

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.08.2017

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE M.DURAI SWAMY

W.P.No.22158 of 2017

N.Dinakaran

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.
2. The Sub Collector/
The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Maduranthagam,
Kancheepuram District.
3. The Tahsildar,
Maduranthagam,
Kancheepuram District.
4. Kandasamy ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of mandamus, directing the second respondent to consider the petitioner representation dated 11.07.2017 and conduct the De-nova enquiry pursuant to the direction of the first respondent and delete the name of the fourth respondent in patta No.466 with respect to the land comprised in S.No.94/1B for an extent of 0.70.0 Ares in Melavalam Village, Maduranthagam Taluk, Kancheepuram District.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Muthappan

For Respondents : Mr.S.V.Doraisolaimalai
Additional Government Pleader
(R1-3)

O R D E R

Mr.S.V.Doraisolaimalai, learned Additional Government Pleader takes notice for the respondents 1 to 3. By consent, the main Writ Petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.

2.The petitioner has filed the above Writ Petition to
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/> issue a writ of mandamus directing the second respondent to

consider his representation dated 11.07.2017 and conduct the De-nova enquiry, pursuant to the direction of the first respondent and delete the name of the fourth respondent in patta No.466, with respect to the land comprised in S.No.94/1B measuring an extent of 0.70.0 Ares in Melavalam Village, Maduranthagam Taluk, Kancheepuram District.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that as against the order passed by the third respondent, the fourth respondent preferred an appeal before the second respondent and challenging the order passed by the second respondent, he preferred a revision before the first respondent and the first respondent remanded the matter to the second respondent for fresh consideration. The learned counsel further submitted that now the appeal is pending before the second respondent pursuant to the order passed by the first respondent and therefore, the second respondent may be directed to dispose of the appeal in accordance with law, within a time frame.

4.Mr.S.V.Doraisolaimalai, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 to 3 submitted that the second respondent may be directed to dispose of the appeal in accordance with law, after giving notice to all the interested parties.

5.Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, without expressing any opinion with regard to the merits of the case, I direct the second respondent to dispose of the appeal, which was remanded by the first respondent, in accordance with law, after giving notice to all the interested parties, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6.With this observation, the Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(J)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

Rg/ah

To

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.
2. The Sub Collector/
The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Maduranthagam,
Kancheepuram District.

3. The Tahsildar,
Maduranthagam,
Kancheepuram District.

+1cc to Mr.M.Muthappan, Advocate, S.R.No.59896

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.60531

W.P.No.22158 of 2017

AR J
CA(04/09/2017)



WEB COPY