



WEB COPY



1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27.02.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE **C.V.KARTHIKEYAN**

W.P.No.20671 of 2018

A.Usha

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Tambaram, Chennai.

2.G.Thambiraj

3.T.Jaya

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to take immediate steps to retrieve the land in S.No.510/6 (Old S.No.179/Pa) to the extent of 0070 Sq.Mts vide patta No.527 in the village No.50, Kovur Village, Sriperambathur Taluk, (earlier Chengalpet MGR District) now come under the Kancheepuram District from the 2nd and 3rd respondent and hand over the same to the petitioner.

For Petitioner

.. Ms.V.Chithra & R.Amburosh

For Respondents

For R1

.. Mr.M.Muthusamy
Government Advocate

For R2 & 3

.. Mr.D.Jaganathan

**ORDER****WEB COPY**

This writ petition has been filed in the nature of Mandamus, seeking direction to the first respondent to take steps to retrieve the land in S.No.510/6 (Old S.No.179/Pa) to an extent of 0070 Sq.Mts in Patta No.527 at No.50, Kovur Village, Sriperambathur Taluk (earlier Chengalpet MGR District) now Kancheepuram District.

2. The first respondent, who had been impleaded as the Revenue Divisional Officer, Tambaram, Chennai, is not the jurisdictional officer for the said land. The correct jurisdictional officer is the Revenue Divisional Officer, Sriperambathur. The respondents 2 and 3 have been impleaded as private individuals but their learned counsel states that they are not owners of the land and they had disposed of the said lands more long back.

3. It is also pointed out by both the learned Government Advocate for the first respondent and also by the learned counsel for the respondents 2 and 3 that the said land is Grama Natham land and therefore, they cannot claim any retrieval of land.



4. The writ petition seems to be filed on a misconception. On the basis of the representation given, no action can be taken by the first respondent, since he is not the jurisdictional Revenue Divisional Officer at all.

5. The writ petition is dismissed, without entering into a discussion on the merits raised.

6. The petitioner is always at liberty to give a representation to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Sriperambathur, but the respondents 2 and 3 need not be impleaded, since they have nothing to do with the lands having disposed it of long time back. If at all a fresh representation is given, I am confident the officials would take steps in accordance with law.

7. The writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

27.02.2023

Index:Yes/No
Internet:Yes/No
ata

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN,J.



WEB COPY

To

The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Tambaram, Chennai.

4



ata

W.P.No.20671 of 2018

27.02.2023