



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED : 20.06.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

WEB COPY

W.P. (MD) .No.6322 of 2017

Pavala Malliga

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
Thiruchirappalli District,
Thiruchirappalli.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
Collectorate Office Campus,
Thiruchirappalli.

3.The Tahsildar,
East Taluk Office,
Town Hall Road,
Thiruchirappalli.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated, 27.01.2017 to effect necessary entries in respect of the petitioner's property comprised in S.No.60/3G of an extent of 3 acres punja lands situated in Aryamangalam Village, Thiruchirappalli District.

For Petitioner

: Mr.M.Sridharan

For Respondents

: Mr.A.Muthukaruppan

Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

This Writ petition has been filed by the petitioner for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated, 27.01.2017 to effect necessary entries in respect of the petitioner's property comprised in S.No.60/3G of an extent of 3 acres punja lands situated in Aryamangalam Village, Thiruchirappalli District.

2.Heard Mr.M.Sridharan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.A.Muthukaruppan, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.

3.According to the petitioner, the Government assigned 3 acres of punja lands in Survey No.60/3 sub-divided as 60/3G to the petitioner by an order dated 10.06.1974. Since then, the



petitioner has been in possession and enjoyment of the property.

4.The petitioner would state that since the third respondent has interfered in her possession, the suit was filed in O.S.No.114 of 1996 before the First Additional District Munsif, Thiruchirappalli against the first and third respondents. The suit was decreed after the contest on 19.12.1997. However the appeal preferred by the respondents in A.S.No.54 of 1998, was allowed by the Principal Subordinate Judge, Thiruchirappalli. The second appeal preferred by the petitioner in S.A.(MD)No.1222 of 1999 was allowed and the Judgment of the Trial Court is restored.

5.Mr.M.Sridharan, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner made a representation to the respondents on 27.01.2017 and requested them to do necessary entries in the revenue record. Since no favorable order was passed, the present writ petition is filed.

6.The learned Additional Government Pleader would submit that the petitioner has not produced any proof for submitting the representation and the petitioner may be directed to give a fresh representation to the respondents.

7.Considering the limited prayer sought for in this writ petition and the submissions of the learned counsels, the petitioner is directed to give a fresh representation enclosing this order copy within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of the order copy. On such receipt, the third respondent is directed to consider and pass an order on merits and in accordance with law, after providing opportunity to the necessary parties, within a period of eight weeks therefrom.

8.Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

sd/-

Assistant Registrar(RTI)


/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The District Collector,
Thiruchirappalli District,
Thiruchirappalli.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
Subordinate Judge's Office Campus,
Thiruchirappalli.



3.The Tahsildar,
East Taluk Office,
Town Hall Road,
Thiruchirappalli.

+1cc to Mr.M.Sridharan,Advocate,SR.61095

+1cc to M/S.Special Government Pleader,SR.61203

W.P. (MD) .No.6322 of 2017
20.06.2017

SM/GSP

KK/MR/SAR3/23.06.2017/3P-6C/