



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATE: 10.8.2021.

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN

W.P.No.29387 of 2019

and

W.M.P.No.29231 of 2019

Perumal

...Petitioner

vs.

1. The District Collector,  
Krishnagiri District,  
Krishnagiri.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Krishnagiri,  
Krishnagiri District.
3. The Tahsildar,  
Krishnagiri Taluk,  
Krishnagiri District.
4. Janakiraman
5. Dhandapani
6. Prakash

...Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking to issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 3 to remove the name of late Gaurammal wife of Chinnasamy from the revenue records relating to the property comprised in Survey No.377/6B and 364/14B situate at Jagathap Village, Krishnagiri Taluk and District based on the representation of the petitioner dated 19.9.2019 and to issue a separate patta in petitioner's name in respect of the properties in Survey No.377/6A and 364/14A to an extent of 31 cents and 42 cents respectively situate at Jagathap Village, Krishnagiri Taluk and District forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Prabakaran

For RR1 to 3 : Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan, Government Advocate  
For RR4 to 6 : Mr.D.Saravanakumar



## ORDER

The writ petition has been filed seeking issuance of a mandamus seeking enquiry into the representation dated 19.9.2019. The petitioner had been aggrieved by the inclusion of the name of Gaurammal wife of Chinnaasamy in the patta with respect to the lands in S.No.377/6B and 364/14B in Jagathap Village, Krishnagiri District.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner Mr.C.Prabakaran, the learned Government Advocate Mr.K.M.D.Muhilan for respondents 1 to 3 and Mr.D.Saravanakumar, learned counsel for respondents 4 to 6.

3. By way of the said representation, issuance of separate patta, after removing the name of Gaurammal in the patta was also sought. The said lands measure 31 cents and 41 cents respectively.

4. The writ petition had been filed on 1.10.2019. Counter had been presented before this court on 11.11.2019. In the said counter, the third respondent, Tahsildar Krishnagiri had made a very specific averment that orders had been passed in Na.Ka.No.4913/2019(F1) on 6.11.2019 which had also been communicated to the petitioner and the petitioner has to seek redress of his grievance in the civil court.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner, however, claims ignorance of the said order. He also submits that the petitioner has no knowledge of the order passed by the Tahsildar and therefore, placed a request that a fresh copy of the same may be issued to the petitioner Perumal, son of Ramar.

6. A perusal of the order which had been passed by the Tahsildar Krishnagiri District shows that a copy had already been forwarded. At any rate, since a representation is made claiming ignorance of the order, the third respondent/Tahsildar, is requested to forward another copy of the said order to the writ petitioner and also to respondents 4 to 6 viz., Janakiraman, Dhandapani and Prakash all residing at Arasamarathu Kottai Village, Jagathap Post, Krishnagiri Taluk and District.



7. With the above observation, the writ petition is dismissed. No order as to costs. The connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

WEB COPY

Sd/-  
Assistant Registrar(CS V)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ssk.

To

1. The District Collector,  
Krishnagiri District,  
Krishnagiri.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Krishnagiri,  
Krishnagiri District.
3. The Tahsildar,  
Krishnagiri Taluk,  
Krishnagiri District.

+1CC to Mr.M.Sathishkumar, Advocate, Sr.No.39704  
+1CC to Government Pleader, Sr.No.39737

W.P.No.29387 of 2019  
and  
W.M.P.No.29231 of 2019

NRL (CO)  
K.RK. (02.09.2021)