



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 05.07.2019

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.15178 of 2019

WEB COPY

C.Palanichamy

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The Collector,
Tiruchirappalli.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
Tiruchirappalli.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Srirangam Taluk,
Tiruchirappalli.

4.The Tahsildar,
Marungapuri Taluk,
Trichy District.

5.C.Malayandi

6.Alagarsamy

7.Andichamy

8.Chinnu

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition - filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 4 to rectify the mistake that crept in the issuance of patta to the petitioner's property by considering the petitioner's representation within a reasonable period of time to be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Ganapathi Subramanian

For Respondents : Mr.V.Anand, G.A. For RR1 to 4

ORDER

The prayer in this writ petition is for a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 4 to rectify the mistake that crept in the issuance of patta to the petitioner's property by considering the petitioner's representation within a reasonable period of time to be fixed by this Court.

2.Heard Mr.P.Ganapathi Subramanian, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.V.Anand, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 to 4.



3. With the consent of both sides, this writ petition is disposed of at the admission stage itself. Since no adverse order is going to be passed against the respondents 5 to 8, notice to them is dispensed with.

WEB COPY

4. The petitioner, in order to rectify the mistakes with regard to the issuance of the patta in S.No.265/4B at Melakurichi Village, Marungapuri Taluk, Trichy District, gave a representation to the respondents and the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks indulgence of this Court to give a direction to the respondents 1 to 4 to pass orders on the representation dated 27.06.2017.

5. I have heard the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 to 4, who would submit that, since the representation has not been given to the respondents and it has been sent only to the Special Officer of Chief Minister's Cell, let the copy of the representation be given to the 2nd respondent, who is the competent authority to decide the issue raised by the writ petitioner and on receipt of such representation from the petitioner, the same would be considered by the 2nd respondent, within a time frame.

6. I have considered the said submissions. Having regard to the facts of the case, this Court is inclined to dispose of this writ petition with the following direction:

"The petitioner is permitted to send a copy of the representation dated 27.06.2017 along with the copy of this order to the 2nd respondent i.e., the District Revenue Officer concerned and on receipt of such representation with the copy of this order, the 2nd respondent shall consider the same and pass orders thereon, of course, after giving opportunity of being heard to the respondents 5 to 8, on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks thereafter, from the date of receipt of such copy of representation along with a copy of this order."

7. With this direction, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ()

// True Copy //



To

1.The Collector,
Tiruchirappalli.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
Tiruchirappalli.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Srirangam Taluk,
Tiruchirappalli.

4.The Tahsildar,
Marungapuri Taluk,
Trichy District.

+1 CC to M/s.P.GANAPATHI SUBRAMANIAN, Advocate (SR-73597[F] dated 05/07/2019)

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP (SR-73935[F] dated 08/07/2019)

Arul

Order made in
W.P. (MD) No.15178 of 2019
05.07.2019

_KM/ (16.07.2019) 3P 7C