



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 26.07.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. KALYANASUNDARAM

W.P(MD)No.13858 of 2017

Annapoorani

: Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The District Revenue Officer,
Collectorate,
Pudukottai.

2.The Tahsildar,
Aranthangi & Taluk,
Pudukottai District.

3.Veeraperumal

: Respondents

PRAYER: Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the first respondent to describe the petitioner's husband's name in the chitta deleting the name of third respondent as well as to delete the name of third respondent as joint pattadar in Patta No.256 relating to S.No.40 of 2010 with an extent of 0.36.0 hectares of dry land at Kummakadu Revenue Village, Aranthangi Taluk, Pudukottai District.

For Petitioner	: Mr.N.Balakrishnan
For Respondents	: Mr.C.Selvaraj, Special Government Pleader (for R1 and R2)

O R D E R

This writ petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the first respondent to change the name of the petitioner's husband in the Chitta in respect of the property in Survey No.40/10 situated at Kummakadu Revenue Village, Aranthangi Taluk, Pudukottai District in the Patta No.256.

2.Mr.C.Selvaraj, learned Special Government Pleader takes notice for the respondents. By consent, this Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3.According to the petitioner, the land to an extent of 0.36.0 hectares in Survey No.40/10 is belonging to her and she is in possession and enjoyment of the said land paying kist to the Government.

4.The petitioner would state that the third respondent has no right or title over the property and despite the same, he filed a vexatious suit in O.S.No.197 of 1995 before the District Munsif, Aranthangi. After trial, the said suit was dismissed, which was confirmed in A.S.No.40 of 2005 and S.A.No.505 of 2010. The



petitioner would further state that the name of the third respondent was wrongly included in the joint Patta. Hence, she sent a representation to the respondents to delete his name.

5.Mr.N.Balakrishnan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner's husband's name is Ramanathan, but name of the third respondent has been shown as husband of the petitioner. He further submitted that the second respondent had sent a letter to the petitioner stating that the first respondent is the competent authority as the mistake has been committed, while making entry under the "UDR" scheme.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court, without going into the merits of the claim made by the petitioner, directs the first respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 28.02.2017 and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, after providing opportunity to all necessary parties, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7.With the above direction, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The District Revenue Officer,
Collectorate,
Pudukottai.

2.The Tahsildar,
Aranthangi & Taluk,
Pudukottai District.

+1cc to THE SPECIAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER in SR. No.68694

+1cc to Mr.N.BALAKRISHNAN Advocate in SR. No.67694

RMK/SKN

JS/GT/SAR.3/3.8.2017/2P-5C

W.P(MD)No.13858 of 2017

26.07.2017