

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Date : 21.04.2021

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR

W.P.No.26804 of 2017

D.Sigamani

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Jakkampettai,
Tindivanam Taluk, Villupuram District.

2.The Tahsildar,
Tindivanam Taluk,
Villupuram District.

3.Elumalai

... Respondents

Prayer: Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the first respondent herein to conduct enquiry considering the representation preferred by the petitioner dated 21.08.2017 and cancel the separate patta granted in the name of the third respondent in respect of the land bearing New Survey No.7/1A, and 7/4B, Tindivanam Taluk, Villupuram District.

For Petitioner : Mr.Dhamodharan
For Mr.M.Venkadeshan

For Respondents 1 & 2 : Mr.N.Inbanathan
Additional Government Pleader

For 3rd Respondent : Mr.S.Ranjithkumar

WEB COPY ORDER

The prayer sought for herein is for a writ of mandamus directing the first respondent herein to conduct enquiry considering the representation preferred by the petitioner dated 21.08.2017 and cancel the separate patta granted in the name of the third respondent in respect of the land bearing New Survey No.7/1A, and 7/4B, Tindivanam Taluk, Villupuram District.

2.Today when the case is taken up for hearing, Mr.Dhamodharan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, on instruction, would submit, that pursuant to the representation given by the petitioner dated 21.08.2017, which in fact sought to be considered by way of mandamus as sought for in this writ petition, an enquiry was conducted by the Revenue Authorities i.e., the first respondent, who after conducting the enquiry, has cancelled the patta in question which was issued in the name of the third respondent, therefore, the prayer sought for in the writ petition has already been accomplished by the petitioner. Therefore, nothing survives in this writ petition, hence, he seeks dismissal of this writ petition after recording the aforesaid.

3.I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the third respondent, who would submit that, according to his instruction, he has nothing to offer on the said submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner. The learned Additional Government Pleader would be in the same position.

4.Be that as it may, now the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has made the aforesaid, recording the same, this Court feels that, this writ petition can be disposed of. Accordingly, since the prayer sought for in the writ petition is accomplished already as stated by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, of course on instruction from the petitioner, no further order is required to be passed in this writ petition, hence it is dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-VI)

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

Sgl

To

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Jakkampettai,
Tindivanam Taluk, Villupuram District.

2.The Tahsildar,
Tindivanam Taluk,
Villupuram District.

W.P.No.26804 of 2017

KJ(CO)
GMY(06/07/2021)