



WEB COPY



W.P. No.16219/2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on	Pronounced on
02.09.2022	14.10.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

**W.P. NO.16219 OF 2017
AND
W.M.P. NOS.17531 TO 17533 OF 2017**

B.Yousuf Ahmed

.. Petitioner

- Vs -

1. The Addl. Chief Secretary &
Commissioner of Land Administration
Ezhilagam, Chepauk
Chennai 600 005.

2. The Assistant Settlement Officer (North)
O/o Commissioner of Survey & Settlement
Ezhilagam, Chepauk
Chennai 600 005.

3. The District Revenue Officer
Thiruvallur Collectorate Office
Tiruvallur District 602 001.

4. The Revenue Divisional Officer
O/o The Revenue Divisional Officer
Ponneri Division, Ponneri 601 204.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

5. The Tahsildar
O/o The Tahsildar
Gummidipoondi Taluk
Gummidipoondi 601 201.

.. Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying this Court to issue a writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for all the records pertaining to the impugned order dated 12.06.2017 in K1/7587/2016 of the 1st respondent and to quash the same and consequently direct the 5th respondent to issue patta in the name of the petitioner and other legal heirs of Late Basheer Ahmed, viz., Farid Ahamed, Sayeeda Begum, Masood Ahmed and Zarina Begum with respect to the land in Survey No.239, measuring to an extent of 51.27 acres in Thervoi Kandigi Village, Gummidipoondi Taluk, Tiruvallur District in pursuance of the order dated 08.02.1969 passed in S.R.890/GPD/Sub-Taluk/L.H/68 of the Settlement Tahsildar – V, Chengalpattu.

For Petitioner : Mr. R.Gopinath, for
M/s.McGan Law Firm

For Respondents : Mr. G.Krishnaraja, AGP

ORDER



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

Assailing the order passed by the 1st respondent in and by which the patta granted to the petitioner's father by the Settlement Tahsildar was cancelled is put to test before this Court by filing the present petition.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner's father was in possession and enjoyment of the property comprised in Old Paimash Nos.155-B, 155-B2, 156, 157-A now collectively in Paimash No.239, measuring an extent of 51.27 acres, situated at Thervoi Kandigai Village for several decades. Upon the leasehold villages, including Thervoi Kandigai Village being taken over by the Government under the Madras Leaseholds (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1963, (for short 'Act, 1963') on 15.2.1965, the Settlement Tahsildar – V, Chengalpet, vide his proceedings dated 08.02.1969, allotted the abovesaid property to the petitioner's father and adjacent properties to other 9 beneficiaries in the said village, who were carrying out agricultural activities in the said lands. After the death of the petitioner's father on 14.3.1985, the legal heirs of the petitioner's father, including the petitioner, inherited the estate of their father and are jointly enjoying the same and are in peaceful possession and occupation.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

3. It is the further case of the petitioner that no appeal was preferred against the aforesaid order of the Settlement Tahsildar. Thereafter, in order to get join patta in the name of all the legal heirs, representation dated 18.3.2015 was given by the petitioner on behalf of all the legal heirs, to the 3rd respondent, which was forwarded to the 4th respondent on 28.3.2015, however no action was taken on the same, prompting the petitioner to file W.P. No.28126 of 2015 in which this Court directed the 4th respondent herein to consider the representation and pass orders.

4. Pursuant to the said direction of this Court dated 8.9.2015, which was communicated to the 4th respondent, vide proceedings dated 7.4.2016, the 4th respondent forwarded a recommendation to the 1st respondent in which it was stated that as per Act, 1963, allotments were granted to many persons, including the petitioner's father, of which only one Leelavathi was granted patta and along with the said recommendation all the documents and records were forwarded to the 1st respondent. In spite of the recommendation of the 4th respondent, the 1st respondent having not acted on the same, the petitioner filed W.P. No.27665 of



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

2016 and this Court, vide order dated 2.2.2017 passed orders to consider the representation of the petitioner within a time frame.

5. It is the further case of the petitioner that in pursuant to the said order, opportunity of hearing was granted to the petitioner as well as the 5th respondent to submit their side of the case. It is the further case of the petitioner that one Leelavathi, who was identically placed as the petitioner, filed W.P. No.40303 of 2002 and based on the orders of this Court, patta was granted in her favour. It is the case of the petitioner that being identically placed, the petitioner is also entitled for grant of patta. However, to the shock and surprise of the petitioner, without applying his mind to the merits of the case, merely recording the submission of either side, the representation of the petitioner was rejected vide the impugned order, which has resulted in filing of the present petition.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the order of the Settlement Tahsildar clearly disclose that the petitioner's father was in occupation and enjoyment of the property and the Karnam of the Village, who was examined in this regard, has categorically deposed about the occupation of



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

the petitioner's father of the lands in question and that the lands are ryoti lands. Such being the case, in the absence of any claim being made by any other person to the said lands and no objection also having been made to the allotment of the said lands in favour of the petitioner's father, the Settlement Tahsildar has rightly granted joint patta. It is the further submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the 2nd respondent in his proceedings dated 27.01.2012 sent to the 3rd respondent has categorically stated that the order of the Settlement Tahsildar-V, Chengalpat, dated 8.2.1969 has not been cancelled till date, which fact has not been taken into consideration by the 1st respondent, while rejecting the claim of the petitioner.

7. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that when an occupant, identical to that of the petitioner's father, had been granted patta in respect of the same lands, upon orders of this Court in W.P. No.40303 of 2002, it is not open to the 1st respondent to reject the claim of the petitioner citing that the said order is not applicable to the case of the petitioner, which finding is arbitrary, perverse and clearly reveals non-application of mind on the part of the 1st respondent.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

8. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that any grievance against the orders of the Assistant Settlement Officer, appeal has to be preferred under sub-section (3) of Section 9 before the Tribunal within a period of one year from the date of such order. In the case on hand, though order has been passed on 8.2.1969, no appeal has been filed within the time prescribed under the Act and, therefore, the order is deemed to have attained finality.

9. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that not only Leelavathi, but two other individuals, who are adjacent land owners have been granted patta and, therefore, classifying the lands of the petitioner along as Meichal Poramboke is *per se* illegal. It is the further submission of the learned counsel that the 1st respondent has rejected the claim based on the clarifications issued by the Settlement Officer, Tanjore on the order dated 8.2.1969 without verifying any of the documents and, therefore, the said order is wholly illegal and unsustainable.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

10. It is the further submission that though the Settlement Tahsildar-V, initially vide order dated 28.1.1969 had mentioned the lands in survey No.239 to an extent of 91.42.0 hectares as “Meichal Poramboke”, however, later in point of time, vide order dated 28.01.1969, has reversed his own order, against which no appeal or objection has been filed by any person and such being the undisputed position, the present impugned order of the 1st respondent suffers the vice of non-application of mind to the material documents placed before the said authority. Accordingly, he prays for allowing the present petition by setting aside the order of the 1st respondent and restoring the order passed by the Settlement Tahsildar-V.

11. Per contra, learned Addl. Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submitted that the Settlement Tahsildar-V, Chengalpet, vide proceedings dated 28.01.1969 had treated the land in S. No.239, measuring an extent of 91.42.0 hectares as “Grazing Ground poramboke” and against the said order, no appeal has been preferred by any person before the Tribunal. While that being so, the Settlement Tahsildar-V, vide proceedings dated 8.2.1969, had once again treated the very same land in S. No.239 as “Dry” and issued directions



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

for grant of ryotwari patta to the occupants. It is the submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that though no appeal has been filed against the said order dated 8.2.1969 nor any objection has been filed by any person, a clarification was sought for from the Settlement Officer, Tanjore, who had opined that once an order has been passed by the Settlement Tahsildar-V, dated 28.1.1969, treating a particular land as “Government Grazing land”, the said authority is estopped from reversing his orders and taking a divergent view to grant patta in favour of others is totally invalid.

12. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that during the Updating Registry Scheme, which was completed in the village in the year 1983, the land in S. No.239 of Thervoy Kandigai Village is registered as “Grazing Ground Poramboke”, however the petitioners have not taken any steps to get patta, but have kept silent for more than 30 years and only now have applied for grant of patta.

13. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that neither the father of the petitioners nor the petitioners have produced any



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

documentary evidence with regard to their possession and enjoyment of the property in any form. It is further submitted that the land falling under the categories of forests, beds and bunds of tanks and supply or drainage, irrigation channels, threshing floor, cattle stand, village site, cart track, roads, temple sites, rivers, streams and other poramboke and lands set apart for the common use of the villages, no patta could be granted in favour of any of the persons under any of the provisions of Act, 1963.

14. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that the aforesaid land has been set apart for the common use of the villages in which plantation is raised under the social forestry scheme. Further the panchayat has also passed a resolution objecting to grant of patta in favour of any private individuals, since the said lands are being used for the common use of the villages. The usage of the subject lands have been enquired into by the Tahsildar, Gummidipoondi on the basis of personal inspection on 1.7.2008.

15. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that upon issuance of notices in Form-V to the occupants and Form-VI by



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

publication in the village, since none of the occupants had applied for grant of patta, suo motu enquiry was taken up and as none of the occupants appeared before the Settlement Tahsildar-V for enquiry, it is the duty of the Settlement Tahsildar to verify the records with regard to the occupants and the validity of their title and records for having cultivated the lands in question continuously for a period of not less than twelve fasli years immediately before the appointed date. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Plader that the Settlement Tahsildar failed to hear the Independent Deputy Tahsildar, Gummidipoondi Sub Taluk, as mandated u/s 9 (3) of the Act, by causing notice upon him. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that the order dated 28.1.1969 has been conveniently suppressed by the petitioner while making claim before the authority for grant of patta. It is further submitted that the documents pertaining to continuous cultivation for a period of not less than twelve fasli years prior to fasli year 1378 by the father of the petitioner has not been produced before the authorities.

16. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that merely because certain other individuals have been granted patta would not



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

be a ground to claim similarity when the petitioner has not provided any documentary evidence to substantiate his possession and continuous cultivation of the property. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that the subject land is under cultivation of the Forest Department for about 30 years. The documents, which were provided by the petitioner did not contain materials to prove the continuous possession and cultivation of the lands at the hands of the petitioner's father and that the lands are classified as "Meichal Poramboke". Further S. No.239/3 for an extent of 67.7.40 has been registered as Social Forest as evidenced by adangal for the fasli year 1426.

17. It is the further submission of the learned Addl. Government Pleader that inspite of the fact that no appeal has been preferred against the order of the Settlement Tahsildar, the said act does not bar the Commissioner of Land Administration in exercising suo motu powers u/s 7 (c) of Act, 1963 as the powers u/s 7 (c) vested on the Commissioner of Land Administration is very vast. It is also submitted by the learned Addl. Government Pleader that the patta granted in favour of Leelavathi is not having any merit, as it has been granted without any supportive documents and against the same, by invoking the suo motu powers,



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

action is being taken to review the patta granted in favour of Leelavathi. Accordingly, for the reasons aforesaid, learned Addl. Government Pleader prays for dismissal of the present writ petition.

18. This Court gave its anxious consideration to the submissions advanced by the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

19. It is the admitted case of the parties that “Thervoy” and “Kandigai”, two leasehold villages, specified in the Schedule u/s 1 (2) was taken over on 15.2.1965 and grouped into one revenue survey village, viz., Thervoy Kandigai and settlement proceedings were initiated. It is the case of the petitioner that the Settlement Tahsildar-V, Chengalpet had granted ryotwari patta on 8.2.1969 on the ground that the father of the petitioner had owned the lands and carrying out agricultural activities in the subject lands. Though such a contention is raised by the petitioner, the affidavit of the petitioner is silent on the earlier proceedings of the Settlement Tahsildar dated 28.01.1969 in and by which the subject lands were classified as “Grazing Grounds Poramboke”. There is no



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

whisper in the affidavit of the petitioner about the aforesaid fact, nor the petitioner has disputed the said proceedings of the Settlement Tahsildar.

20. It is not disputed by the parties that Form-5 and Form-6 notice were issued to the petitioner and published in the village. It is the case of the respondents that pursuant to the notice, no one staked claim for the lands and sought for patta, which resulted in the lands being classified as “Grazing Grounds”. The said proceeding was passed on 28.01.1969. However, curiously, within a span of 10 days, the next proceeding granting ryotwari patta in favour of the petitioner’s father by reclassifying the lands as “Dry” has been issued by the Settlement Tahsildar.

21. In this regard, a perusal of the proceedings of the Tahsildar dated 8.2.1969, which has been extracted in the affidavit filed by the petitioner reveals that the field staff reported that the schedule lands are under the possession and enjoyment of the occupants as indicated in it. For better clarity, the relevant portion of the order is quoted hereunder :-



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

“2. The field staff reported that the schedule lands are under the enjoyment and possession of the occupants as indicated in it. These occupants did not apply for grant of patta. Suo motu enquiry was therefore taken up under the powers delegated in G.O.P. 402, Revenue dated 15.2.65.”

22. From the above, it transpires that the lands are said to be under the occupation, possession and enjoyment of the occupants as indicated in the report, but the occupants have not applied for patta. This is reflected in the proceedings dated 8.2.1969. However, even in the proceedings dated 28.01.1969, the subject lands have been classified as “Grazing Grounds Poramboke”. Further, even in the proceedings dated 8.2.1969, no occupants have come to claim patta for the subject lands. When such being the case, this Court is at a loss to understand as to how in a suo motu proceeding, in the absence of any claim being made to the said land, the Settlement Tahsildar has taken a divergent view on 8.2.1969 from the one taken on 28.1.1969. This clearly shows that all is not well with the Settlement Tahsildar.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

23. In this regard, it is to be pointed out that patta being granted pertains to ryoti lands and, therefore, the lands should satisfy the character of ryoti lands to be eligible for ryotwari patta by the competent authority. To appreciate the case better, it is necessary to refer to the meaning of the expression 'ryot' and 'ryoti land' as defined under Sections 3 (15) and (16) of the Tamil Nadu Estate Land Act, 1908, which expression has been adopted in the Tamil Nadu Inam Estates (Abolition & Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 as well as 1963 and for better appreciation, the same is quoted hereunder :-

"3.

(15) **"Ryot"** – **"Ryot"** means a person who holds for the purpose of agriculture ryoti land in an estate on condition of paying to the landholder the rent which is legally due upon it.

Explanation. - A person who has occupied ryoti land for a continuous period of twelve years shall be deemed to be a ryot for all the purposes of this Act.

(16) **"Ryoti Land"**- **"Ryoti Land"** means cultivable land in an estate other than private land but does not include :

(a) beds and bunds of tanks and of supply, drainage, surplus or irrigation channels;

(b) threshing-floor, cattle-stands, village-sites and other lands situated in any estate which are set apart for the common use of the villagers;



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

(c) lands granted on service tenure either free of rent or on favourable rates of rent if granted before the passing of this Act or free of rent or granted after the date, so long as the services tenure subsist.”

24. From the above definition of *ryoti land* what transpires is the fact that the lands should be cultivable land within the estate. Respective rights would accrue to the individuals only on the lands being classified as ryoti lands. From the above, it is amply evident that the land should not only have the character of cultivable lands and should be cultivable, but the lands should also have been under cultivation and the person, who claims patta for the said lands should have carried on cultivation in the said lands for the preceding twelve fasli years from the appointed date. Therefore, from the above provision of law, it is not only incumbent on the part of the parties to prove title to the property, but in addition to title, the parties ought to prove that the said lands have been under cultivation or are cultivable lands. In essence, the parties have title to the property and the lands are agricultural lands.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

25. In the above backdrop, the classification of the lands assumes significance. Once a ryotwari patta is applied for and granted, it means that the lands have been declared as ryotwari lands vide the Ryotwari Act. As per the definition of “Ryot” and “Ryoti Lands” provided u/s 3 (15) and (16) of the Tamil Nadu Estate Land Act, 1908, which has been adopted in the Ryotwari Act, ryoti lands means cultivable lands in an estate and that the person holding the said lands should be for the purpose of agriculture. From the above, it is abundantly clear that ryoti lands are lands which are cultivable and are used for agriculture purposes. Any land in which agriculture is not being done would not fall within the scope of ryoti lands. Further, the person, who claims patta for the ryoti lands should establish that the lands are being used for agriculture. It is further to be pointed out that the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***P.Venkataswami & Anr. – Vs – D.S.Ramireddy & Anr. (1976 (3) SCC)*** has held that a landholder claiming ryotwari patta must prove that he has been cultivating the land by himself or by his own servants from July, 1945 and is in continuous possession of the said lands. The above view has been followed by this Court in the case of ***Tahsildar, Mambalam-Guindy Taluk & anr. – Vs – Kaneez Fathima & Ors. (2013 (5) MLJ 263)***.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

26. However, it transpires from the materials available on record that though it is allegedly claimed by the petitioner that the petitioner's father was owning the lands and cultivating the same, yet, when notice under Form-V and Form-VI were issued, no claim was made for grant of patta. Without the person claiming ryotwari patta establishing his continuous occupation and possession along with cultivation of the subject lands for the preceding twelve fasli years from the appointed date, grant of ryotwari patta is impermissible. Such being the case, the materials that formed the basis of grant of patta is not evident from the order passed by the Settlement Tahsildar. Further, it is also the case of the respondents that the subject lands are being held as common lands for the usage of the villages and it is under the control of the Forest Department in which plantation such as cashew and eucalyptus are being grown. Such being the case, there is no material to infer or establish that the petitioners have been carrying on agricultural activities in the said lands. Such being the case, claim of ryotwari patta without establishing the necessities of a ryot and ryoti lands would only negate the claim of the petitioner.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

27. Further, once an order is passed by the Settlement Tahsildar, retaining the classification of the land as “Government Grazing Poramboke”, it is not open to the said authority, once again invoking suo motu powers to reclassify the said land as “Dry” and grant patta and allot the same in favour of the petitioner’s father and other alleged occupants is wholly illegal. This Court is at a loss to understand as to from where the Settlement Tahsildar drew suo motu powers to pass such an order. The Settlement Tahsildar is not vested with any suo motu power and such being the case, the proceedings of the Settlement Tahsildar, dated 8.2.1969, would be a void act and would suffer the vice of arbitrariness, perversity and is a wholly illegal and unsustainable order.

28. Further, it is to be pointed out that in respect of lands, which have been classified as forests, beds and bunds of tanks and supply or drainage, irrigation channels, threshing floor, cattle stand, village site, cart track, roads, temple sites, rivers, streams and other poramboke and lands set apart for the common use of the villages no ryotwari patta could be issued by the Settlement Tahsildar and for that matter by any other authority. Such being the case, the subject lands having been classified as “Grazing Grounds Poramboke”, the act of



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

the Settlement Tahsildar in granting ryotwari patta in respect of such lands is not only impermissible, but it is beyond the domain of the Settlement Tahsildar. The Settlement Tahsildar neither has suo motu powers to reclassify the lands as “Dry” nor has the power to grant patta in respect of lands, which have been excluded from the grant of patta and such being the case, the act of the Settlement Tahsildar in granting patta in favour of the petitioner’s father, without there being any claim made or an application filed by the petitioner’s father is beyond the comprehension of the Court.

29. Further, it is to be pointed out that the inspection report of the field staff has clearly stated the said lands to be that of “Grazing Grounds Poramboke”. When such being the case, the inspection having categorically stated the lands to be grazing ground poramboke, under what authority the Settlement Tahsildar has reclassified the said lands is not known, but definitely the said act of the Settlement Tahsildar is perverse and deserves to be interfered with.

30. Be that as it may. The main thrust of argument on behalf of the petitioner is that the proceeding dated 8.2.1969 in and by which patta has been



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

granted in favour of the petitioner's father, having not been appealed by the authority/Government within the time prescribed period of one year under the provisions of ct, 1963, the said proceeding is deemed to have attained finality and it cannot be put in issue nor could the said proceeding be set aside at a later point of time.

31. Though such a contention, on the face of it looks attractive, yet the said contention cannot hold water for the simple reason that the Board of Revenue, viz., the Commissioner of Land Administration is vested with suo motu powers of review u/s 7 (c) of Act, 1963.

32. Section 7 of Act, 1963, prescribes the power of control of the Board of Revenue and for better appreciation, the said provision is quoted hereunder:-

"7. Power of control of the Board of Revenue.- The Board of Revenue shall have power –

(a) to give effect to the provisions of this Act Revenue and in particular to superintend the taking over of estates and to make due arrangements for the interim administration thereof;

(b) to issue instruction for the guidance of the Director, District Collectors, Settlement Officers and managers of estates;



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

(c) to cancel or revise any of the orders, acts or proceedings of any Settlement Officer other than those in respect of which an appeal lies to the Tribunal or of any manager ; and

(d) to cancel or revise any of the orders, acts or proceedings of the Director or of any District Collector, including those passed, done or taken in the exercise of revisional powers.”

33. A careful reading of the aforesaid provision reveals that it clothes the 1st respondent with power to cancel or revise any of the orders, acts or proceedings of any Settlement Officer other than those in respect of which an appeal lies to the Tribunal or of any manager. In the case on hand, the patta has been granted by invoking powers, which are not vested with the Settlement Tahsildar. An order passed by an authority, bereft of jurisdiction, is a non-est order in the eye of law. There arises no reason or rhyme for the superior authority to submit to an appeal before the Tribunal and a non est order could very well be set aside by the 1st respondent by invoking his suo motu power u/s 7 of Act, 1963.

34. It is always open to the Commissioner of Land Administration, an authority superior to that of the Settlement Tahsildar to revisit the grant of patta,



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

if it otherwise not done in accordance with law and the said authority is not barred into looking at the correctness of the grant of patta in favour of the petitioner.

35. It is no where the case of the petitioner that upon proper application on the issuance of Form-V and Form-VI, the Settlement Tahsildar had gone into the matter and granted patta in favour of the petitioner's father. Further, it is to be pointed out that even the affidavit filed in support of the present petition is silent on the aspect of the earlier order dated 28.01.1969 passed by the Settlement Tahsildar in which the lands have been classified as "Grazing Grounds Poramboke". This clearly reveals that the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands and, therefore, not entitled to any consideration at the hands of this Court, more so when the order passed, which has been impugned herein, is wholly justifiable and reasonable on the facts of the present case.

36. Further, the claim of the petitioner that one Leelavathi has been granted patta pursuant to order in W.P. No.40303/2002, it has been fairly submitted by the respondents that the said patta has been granted without any



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

supportive documents, which is also under the scanner of the respondents and the said patta is being reviewed. In such a backdrop, no leverage can be taken by the petitioner on the basis of patta granted to the said Leelavathi, more so, when the patta granted to both the petitioner's father and Leelavathi suffer from the same vices, as stated above, and both the pattas cannot be sustained.

37. On an overall conspectus of the matter, the patta granted by the Settlement Tahsildar having not been granted in consonance with the provisions of Act, 1963, though not appealed before the Tribunal, necessarily, the 1st respondent is vested with power u/s 7 (c) of Act, 1963 to revise the said order by exercising suo motu powers, more so, when the lands to which patta has been granted are lands, which are excluded from the ambit of grant of patta by any authority for that matter. Such being the case, the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent does not suffer from any illegality, arbitrariness, perversity and irrationality and the said order deserves to be sustained, as the said order has rightly set aside an order which suffers from all the above vices.



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

38. For the reasons aforesaid, this Court finds that there are no merits in the present writ petition and, accordingly, the same is dismissed confirming the order passed by the 1st respondent. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

14.10.2022

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

GLN



W.P. No.16219/2017

WEB COPY

To

1. The Addl. Chief Secretary &
Commissioner of Land Administration
Ezhilagam, Chepauk
Chennai 600 005.
2. The Assistant Settlement Officer (North)
O/o Commissioner of Survey & Settlement
Ezhilagam, Chepauk
Chennai 600 005.
3. The District Revenue Officer
Thiruvallur Collectorate Office
Tiruvallur District 602 001.
4. The Revenue Divisional Officer
O/o The Revenue Divisional Officer
Ponneri Division, Ponneri 601 204.
5. The Tahsildar
O/o The Tahsildar
Gummidipoondi Taluk
Gummidipoondi 601 201.



WEB COPY



W.P. No.16219/2017

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

GLN

**PRE-DELIVERY ORDER IN
W.P. NO. 16219 OF 2017**

**Pronounced on
14.10.2022**