



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Judgment reserved on : 21.11.2023

Judgment pronounced on : **06.12.2023**

CORAM :

**THE HON'BLE MR.SANJAY V.GANGAPURWALA ,
CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY**

W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

L.Varalakshmi

.. Appellant
(in both W.As)

Versus

1. The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious & Charitable
Endowments,
Nungambakkam High Road,
Chennai - 600 034.
 2. The Executive Officer,
Arulmighu Ekambareswarar Thirukoil,
Aminjikarai, Chennai - 600 029.
 3. The Collector of Chennai District,
Collector's Office,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai - 600 001.
 4. The Tahsildar,
Egmore-Nungambakkam Taluk,
Chetput, Chennai - 600 031.
- .. Respondents
(in both W.As)



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

Prayer in W.A.No.1294 of 2021 : Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent to set aside the order, dated 02.01.2020 in W.P.No.23541 of 2008.

Prayer in W.A.No.1302 of 2021 : Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent to set aside the order, dated 02.01.2020 in W.P.No.23542 of 2008.

For Appellant : Mr.Om Prakash, Senior Counsel
(in both W.As) for Mr.V.Venkatesan

For Respondents : Mr.N.R.R.Arun Natarajan,
(in both W.As) Special Government Pleader (HR & CE),
for R1

: Mr.A.K.Sriram, Senior Counsel
for Mr.S.D.Ramalingam, for R2

: Mr.P.Muthukumar,
State Government Pleader for RR-3 and 4

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment made by the Hon'ble Mr.Justice D.Bharatha Chakravarthy)

These Writ Appeals arise out of the common order of the learned Single Judge, dated 17.12.2019 dismissing W.P.Nos.23541 and 23542 of 2008. In W.P.No.23541 of 2008, the appellant challenged the notice-cum-order, dated 15.07.2008 fixing increased rent in respect of the premises at



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

Door No.40, South Kasar Garden Street, Aminjikarai, Chennai. In W.P.No.23542 of 2008, a Writ of Declaration is prayed to declare that the respondents have no power and jurisdiction to treat the schedule mentioned land as temple land by virtue of order of Settlement Tahsildar, Chengalpattu, dated 31.03.1971 and in ver of Section 43 of *Tamil Nadu Act 30 of 1960*.

2. The case of the appellant / writ petitioner is that her father *T.S.Duraisami Naidu*, was in occupation of the land of an extent of 1 Ground and 1820 Sq.ft., comprised in S.No.70/2 part in Aminjikarai village having put up a superstructure 80 years before. The land was assessed to Urban Land Tax by the Assistant Commissioner of Urban Land Tax. The name of the temple is mentioned as Ekamberashwarar Devasthanam and present owner as *T.S.Duraisami Naidu*.

3. The State of Tamil Nadu enacted the *Tamil Nadu Minor Inams Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari Act, 1963 (Act 30 of 1963)* (hereinafter 'the Act'), under which, the Settlement Tahsildar had passed an order, dated 31.03.1971, granting joint ground rent patta to the petitioner's



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

father. The same had become final. Thus, the ownership of the property vested with the petitioner. However, the petitioner's father and others in the locality continued to pay an amount to the temple in the name of rent. Taking advantage of the same, by the impugned order, rent is sought to be revised, that too retrospectively. The authorities have no jurisdiction in respect of the same and hence the petitions.

4. The Writ Petition is resisted by the respondents. It is the stand of the temple that the land in question was minor inam land. The temple is the holder of both warams in respect of the land. The temple has leased out the land to the petitioner's father and others, who put up superstructure and were living in the land as tenants. The temple is granted ryotwari patta under Section 8 of the *Act*. Only in respect of building, joint ground rent patta is given. The temple is therefore entitled to revise the rent for the land on which the building is situate. Since the tenant has defaulted, already a suit for recovery of possession is filed in O.S.No. 7349 of 2008 and the same is pending. The very same defence is raised in the said suit.



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

5. The learned Single Judge considered the case of the parties and by the order under appeal held that all along the petitioner was paying rent and accepted the ownership of the temple. Upon consideration of Section 13 of the *Act*, it can only be held that building alone vested with the petitioner. The patta is not a document of title and the joint patta granted by the Settlement Officer will not vest title in the petitioner. The original Inamdar will be entitled to possession as well as rent from the tenant. As against fixation of fair rent, appeal remedy is available.

6. We have heard *Mr.Om Prakash*, the learned Senior Counsel on behalf of the appellant, *Mr.N.R.R.Arun Natarajan*, the learned Special Government Pleader (HR & CE) for the first respondent, *Mr.A.K.Sriram*, the learned Senior Counsel on behalf of the Second respondent temple, *Mr.P.Muthukumar*, the learned State Government Pleader for the respondent Nos.3 and 4.

7. *Mr.Om Prakash*, the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant would submit that the rights of parties are governed by the order of the Settlement Tahsildar passed under the *Act* as the same has



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

become final. Though the patta is granted in recognition of existing right, unless the same is issued under Section 8 or under Section 13 of the *Act*, the land or building stood vested in the Government. By the said order, joint patta has been granted. Though the pleading of the petitioner in respect of the exclusive ownership may not be correct, still when joint patta is issued, the ownership of the appellant is recognised. When the order also mentioned that rents are not revisable, the temple is also bound by the same and as such, the Writ Petitions deserve to be allowed.

8. The learned Senior Counsel relied upon the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***K.S.Thirugnasambandam Chettiar (dead) by LRs. etc. Vs. The Settlement Thesildar, Coimbatore-18 and Ors. etc.,***¹ for the proposition that dual ownership is permissible by a reading of Section 13 of the *Act*. The judgment of the learned Single Judge of this Court in ***Silambani Sri Chidambaram Vinayagar Devasthanam, Devakottai Vs. Duraisami Nadar and Ors.***² was relied upon to contend that merely because the tenant continued to pay rents, he will not be estopped to contend that the temple which has lost its ownership by a statutory regime

¹ 1996-1-L.W.19

² AIR 1971 Mad 474



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

under the *Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion Into Ryotwari) Act, 1948* cannot claim or revise rent any further. The learned Senior Counsel traced the development of law in ***K.Somasundaram Pillai and Ors. Vs. A.Dorairaj and Ors.***³ and finally in ***Sri Kumarakattalai Subrahmanyaswami Devasthanam Vs. K.S.Sundararajulu Chettiar***⁴ to contend that there can be dual ownership under Section 13 of the *Act*.

9. *Mr.N.R.R.Arun Natarajan*, the learned Special Government Pleader (HR & CE) appearing on behalf of the first respondent, by relying upon the judgments of this Court in ***V.S.Natarajan and Ors. Vs. Rani Kannuthai @ Muthatha Nachiyar and Ors.***⁵ and ***K.Somasundaram Pillai***'s case (cited *supra*) would submit that even as on the appointed day, it is the temple which is the owner of the property and thus the revision of rent is in order.

10. *Mr.A.K.Sriram*, the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the second respondent temple, taking this Court through the order of the Assistant Settlement Officer under the *Act*, would submit that in that instant

3 1992 L.W.366

4 (1975)ILR 1 Mad 501

5 86 L.W. 577



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

case, ryotwari patta under Section 8 of the *Act* has been given in favour of the temple. Only in respect of the building, the right of the tenant was recognised. The temple being the owner, is entitled to revise the rent as per the Government Orders in force. The appellant all along was paying rents to the temple. The temple has already filed a suit for recovery of possession and the same is pending. The Writ Petition is in the nature of title declaration and is not at all maintainable.

11. We have considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the material records of the case. The questions which arise for consideration in the instant case are : (i) What is the import of the order of the Assistant Settlement Officer ? (ii) Whether the petitioner is entitled to claim that no rent is payable / revisable in view of the same ?

12. To answer the questions, first we have to advert to the land tenure laws applicable to the State of Tamil Nadu. Prior to independence, under various enactments and rules, intermediaries were appointed by the then regimes, namely, Zamindars, Palaiyams, Jagirs and Inamdars. The *Madras Estates Land Act, 1908* was enacted to regulate these holdings and to assure



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

the ryots of possession of a permanent holding in ryot land on payment of fair rent without being subject to eviction at Will. After independence, in order to acquire the rights of these intermediaries and also to introduce a ryotwari settlement of the estates, the *Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion Into Ryotwari) Act, 1948* was enacted. As per the same, the entire 'estate' stood vested in the Government and the persons entitled for occupation were conferred ryotwari patta, upon which, the land stood vested in the individuals. An Assistant Settlement Officer was appointed to carry out the inquiry and pass order under the *Act*. Against the order, further appeals were provided. However, the said *Act*, was not made applicable in respect of the Inam Estates. Thereafter, another enactment, namely, the *Tamil Nadu Inam Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1963* was enacted on the same lines in respect of the Inam Estates. However, even after the same, certain inams such as 'religious inams' etc., were not covered under the said *Act*, which are termed as 'minor inams' and as such the *Act* relevant to the present dispute, namely, the *Tamil Nadu Minor Inams (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1963* was enacted.



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

13. As per Section 2(5) of the *Act*, 'inam' means grant of melvaram in any inam land or a grant of both the melvaram and kudiwaram in any land which grant has been made, confirmed or recognised by the government. Section 2(6) of the *Act* defines 'inamdar' in respect of any inam means the person who held the inam immediately before the appointed day. As per Section 3 of the *Act*, all minor inam lands vested with the Government. Under Section 4 of the *Act*, Assistant Settlement Officers were appointed to carry out the purposes of the *Act*. Section 8 of the *Act*, provides for grant of 'ryotwari patta' and it reads as follows :-

" **8. Grant of ryotwari pattas.** - (1) *Subject to the provisions of sub-section (2), every person who is lawfully entitled to the kudivaram in an inam land immediately before the appointed day whether such person is an inamdar or not shall, with effect on and from the appointed day, be entitled to ryotwari patta in respect of that land.*

(2) *Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) in the Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1959 [Tamil Nadu Act 22 of 1959], and in the Tamil Nadu (Transferred Territory) Incorporated and Unincorporated Devaswoms Act, 1959 [Tamil Nadu Act 30 of 1959], the following provisions shall apply in the case of lands in an iruvaram minor inam granted for the support or maintenance of a religious institutions or for the performance of a charity or service connected therewith or of any other religious charity -*



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

(i) where the land has been transferred by way of sale and the transferee or his heir, assignee, legal representative or person deriving rights through him had been in exclusive possession a such land -

(a) for a continuous period of sixty years immediately before the 1st day of April 1960, such person shall, with effect on and from the appointed day, be entitled to a ryotwari patta in respect of that land;

(b) for a continuous period of twelve years immediately before the 1st day of April 1960, such person shall, with effect on and from the appointed day, be entitled to a ryotwari patta if he pays as consideration to the Government in such manner and in such number of instalments as may be prescribed an amount equal to twenty times the difference between the fair rent in respect of such land determined in accordance with the provisions contained in the Schedule and the land revenue due on such land;

(ii) in the case of any other land, the institution or the individual rendering service shall, with effect on and from the appointed day, be entitled to a ryotwari patta in respect of that land.

Explanation. - For the purpose of this subsection, "land revenue" means the ryotwari assessment including the additional assessment, water-cess and additional water-cess.

(3) Any arrear of the amount due from any person under clause (i)(b) of subsection (2) shall be recovered together with such interest as may be prescribed as if it were an arrear of land revenue.

(4) The Government shall [within such period as may be prescribed], pay to the



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

institution concerned in one lump sum the amount specified in clause (i)(b) of sub-section (2) and such payment shall be made in such form and manner as may be prescribed.

(5) In the case of a minor inam held immediately before the appointed day by an individual on condition of rendering service to a religious, educational or charitable institution, the grant of ryotwari patta under sub-section (1) or (2) shall be subject to the provisions of section 21."

14. Section 12 of the *Act* provides for the liability to pay land revenue to the Government by persons to whom Ryotwari Patta is issued under the *Act*. Section 13 of the *Act* provides for vesting of the buildings within the inam land on the person who owned it and it is relevant to extract Section 13 which reads as follows :-

" 13. Vesting of buildings. - (1) Every building situated within the limits of an inam land shall, with effect on and from the appointed day, vest in the person who owned it immediately before that day; but the Government shall be entitled for each fasli year commencing with the fasli year in which the appointed day falls, to levy the appropriate assessment thereon.

(2) In this section, "building" includes the site on which it stands and any adjacent premises occupied as an appurtenance thereto."



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

15. It is in this context, the order was passed by the Settlement Officer on 31.03.1971. The order has become final. It is essential to extract the entire order which reads as follows :-

" *The Schedule lands are religious minor inam lands situated in 76, Aminjikarai village of Madras Central Taluk, Madras District and confirmed in T.D.No.1659. These lands correlate to R.Survey No.70/2pt. The inam tenure of these lands was extinguished and the lands stand transferred to Government and vest in them under sec.3 of the Act 30/63, with effect from 15-2-65, the date of coming into force of the Tamil Nadu Minor Inams Abolition Act 30/63.*

2. Nobody has preferred any petition for the grant of ryotwari patta for these lands as required under the rules framed under the Act 30/63. Enquiry regarding the grant of patta was therefore taken up suomotu, on the basis of the materials gathered by the field staff to decide whether anybody is entitled to ryotwari patta. Notices regarding the enquiry were issued to the claimants and other interested persons and served on them as required under the rules. A notice was also published in the village and in the Notice Board of the Taluk Office in the prescribed manner. The powers of the Assistant Settlement Officer are exercised by me on delegation of powers with reference to G.O. Press No.401, Revenue dated 15-2-65.

3. The Executive Officer of Shri Ekambareswarn Devasthanam of 76, Aminjikarai, Madras - 29 has appeared as claimant on behalf of the Temple and deposed that the schedule lands mentioned in the notice in S.R.No.55/70 dated 4-1-71 are the inam lands



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

given to the temple, that they are in their possession and enjoyment and these lands were leased out to the occupants for construction of houses and rents are being collected regularly from them. He requests that patta may be given in the name of the Temple.

Seventy three witnesses were examined for the claimants as occupants in the lands. Most of them say that they have taken the sites in their occupation on lease and paying rent to the temple and some of them built up huts on their own accord and they are living there for over 40 years. They are neither paying any rent to the temple nor any tax to Corporation or Urban Land Tax to Government.

4. The schedule lands are religious inam granted for 'Shri Ekambaraswarar Devasthanam' of 76 Aminjikai village, Madras - 29 and confirmed T.D.No.1650. The lands correlate to R.Survey No.70/2pt. The inam in question is iruvaram minor inam. The claimant temple owns both from them. The claimant temple is lawfully entitled to both warams in the schedule lands and consequently entitled to ryotwari patta under sec.11 read with sec.8(2)(ii) of the Act 30/63. The schedule lands are building sites and they are liable to non-revisable manai rate with the reference to the Settlement Notification. Most of the occupants have put up pucca, buildings and are residing there. Therefore in exercise of the powers delegated to me in G.O.P.No.401, Revenue dated 15-2-65. I hereby allow ground rent patta in favour of the temple and the occupants jointly under sec.13(1) of the Act 30/63 appended to this order.

Note: An appeal against this order lies to the City Civil Court, Madras (Inam Abolition Tribunal)



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

within three months from the date of communication of this order."

16. In the schedule to the order, the name of the father of the appellant, *Duraiswamy Naidu* finds place in Serial No.59 in respect of T.S.No.90 admeasuring 1 Ground 1920 sq.ft. In the case of the appellant's father, admittedly, Urban Land Tax was paid and the receipt is both in the name of the temple as well as the individual.

17. In this context, on a perusal of the above order, more specifically paragraph No.4, it would be clear that the second respondent temple is granted ryotwari patta. It is held that it possessed both melvaram and kudiwaram. Considering the fact that individuals like the appellant who are either lessees or encroachers, have put up superstructures on their own and are living there, a joint ground rent patta is given. That is, the building is vested in them as per Section 13 of the *Act* as they are the owners of the superstructures. But, however, the land on which the building is situated will not vest in them because they were not owners / holders of the land immediately before the appointed day and it is only the temple which was. As such, the joint ground rent patta is given. The meaning of the joint



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

ground rent patta would be that the temple is the owner of the land and the appellant's father will be owner of the superstructure. Such dual ownership is recognised law of our country and is very much part of the scheme of things under the *Act*.

18. Further, the statement 'The schedule lands are building sites and they are liable to non-revisable manai rate with reference to the settlement notification' will only relate to the levy of land revenue payable to the Government. The purpose of the *Act* is also to levy tax as per Section 12 of the *Act*. The above statement cannot be interpreted to mean 'lease rent'. The same could not be read as relatable to 'rent' as the quantum of rent to be paid between the landlord and tenant in an inam land is not at all within the purview of the *Act*. The Assistant Settlement Officer is in no way concerned with the same. Even if it had mentioned anything about the rent, the same would be without jurisdiction and had to be ignored.

19. Our above views can be fortified by the findings of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***R.Manicka Naicker and Ors. Vs. E.Elumalai***



WEB COPY

Naicker⁶ which arose under the same Act and it is necessary to extract

paragraph Nos.10 to 14 which read thus :-

" **10.** The purpose of the said Act is introduction of ryotwari settlement in the place of the rights of inamdars in minor inams with the exception of certain types of public lands set out in Section 10 such as forests, irrigation channels, lands which are set apart for the common use of the villagers, rivers, streams etc. which vest in the Government and in respect of which no ryotwari patta can be granted.

11. The Assistant Settlement Officer is required under Section 11 to enquire into the claims of any person to a ryotwari patta in respect of any inam land and to decide it. This enquiry has to be conducted by the Assistant Settlement Officer in the manner set out in Section 11. Under Section 12, every person who becomes entitled to a ryotwari patta is required to pay land revenue to the Government as set out therein. The grant of ryotwari patta is for the purpose of collection of land revenue. By eliminating Minor Inams any intermediaries for the collection of land revenue are eliminated. In the case of buildings situated within an inam land, Section 13 provides that the building shall vest in the person who owned it immediately before the appointed day but the Government shall be entitled to levy appropriate assessment on it. As the object of the enquiry by the Settlement Officer is the grant of a ryotwari patta as a revenue settlement, the grant of a patta cannot be equated with an adjudication of title to the lands in question.

6 (1995) 4 SCC 156



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

12. The contention of the appellant that by virtue of Section 13, the land underneath the building also vests in him must be rejected. Section 13 does not vest any property in a person in whom that property did not vest prior to the appointed day. It merely sets out that a building shall vest in the person who owned it immediately before the appointed day. Section 13(2) merely provides that the site on which the building stands will also be covered by Section 13(1). Hence the site on which the building stands will vest in the person who owned it immediately before the appointed date.

13. In the case of *Sri Kumarakattalai Subrahmanyaswami Devasthanam v. K.S. Sundararajulu Chettiar* [ILR (1975) 1 Mad 501] a learned Single Judge of the Madras High Court considered the provisions of Section 13 of the said Act and held that unless the owner of the building is also the owner of the site, the site will not vest in the owner. The effect of sub-section (2) is not to make a statutory transfer of the land to the owner of the building where it had not formerly belonged to him. An inamdar who continues to be in constructive possession of the site even after the notified date would be entitled to recover possession from his tenant. We respectfully agree with these findings of the learned Single Judge.

14. Moreover, in the present case, the patta granted expressly provides that the appellant has been granted a ground rent patta only in respect of the building, while the patta for the site has been granted to the respondent. A joint patta seems to have been granted in the names of both the appellant and the respondent because of the claim of the appellant to the building and the



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

claim of the respondent to the site on which the building stands. Therefore, looking to the nature of the grant of the patta also it cannot be said that by virtue of the patta, the site on which the building stands has been, in any manner, transferred to the appellant or vests in him. The appellant cannot, therefore, claim that the decree for possession cannot be executed against him because he has become the owner of the site."

(emphasis supplied)

20. Moreover, the concept of dual ownership under Section 13 of the Act was also categorically laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **K.S.Thirugnasambandam Chettiar** (cited *supra*) and relevant findings read thus :-

" It is plain from a bare reading of the Section and its setting that it is a provision occurring in Chapter III as one of the tools to confer ryotwari pattas to persons entitled. The Preamble of the Act makes it clear, as also its name, that the Act enables the State to accomplish acquisition of the rights of inamdars in minor inams in the State of Tamil Nadu and the introduction of ryotwari settlements in such inam lands. It nowhere envisaged that the rights of a person who held a ryotwari patta in his favour or was otherwise entitled to a ryotwari patts, were meant to be abolished under the Act. Rather on abolition of inams claims of persons entitlel, to the grant of ryotwari pattas had to be examined and settled. Under the provision under scrutiny too, it is patent that some ryotwari pattas had to



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

be settled. Where buildings stood erected on inam lands immediately before the appointed day and the government in that event was entitled to an appropriate assessment as envisaged therein. Designedly, the building so erected was to include the site on which it stood and any adjacent premises occupied as an appurtenance thereto. Since the scheme of the Act patently was in establishment and preservation of ryotwari rights, it cannot be said that by virtue of Section 13, the ryotwari rights of the site-owners stood abolished or those rights got merged in the building and hence vesting in the building owner. Rather, a dual estate is conceived of in the scheme of Section 13, that is to say, the building may belong to one and the site to another. It is, therefore, not necessary that both the site and the building should belong to one and the same person so as to derive the benefit of Section 13 with effect from the appointed day. A dual estate is not repugnant to the provision, which evidently is of a very special nature, when ryotwari patta may not be admissible for a building per se, but may be admissible for the site standing thereon. Yet, this is a special provision which confers rights on the building-owners also, though in the strict sense that right may not be a ryotwari right conferable in the form of a patta. The provision, self-contained as it is, allow, the Government levying an appropriate assessment thereon for each fasli year commencing with the fasli year in which the appointed day fell, which assessment obviously would be based on the assessment due on the site as if unbuilt, and not on the price of the building...."

(emphasis supplied)



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

21. Thus, it can be seen that the appellant is only the owner of the superstructure. The second respondent temple is the owner of the land in question. It is entitled to revise the rent. Therefore, no exception can be taken to the findings of the learned Single Judge entitling the respondents to revise the rent.

22. In the result, finding no merits, the W.A.Nos. 1294 and 1302 of 2021 shall stand dismissed. No costs. Consequently, C.M.P.Nos.8203 and 8236 of 2021 are closed.

(S.V.G., CJ.)

(D.B.C., J.)

06.12.2023

Index : yes/no
Speaking order/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : yes/no
grs

To

1. The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious & Charitable
Endowments,
Nungambakkam High Road,
Chennai - 600 034.
2. The Executive Officer,
Arulmighu Ekambareswarar Thirukoil,
Aminjikarai, Chennai - 600 029.



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

WEB COPY

3. The Collector of Chennai District,
Collector's Office,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai - 600 001.
4. The Tahsildar,
Egmore-Nungambakkam Taluk,
Chetput, Chennai - 600 031.



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

**THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.**

grs

W.A.Nos.1294 and 1302 of 2021

06.12.2023