



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K. SURENDER

WMP (MD) No.10922 of 2026
in
REV. APLW (MD) SR. No.40770 of 2026

1.The District Collector,
Thanthonimalai,
Karur District, Karur.

2.The Land Acquisition Officer &
Special Tahsildar (LA),
Master Plan Complex, Unit -1,
Karur District.

... Petitioners /
Review Applicants /

Respondents

Versus

S. Pappayye,
W/o. Late.Subbarayan,
No.11, T.Arumugampalayam,
Thanthoni Village & Post,
Karur District.
Respondent /

... Respondent /

Writ Petitioner

Prayer in WMP (MD) No.10922 of 2026: Writ Miscellaneous
Petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, praying to
condone the delay of 83 days in filing the above Review Application, to
review the order passed by this Court in W.P. (MD) No.7275 of 2022,



WMP (MD), No. 10922 of 2026
in
REV. APLW (MD) SR.No.40770 of 2026

WEB COPY

dated 05.01.2026.

Prayer in REV. APLW (MD) SR. No.40770 of 2026: Review Application filed under Order 47 Rule 1 & 2 of Code of Civil Procedure (C.P.C.,) read with Section 114 of C.P.C., praying to Review the order passed by this Court in W.P.(MD) No.7275 of 2022, dated 05.01.2026.

For Petitioners / Review Applicants : Mr. K.K. Udhayakumar

ORDER

This Writ Miscellaneous Petition has been filed to condone the delay of 83 days in filing the above Review Application challenging the order dated 05.01.2026 passed by this Court in W.P.(MD) No.7275 of 2022.

2. The District Collector and the Land Acquisition Officer are the review applicants. The writ petition in W.P.(MD) No.7275 of 2022 was filed seeking issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents, who are the review applicants herein, to redetermine the compensation payable for the acquired lands.



WMP (MD), No. 10922 of 2026
in
REV. APLW (MD) SR.No. 40770 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the review applicants submitted that this Court had only directed the respondents to redetermine the compensation amount. According to the learned counsel, the petitioner/respondent is not automatically entitled to the compensation merely because such a direction was issued.

4. The expression of “redetermine” used in the said order does not mean that compensation has to be paid, particularly if the said writ petitioner is otherwise found to be ineligible.

5. This Court considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the review applicants. No sufficient cause has been shown to condone the delay of 83 days in filing the Review Application. Further, no valid grounds have been raised in the review application, warranting interference with the order sought to be reviewed.

6. Accordingly, this Writ Miscellaneous Petition stands dismissed. Consequently, the Review Application in REV. APLW (MD) SR. No. 40770 of 2026 is also dismissed at the SR stage itself.



WEB COPY



WMP (MD), No. 10922 of 2026
in
REV. APLW (MD) SR. No. 40770 of 2026

09-07-2026

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

klt

K.SURENDER, J.

klt

WMP (MD) No. 10922 of 2026
in
REV. APLW (MD) SR. No. 40770 of 2026

09-07-2026