



W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 07.08.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

and

WMP (MD)Nos.16779 & 16781 of 2026

P.Masanam

... Petitioner(s)

VS.

1. The District Collector,
The District Collector Office,
Thoothukudi 628 101.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
the Revenue Divisional Office,
Thoothukudi 628 101.

3. The Village Administrative Officer,
the Village Administrative Office,
Seydunganallur,
Thoothukudi 628809.

4. The Sub Registrar,
Joint No. 1, the Sub Registrar Office,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli 627 002.



W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

WEB C 5. M.Poolpandi

6. M.Lakshmi

... Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent in Na Ka.C1 /e-4082735/2025 dated 12.03.2026, which is confirming the order passed by the 2nd Respondent in Mu.Mu (AA4)/2018/2025 dated 12.11.2025, and quash the same as illegal and arbitrary, and consequently direct the 4th Respondent to cancel the Settlement Deed No.599 of 2024 dated 31.01.2024 registered on the file of the 4th Respondent/Joint-I Sub Registrar Office Palayamkottai.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Suresh Subramanian

For R1 to R4 : Mrs.K.R.Shivashankari, AGP

ORDER

Challenging the impugned order dated 12.03.2026 passed by the first respondent, confirming the order dated 12.11.2025 passed by the second respondent, the present writ petition has been filed.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the parties. By consent of both parties, the Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage

2/8



W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

WEB COPY itself. Since no adverse order is going to be passed, notice to the respondents 5 and 6 is dispensed with.

3. The The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the father of the fifth respondent. Out of love and affection, the petitioner executed a settlement deed dated 31.01.2024 in favour of the fifth respondent, which was registered as Document No.599 of 2024. Thereafter, the petitioner made an application before the second respondent seeking cancellation of the settlement deed on the ground that the fifth respondent had failed to take care of the petitioner and had violated the conditions imposed under the settlement deed.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would further submit that the application was rejected by the second respondent on the ground that the petitioner owns about seven acres of land and that the fifth respondent is residing along with his mother in the village and is engaged in grazing cattle. It was also observed that the settlement deed did not contain any specific condition requiring the fifth respondent to maintain the petitioner. Aggrieved by the said



W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

WEB COPY

order, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the first respondent. The first respondent, in turn, confirmed the order passed by the second respondent. Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the settlement was executed by the petitioner out of love and affection, with the expectation that the fifth respondent would take care of him during his lifetime. However, subsequently, the fifth respondent failed to discharge the said obligation and refused to take care of the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner was constrained to seek cancellation of the settlement deed before the competent authority.

6. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents would submit that the settlement deed does not contain any condition requiring the fifth respondent to maintain the petitioner. Therefore, the authorities have concurrently rejected the petitioner's application. He would further submit that the impugned orders have been passed in accordance with the applicable legal position and do not warrant interference by this Court.



W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

WEB COPY

7. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents and perused the materials available on record.

8. The issue involved in the present writ petition is whether the competent authority was justified in entertaining and rejecting the petitioner's application seeking cancellation of the settlement deed, particularly when the settlement deed does not contain any express condition relating to the maintenance of the petitioner. In this regard, the issue is no longer *res integra*, in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Full Bench in the case of ***Sasikala v. Revenue Divisional Officer and another*** reported in 2022 SCC online Mad 4343 as well as the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sudesh Chhikara v. Ramti Devi and another***, reported in (2024) 14 SCC 225. The authorities have concurrently found that no such condition was incorporated in the settlement deed and have accordingly rejected the petitioner's claim.



W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

WEB COPY

9. In view of the above, this Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the impugned orders warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

07.08.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
PKN



W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

WEB COPY

To

1. The District Collector,
The District Collector Office,
Thoothukudi 628 101.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
the Revenue Divisional Office,
Thoothukudi 628 101.
3. The Village Administrative Officer,
the Village Administrative Office,
Seydunganallur,
Thoothukudi 628809.
4. The Sub Registrar,
Joint No. 1, the Sub Registrar Office,
Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli 627 002.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026

M.DHANDAPANI,J.

PKN

**ORDER MADE IN
W.P(MD)No.22543 of 2026**

DATED : 07.08.2026