



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05-08-2026

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP Nos. 30662 & 30667 of 2026

S.Rajendran
S/o Subramani,
No 121, Anna Nagar, Thazhankunam Village,
Melamaliyanur Taluk, Villupuram District

..Petitioner(s) in both
petitions

Vs

1. The Revenue Divisional officer (RDO)
Tindivanam Division, Villupuram District
2. The Tahsildar
Melmalaiyanur Taluk office,
Melmalaiyanur, Villupuram District
3. K. Karthikeyan,
S/o Kannan,
Residing at Anna Nagar Village,
Thazhankunam, Melmalaiyanur Taluk,
Villupuram District
4. Arul Jothi
S/o Velu,
Residing at Anna Nagar Village,
Thazhankunam, Melmalaiyanur Taluk,
Villupuram District
5. Kathirvelu
S/o Ellappan,
Residing at Anna Nagar Village,
Thazhankunam, Melmalaiyanur Taluk,
Villupuram District

..Respondent(s) in both
petitions

**Common Prayer:**

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus,

Calling for the records of the 2nd respondent pertaining to order 2025/ 0105 / 07 / 692763 dated 28.01.2026 and quash the same as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional and consequently directing respondents 1 and 2 to process Application No 2025/ 0105 / 07 / 692763 dated 02.12.2025 conduct the field measurement / Survey subdivide survey Nos 218/ 1A32A and 218/3 in Thazhankunam village and issue a separate patta in the name of the petitioner and his co-owners within a time bound frame specified by this Honble Court

Calling for the records of the 2nd respondent Tahsildar relating to the rejection order passed in proceedings No 2026/ 0105 / 07 / 020202 dated 27.05.2026 and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to process the sub-division and issue a patta for the land measuring 1 cents in survey No 223/2C1, Thazhankunam Village, within a strict time frame that may be fixed by this honble Court

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Prakalathan

For Respondent(s): Mr.P.R.Vineeth, GA for R1 & 2

Order

These writ petitions have been filed challenging the impugned orders dated 28.01.2026 & 27.05.2026 passed by the 2nd respondent.

2. Mr.P.R.Vineeth, learned Government Advocate, takes notice on behalf of the respondents 1 & 2.



3. By consent of the parties, the main petitions are taken up for disposal at the stage of admission itself.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in these cases, an applications dated 02.12.2025 & 24.04.2026 were filed by the petitioner for the purpose of sub-division and issuance of patta. However, the said applications were rejected vide the impugned non-speaking orders. Hence, these petitions.

5. In reply, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent would submit that in these cases, due to the objection raised by the adjacent land owners, no survey was conducted and hence, the petitioner's applications were rejected by the respondent vide impugned orders. Further, he would submit that if appropriate police protection is provided, the survey will be conducted at the subject property. Therefore, he requests this Court to pass appropriate orders.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondents and also perused the entire materials available on record.

7. In the cases on hand, the applications dated 02.12.2025 & 24.04.2026 were filed by the petitioner for the purpose of sub-division and issuance of patta. However, the said applications were rejected vide the impugned non-



speaking orders dated 02.12.2025 & 27.05.2026. On the other hand, according to the respondent, due to the objection raised by the adjacent land owners, no survey was conducted and hence, the petitioner's applications were rejected by the respondent vide impugned orders.

8. Normally, upon receipt of objections from the adjacent land owners, the respondents should have issued notice and conducted enquiry and thereafter, proceeded with the matter in accordance with law. Instead of doing so, the respondent had rejected the petitioner's applications vide the impugned orders by merely citing the said objections. Further, upon perusal of the impugned orders, it appears that the said orders were passed without assigning any proper reason, which is not proper.

9. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the impugned orders passed by the 2nd respondent are liable to be set aside. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 28.01.2026 & 27.05.2026 are hereby set aside and the matters are remanded back to the 2nd respondent for re-consideration. The 2nd respondent is directed to take appropriate steps to conduct survey at the subject property and thereafter, pass appropriate orders for sub-division and issuance of separate patta, on merits and in accordance with law. The entire exercise shall be completed within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



10. It is made clear that this order is passed only for the purpose of issuing a direction to the official respondent for conducting survey and subdivision of the subject land. If there is any dispute with regard to the title/possession over the said property, the same has to be decided only by way of filing a suit before an appropriate Civil Court.

11. If any police protection is required at the time of conducting survey, the revenue officials are granted liberty to avail the same by approaching the jurisdictional police station. In such case, the concerned police officer shall provide all necessary protection to the revenue officials till the completion of survey at the subject land.

12. With the above directions, these writ petitions are disposed of. No cost.

05-08-2026

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

nsa



WEB COPY

WP No. 30662 of 2



To

1. The Revenue Divisional officer (RDO)
Tindivanam Division,
Villupuram District
2. The Tahsildar
Melmalaiyanur Taluk office,
Melmalaiyanur,
Villupuram District



WEB COPY

WP No. 30662 of 2



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.

nsa

WP No. 30662 & 30667 of 2026

05-08-2026