

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.03.2015

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T.S.SIVAGNANAM

W.P.No.8295 of 2015

Raja Giramani
Rep by Power of Attorney
Palani

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Tahsildhar
Cheyyar Taluk
Thiruvannamalai District.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Cheyyar Division
Thiruvannamalai District.
3. The District Revenue Officer
Thiruvannamalai District.
4. Tmt Saroja
5. Karunakaran
6. Gopal

...Respondents

Prayer:

Petition filed under section 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the 2nd respondent to pass orders on the proposal sent by the Tahsildhar in Na.Ka.No.C1/5300/2012 dated 27.04.2012 to make necessary correction in the patta nos.173, 295, 312, 311 in 78, Vadamavanthal village, Cheyyar Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District within a stipulated time.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Muthappan
For Respondents : Mr.R.A.S.Senthilvel for R1 to R3
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

Heard Mr.M.Muthappan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.R.A.S.Senthilvel, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 to 3.

2.Petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the second respondent to pass orders on the proposal sent by the Tahsildhar in Na.Ka.No.C1/5300/2012 dated 27.04.2012 to make necessary correction in the patta nos.173, 295, 312, 311 in 78, Vadamavanthal village, Cheyyar Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District within a stipulated time.

3.The petitioner sought for rectification of the wrong entries in the revenue records in respect of patta nos.173, 295, 312, 311. The petition was considered and an enquiry was conducted by the first respondent and the report has been submitted by the first respondent to the second respondent on 27.04.2012. In the said report, the first respondent has recommended the case of the petitioner for cancellation of the patta granted in favour of the private respondents and issuing patta in favour of the petitioner. Though such report was submitted in the year 2012, till date, the second respondent has not passed any final orders. Therefore, the petitioner is before this Court. It is not known as to whether the private respondents have challenged the recommendation of the first respondent dated 27.04.2012. In any event, it has to be taken into consideration by the second respondent who is the competent authority.

4.Accordingly, there will be a direction to the second respondent to take note of the report submitted by the first respondent, issue notice to the petitioner as well as the fourth respondent, hear the parties in person and pass orders on merits and in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5.The writ petition is disposed of with the above observations.
No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

pri

To

1. The Tahsildhar
Cheyyar Taluk
Thiruvannamalai District.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Cheyyar Division
Thiruvannamalai District.
3. The District Revenue Officer
Thiruvannamalai District.

1 CC to the Government Pleader, SR.No. 16669

W.P.No.8295 of 2015

KM (CO)
PSI (07.04.2015)

सत्यमेव जयते
WEB COPY