



W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 14.07.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD).No.14598 of 2026

K.Sangeetha

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The District Collector,
Madurai District, Madurai.

2.The Tahsildar,
Melur Taluk,
Madurai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned online rejection order passed by the second respondent in respect of the petitioner's application for issuance of legal heir certificate vide Application No.TN-720251128204, quash the same and consequently direct the second respondent to consider and dispose of the petitioner's fresh online application in Application No.TN-720260623969 dated 23.06.2026 on its own merits and in accordance with law, after conducting a proper enquiry and affording the



W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

WEB COPY

petitioner an opportunity of personal hearing, within such time as may be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Mohan

For Respondents : Mrs.K.R.Shivashankari,
Counsel for State

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the impugned online rejection order passed by the second respondent in respect of the petitioner's application for issuance of a Legal Heir Certificate vide Application No.TN-720251128204 and consequently directing the second respondent to consider and dispose of the petitioner's fresh online application in Application No.TN-720260623969 dated 23.06.2026, on its own merits and in accordance with law, after conducting a proper enquiry and affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner, within a time frame to be fixed by this Court.

2. Heard Mr.A.Mohan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mrs.K.R.Shivashankari, learned Counsel for the State, who accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.



W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. By consent of the learned counsel appearing on either side, the Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had originally married one Nagenthiran. Subsequently, the marriage between them was dissolved by way of customary divorce. Thereafter, the petitioner's former husband married another woman, whose name is not known and according to the petitioner, that marriage was also dissolved by way of customary divorce. It is the further contention of the learned counsel that, despite the above facts, the second respondent/Tahsildar had earlier issued a Widow Certificate to the petitioner mentioning the name of her husband as Athinamilagi. However, when the petitioner subsequently applied for issuance of a Legal Heir Certificate, the second respondent rejected the application by passing the impugned online order, which is arbitrary and unsustainable.

5. Per contra, the learned Counsel for the State submitted that the petitioner's claim involves disputed questions relating to her marital status and the identity of her deceased husband. It is further submitted that the Legal Heir



W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

WEB COPY

Certificate can be issued only after conducting a detailed enquiry with reference to the relevant revenue records and after verifying the claims of all the persons concerned. Therefore, the second respondent had rejected the earlier application. However, if this Court grants an opportunity, the second respondent is prepared to conduct a fresh enquiry and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

6. This Court has carefully considered the submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7. The impugned rejection order does not disclose any detailed reasons as to how the petitioner's claim has been rejected. It is well settled that while deciding an application for issuance of a Legal Heir Certificate, the competent Revenue Authority is required to conduct a proper enquiry, verify the relevant records, afford an opportunity of hearing to the applicant as well as other interested persons, if necessary, and thereafter pass a reasoned order. In the present case, such an exercise does not appear to have been undertaken before passing the impugned online rejection order.



W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

WEB COPY 8. In view of the above, this Court is of the opinion that the matter requires reconsideration by the second respondent. Accordingly, the impugned online rejection order passed by the second respondent in respect of Application No.TN-720251128204 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the second respondent for fresh consideration.

9. The second respondent is directed to consider the petitioner's fresh online application bearing Application No.TN-720260623969 dated 23.06.2026, conduct a comprehensive enquiry after issuing notice to all the necessary parties, afford an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner and other interested persons, verify the relevant records, and thereafter pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

10. With the above directions, this Writ Petition stands allowed to the extent indicated above. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

14.07.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
TSG



W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

WEB COPY To

- 1.The District Collector,
Madurai District, Madurai.
- 2.The Tahsildar,
Melur Taluk,
Madurai District.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

TSG

W.P(MD)No.19752 of 2026

14.07.2026