

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23-03-2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.VENUGOPAL

WRIT PETITION No.7380 of 2014

A.Sudha

...Petitioner

vs

The Tahsildar
Arani Taluk Office
Thiruvannamalai District

...Respondent

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondent to consider the petitioner's representations dated 25.11.2013 and 21.2.2014, and transfer the patta and other relevant documents to the schedule property in her name.

For Petitioner : No appearance

For Respondent : Mr.S.V.Durai Solaimalai
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

According to the petitioner, she had purchased the schedule property from one S.Babu, son of Sundara Mudaliar, and B.Selvi, wife of Babu, and B.Bharath and B.Vinoth, sons of S.Babu, and their agent namely E.Arasu, by means of a registered document No.10518/2012.

2.It comes to be known that originally, the schedule property was purchased by Munusamy, son of Puttu, on 27.5.1968, from one Shiva Poosanammal, wife of Murugesu Mudaliar, and Bala Sundaram, son of Thangavel Mudaliar, in Survey No.350/6 measuring an extent of 7 ½ cents, by means of a registered document No.1628/1968, on the file of the Sub Registrar, Arani, on 7.12.1998. The same property was conveyed by the legal heirs of Munusamy, in favour of S.Saraswathi Ammal, wife of K.Sundara Mudaliar, by means of a registered document No.355/1999. After the demise of the said Saraswathy, the property has been possessed and enjoyed by her heirs namely S.Babu, B.Selvi, B.Bharath, son of Babu, and B.Vinoth, son of Babu, and they have issued a power of attorney in favour of E.Arasu by means of a registered document No.224/12 before the Sub Registrar,

Arani.

3. When that being the fact situation, from the aforesaid individuals, the petitioner had purchased the petition mentioned property by means of a registered document No.10518/2012 and now the said property is under her possession and enjoyment. She projected an application before the V.A.O., Sevoor, on 25.11.2013, together with entire relevant documents. However, till date, there is no reply from him. Therefore, she has submitted a representation before the respondent herein through R.P.A.D.; but, there is no fruitful result. As such, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

4. In view of the fact that the petitioner in the present writ petition, seeks a limited relief for passing of an order by this Court in directing the respondent to consider her representations dated 25.11.2013 and 21.2.2014, the first one addressed to the V.A.O., Sevoor, and the second one addressed to the respondent - Tahsildar, this Court, at this stage, simpliciter, based on equity, fair play, good conscience and even as a matter of prudence, directs the respondent to look into the said representations of the petitioner in a fair, just, objective and dispassionate fashion and to dispose of the same by passing a reasoned speaking order on merits by outlining the process of reasoning in a qualitative and quantitative fashion (of-course after providing due opportunity to the petitioner and others concerned if any, by adhering to the principles of natural justice) within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

nsv

To

The Tahsildar
Arani Taluk Office
Thiruvannamalai District

1 CC to the Government Pleader, SR.No. 16356

W.P.No.7380 of 2014

RSK (CO)
PSI (30.03.2015)