

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT****DATED: 07.07.2020**

WEB COPY

CORAM**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN****W.P. (MD) No. 7360 of 2020**

K.Ramasamy

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Thirumangalam,
Madurai District.
3. The Tahsildar,
Thirupparankundram Taluk,
Madurai District.
4. Gnanamuthusamy
5. Rajeswari
6. Sivasundari

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the first respondent to dispose of the petitioner's petition in Na.Ka.No.G5/31890/2015, dated 15.07.2015 within a time frame fixed by this Court and correct the mistake in UDR survey records of S.Nos.36/1 and 36/2 of Thanakkankulam Village, Thirupparankundram Taluk, Madurai District.

For Petitioner : Mr.Sankaralingam,
for Mr.R.Subramanian.

For R-1 to R-3 : Mr.M.Rajarajan,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side).

O R D E R

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate appearing for respondents 1 to 3.



2. Considering the nature of relief to be granted in this writ petition, notice to respondents 4 to 6 is dispensed with.

3. The petitioner alleges that during UDR certain mistakes crept in and in order to rectify the same, he has given a revision petition on 15.07.2015 to the first respondent. It is not in dispute that the first respondent is the competent authority to correct UDR errors. It is also not in dispute that law does not prescribe any particular limitation period for submitting such a petition.

4. The petitioner's specific case is that in respect of the petition mentioned survey numbers, errors crept into the relevant records.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would fairly state that respondents 4 to 6 are contesting the claim of the petitioner herein. It is also seen that the petition was submitted way back in the year 2015 and that the enquiry notice was also issued by the first respondent in December 2015. There is no justification for keeping the proceeding pending for almost five years. Therefore, I direct the first respondent to conclude the enquiry and pass final orders in accordance with law within a period of eight weeks. However this period of eight weeks will commence from the date when the lock down is totally lifted by the Government of Tamil Nadu. The first respondent will also ensure that respondents 4 to 6 have been duly notified about the resumption of the enquiry proceedings.

6. I make it clear that I have not gone into the merits of the matter.

7. With these directions, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ()

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

To:

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Thirumangalam,
Madurai District.

3. The Tahsildar,
Thirupparankundram Taluk,
Madurai District.

W.P. (MD) No. 7360 of 2020

07.07.2020

SPU (08.07.2020) 3P-4C