



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.02.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.6876 of 2010

Mallika

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Collector,
Cuddalore.

2. The Tahsildar,
Cuddalore.

3. The President,
Thiruchopuram Panchayt,
Cuddalore Taluk.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus or other appropriate writ or order in the nature of writ directing the respondents 1 and 2 to consider and dispose of the petitioner's representation dated 30.03.2009 as renewed by representations dated 24.02.2010 and 15.03.2010.

For Petitioner : Mr. R.Gururaj

For Respondents : Mr.T.Chezhiyan
Additional Govt. Pleader

O R D E R

The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 and 2 to consider the petitioner's representation dated 30.03.2009 as renewed by representations dated 24.02.2010 and 15.03.2010.

2.The case of the petitioner is that she is residing in S.No.64/5 at Poondiyankuppam Village, Cuddalore Taluk, Cuddalore District for more than 30 years. The petitioner made a representation dated 30.03.2009 before the 1st respondent seeking for issuance of patta in her favour and the same was forwarded to the 2nd respondent vide communication dated 08.04.2009. When the petitioner has approached the 2nd respondent/ Tahsildar, she was informed by the subordinates of



the 2nd respondent that only on raising a superstructure in the above said land, patta will be issued in her favour. Believing the same, she constructed a permanent structure in 2010. However, the respondents have not taken any steps to issue patta in her favour. While so, the 3rd respondent/ The Panchayat President, tried to grab the petitioner's land for the purpose of laying cremation site. In such a circumstances, the petitioner made another representation dated 15.03.2010 before the 1st respondent/ District Collector for issuance of patta. However, till date, no order has been passed on the petitioner's representation. Hence, this writ petition.

3. Though very many grounds have been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner, he submitted that, it would suffice if this Court issues direction to the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 15.03.2010 and dispose of the same within a stipulated time that may be fixed by this Court.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent submitted that the acknowledgement of the said representation has not been filed by the petitioner and thereafter, no orders have been passed on the alleged representation. Hence, the prayer sought for in this writ petition cannot be granted.

5. Heard the arguments advanced on either side.

6. Having regard to the limited scope of the prayer that is now sought for in this writ petition before this Court and taking into account the submissions made on either side and the grievance of the petitioner, the Writ Petition is disposed of, with a direction to the petitioner to make a fresh representation to the respondent within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On receipt of such fresh representation the respondents shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders, on merits and in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible. No costs.

7. Accordingly, this Writ petition is disposed of.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS-IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gba



To

1. The District Collector,
Cuddalore.

2. The Tahsildar,
Cuddalore.

3. The President,
Thiruchopuram Panchayt,
Cuddalore Taluk.

+1cc to M/s.D.Baskar, Advocate, S.R.No.9108

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.9537

W.P.No.6876 of 2010

PMK (CO)
RGA (03/03/2022)