

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :15.11.2018

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA

W.P.No.29792 of 2018

P. Thirunavukkarasu, ... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Collector,
Office of the Collectorate Office
Tiruttani Taluk, Tiruttani.

2. The Tahsildar
Thirutani Taluk,
Thiruvallur District
Thiruvallur.

3. Daruman

4. Muthu

5. Sivam

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 16.04.2018 and direct the 2nd Respondent to effect the corrections in survey No.274/15, 16 and 17 and also to effect the name change in the name of Petitioner as mentioned.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Chandrasekar

For Respondents: Mr.S.Sureshkumar (1 and 2)
Government Advocate

O R D E R

By consent of both parties, the Writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

2.The petitioner has come up with this writ petition seeking a direction to the the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 16.04.2018 and direct the 2nd Respondent to effect the corrections in survey Nos.274/15,

16 and 17 and also to effect the name change in the name of Petitioner as mentioned.

3. The case of the petitioner is that earlier the petitioner has given a representation to the Tahsildar, Tiruttani Taluk to change the name in the computer patta issued by the second respondent in S.Nos.241/12, 13, 13B, 6 and 8 vide patta No.902. Since, no action was taken on the same, the petitioner had filed the Writ Petition in W.P.No.19897 of 2018, before this Court and this Court, by an order dated 07.07.2015, directed the Tahsildar to effect the name change in the computer patta. However, the Tahsildar had effected the name change to some third party without the knowledge of the petitioner and his family members. Hence, the petitioner submitted representation to the first respondent on 16.04.2018 and the first respondent had deputed the Revenue Divisional Officer to look into the said issue. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruttani, vide proceedings dated 19.09.2018 had directed the second respondent to conduct appropriate enquiry and send the report to him. However, till today, the second respondent has neither conducted any enquiry nor taken any steps to file a report as per the directions of the Revenue Divisional Officer. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court seeking for the aforesaid relief.

4. Heard Mr.S.Sureshkumar, learned Government Advocate, who takes notice on behalf of the respondents 1 and 2.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and having regard to the submissions made on either side, this Court directs the second respondent/Tahsildar to conduct the enquiry as directed by Revenue Divisional Officer vide proceedings dated 19.09.2018, after giving notice to the private respondents 3 to 5 and other interested persons, in this regard and after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner, pass appropriate orders, on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. However, it is made clear that this Court by this order, has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the matter. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

pds/arr

To

1. The District Collector,
Office of the Collectorate Office
Tiruttani Taluk, Tiruttani.

2. The Tahsildar
Thirutani Taluk,
Thiruvallur District
Thiruvallur.

+1cc to Mr.P.Chandrasekar, Advocate, S.R.No.78076

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.79155

W.P.No.29792 of 2018

VBA(CO)
SSM(06/12/2018)



WEB COPY