



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :04.06.2021

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

W.P(MD)No. 9258 of 2021

S. Singaram

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Pudukkottai District.

2.The Thasildar,
Office of the Thasildar,
Alangudi Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.

3.The Thasildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Karambakudi Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.

... Respondents

RAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 3rd respondent to issue patta to the petitioner by considering his representation dated 06.07.2005, within the time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioners : Mr.S. Malaikani

For Respondents : Mr.P.Thilak Kumar,
Standing Counsel for Government

ORDER

Mr.P.Thilak Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for the Government, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. By consent, the Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. This Writ Petition has been filed for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the 3rd respondent to issue a patta to



the petitioner by considering his representation dated 06.07.2005, within the time stipulated by this Court.

4. According to the petitioner, he and his family members are in possession and enjoyment of the land in S.No. 75/3 situated at Pattathikadu Village. Even prior to the year 1986, the petitioner is cultivating the same and continuously paying the necessary tax to the Government. Based on the representation, dated 06.07.2005, the second respondent wrote a letter to the Revenue Inspector to submit the report within 15 days. Subsequently, the Alangudi Taluk was bifurcated and Karambakudi Taluk was created. But, no report was submitted as per the direction given by the then Tahsildar of Alangudi Taluk. In such circumstances, the petitioner has come forward with the present writ petition.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would state that it would be suffice if a direction is given to dispose of the representation of the petitioner.

6. The learned standing counsel for the respondents would state that the representation of the petitioner would be considered within a reasonable time.

7. Considering the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the respondents and in the light of the facts and circumstances of the case, without going into the merits of the case projected by the petitioner either in his representation or in this Writ Petition, the respondents are directed to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 06.07.2005, on merits and in accordance with law and pass appropriate orders within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No Costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-I)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)



Note: (i) In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To:

1. The District Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Pudukkottai District.

2.The Thasildar,
Office of the Thasildar,
Alangudi Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.

3.The Thasildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Karambakudi Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.

+1 CC to SPL GP (SR-18930[F] dated 07/06/2021)

W.P (MD) No. 9258 of 2021
04.06.2021

KM(15.06.2021) 3P 5C