveyor,
Kaveripattinam Taluk Office,
Krishnagiri.
4. The Revenue Inspector,
Kaveripattinam,
Krishnagiri District.
5. The Block Development Officer,
Kaveripattinam, Krishnagiri District.
6. The Tahsildhar,
Taluk Office, Krisnagiri.
7. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Krishnagiri
8. The District Collector
Krishnagiri District.

..Respondents

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India
praying to set aside the Fair and Decretal order in I.A.No.7/2024 in



O.S.No.108/2023 dated 21.01.2026 on the file of the learned District Munsif, Krishnagiri.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Suresh
For Respondents : Mrs.S.Yogalakshmi,
Additional Government Pleader [R2 to R8]

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the order passed in I.A.No.7 of 2024 in O.S.No.108 of 2023 dated 21.01.2026 wherein the application filed by the petitioner under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC to implead the proposed respondent came to be dismissed by the Court below.

2. Heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for respondents 2 to 8 and perused the materials available on record. This Court also went through the impugned order.

3. The petitioner is the plaintiff in the suit filed in O.S.No.108 of 2023. The suit was filed on the ground that the suit property is a Government poramboke land and the same has been encroached by encroachers and the proposed ninth defendant was a person, who had encroached upon the property and had also managed to get a patta for the said property. The relief sought for in the suit is for permanent injunction restraining the defendants not to permit any person to encroach upon the suit property.



4. During the pendency of the suit, I.A.No.7 of 2024 came to be filed by the petitioner seeking to implead the proposed ninth defendant on the ground that the said person had encroached upon the property and had also managed to get a patta.

5. The above application came to be dismissed by the Court below on the ground that the property in question is a Government poramboke land and therefore, the petitioner does not have a *locus standi* even to maintain the suit. Consequently, the petitioner does not have the right to implead the proposed ninth defendant in the suit. Aggrieved by the said order, the present revision has been filed.

6. This Court directed Mrs.S.Yogalakshmi, learned Additional Government Pleader, to take notice on behalf of the respondents 2 to 8 in this revision. Ultimately, according to the petitioner, the suit property is a Government poramboke land and the same has been encroached by the proposed defendant and he has also managed to get a patta. Hence, instead of the petitioner spending his energy in stopping the encroachment, it is for the authorities to verify as to whether the suit property is a Government poramboke land and whether any encroachment has been made in the said land and if so, the authorities will have to invoke the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Land Encroachment Act, 1905 and evict the encroachers in accordance with law. This

**N.ANAND VENKATESH, J.**

gm

WEB COPY

will sufficiently take care of the grievance of the petitioner. The order passed by the Court below need not be interfered since the suit property is admittedly a Government poramboke land and if no action is taken by concerned authorities, many other persons will also encroach upon the same and endlessly, such impleading petitions will have to be filed before the Court below. Instead, the Government authorities themselves will verify and act accordingly in accordance with law. This clarity will sufficiently take care of the grievance expressed by the petitioner. In view of the above, the order impugned does not warrant interference of this Court by exercising its jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

This Civil Revision Petition is disposed of in the above terms. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

14-08-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
gm

To
The District Munsif,
Krishnagiri.

Civil Revision Petition No.4830 of 2026