IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on: 14.08.2023	Delivered on: 27.09.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.KRISHNAKUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.BALAJI

W.A.Nos.1903,1918 and 1919 of 2018
& W.A.Sr..104222 of 2018
&
C.M.P.Nos.9088/2022, 15459,21808 of 2018
and C.M.P.No.21741 & 21743 of 2021

<u>W.A.No.1903 of 2018</u>

1.P.Venkata Rao (died on 15.05.2017)
rep by his General Power of Attorney
Mr.A.K.K.Elangovan
S/o A.Karuppusamy
No.3-K, Kellys Road,
Ranipet-632 401
Vellore District

2.P.Gopal .... Appellants in W.A. No.1903 of 2018

Vs.

1.The Secretary to the Government
Revenue Department
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009

2.The District Collector
Tiruvallur District
Tiruvallur .... Respondents in W.A. No.1903 of 2018
(Cause title accepted vide
order dated 14.03.2018 made in
C.M.P.Nos. 5151,5152 and 5162 of 2018)

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letter Patent praying to set aside the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 dated 19.01.2016

W.A.No.1918 of 2018

1.P.Venkata Rao (died)
rep by his General Power of Attorney
Mr.A.K.K.Elangovan
S/o A.Karuppusamy
No.3-K, Kellys Road,
Ranipet-632 401
Vellore District

2.P.Gopal .... Appellants in W.A. No.1918 of 2018

Vs.

1.Tata Communications Limited
having registered office at
VSB, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Fort, Mumbai-400 001 and
Chennai Office at
No.4, Swami Sivanandasalai,
Chennai-600 002
Rep by its Deputy General Manager
Mr.N.Kesava Prasad

2.Secretary to the Government
Revenue Department
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009

3.The District Collector
Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur .. Respondents in W.A. No.1918 of 2018
(Cause title accepted vide
order dated 14.03.2018 made in
C.M.P.Nos. 5151,5152 and 5162 of 2018)

PRAYER: Writ Appeals filed under Clause 15 of Letter Patent praying to set aside the order passed by this Court in Review Petition No.197 0f 2015 in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 dated 19.01.2016.

W.A.No.1919 of 2018

1.P.Venkata Rao (died)
rep by his General Power of Attorney
Mr.A.K.K.Elangovan
S/o A.Karuppusamy
No.3-K, Kellys Road,
Ranipet-632 401
Vellore District

2.P.Gopal .... Appellant in W.A. No.1918 of 2018

Vs.

1.Videsh Sanchar Nigam Employees Co-operative
Housing Society
represented by its President
Mr.Joseph Manoharan

No.4, Swami Sivanandasalai
Chennai-600 0002

2.Secretary to the Government
Revenue Department
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009

3.The District Collector
Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur .. Respondents in W.A. No.1919 of 2018
(Cause title accepted vide
order dated 14.03.2018 made in
C.M.P.Nos. 5151,5152 and 5162 of 2018)

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letter Patent praying to set aside the order passed by this Court in Review Petition No.210 of 2015 in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 dated 19.01.2016.

W.A.Sr.No.104222 of 2018

P.Gopal .... Appellant

Vs.

1.Tata Communications Limited
having registered office at
VSB, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Fort, Mumbai-400 001 and
Chennai Office at
No.4, Swami Sivanandasalai,
Chennai-600 002
Rep by its Deputy General Manager
Mr.N.Kesava Prasad

2.The Government of Tamil Nadu
represented by the
Revenue Secretary
Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009

3.The District Revenue Officer (DRO)
Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur

4.Tahsildar
Ponneri Taluk,
Tiruvallur District .. Respondents in W.A.Sr.No.104222 of 2018

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letter Patent praying to set aside the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.23739 of 2014 dated 02.03.2017.

For Appellants in all the cases: : Mr. P.V.Muralidhar
for
Mr.Ilaya Perumal

For Respondents : : Mr. U.M. Ravichandran,
Special Government Pleader
[for R1 & 2 in W.A.No.1903 of 2018]
[for R2 & 3 in W.A. No.1918&1919 of 2018]
[for R2 to 4 in W.A.Sr.No.104222 of 2018]
Ms. A.Sella Visalakshi for petitioner in C.M.P.No.21741 of 2021
Mr.C.Mohan
for
M/s.King & Partridge for R1 in W.A.No.1918/2018
Mr.K.Ravishankar Rao for R1 (VSNL) in W.A.No.1919 of 2018

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was made by P.B.BALAJI,J.)

All these Writ appeals arise against a common order passed in W.P.No.11859 of 2014, R.A.Nos.196,197 and 210 of 2010 and Cont.P.No. 935 of 2015, dated 19.01.2016. The appellant before us is the petitioner in Writ petition as well as the Contempt petition. The review applications were filed at the instance of the State Government and District Collector (R.A. No.192 of 2015), Tata Communication Limited (R.A.No.197 of 2015) and Videsh Sanchar Nigam Limited Employee's Cooperative Housing Society (R.A.No.210 of 2015).

2. The brief facts that are necessary for deciding the above writ appeals are as follows: -

The petitioner in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 approached the Writ Court seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus to direct the Secretary to Government to consider the petitioner'srepresentations dated 24.04.2010 and 04.10.2012, on merits and pass orders after affording an opportunity of personal hearing. Initially, the said writ petition came to be ordered by the Writ Court on 25.04.2014, directing that the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department to consider the representations dated 24.04.2010 and 04.10.2012 and pass orders thereon, on merits and in accordance with law, after affording an opportunity of hearing,within a period of 4 months from the receipt of copy of the order. Alleging disobedience and non-compliance of the of said order, the petitioner filed Cont.P.No.935 of 2015.

3. At the same time, three review applications came to be filed by the respondents as already indicated hereinabove, seeking to review the order dated 25.04.2014 in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 on the grounds that the applications in the form of representations were hopelessly time barred and had become stale and therefore there could not be any direction to consider the same on merits or in accordance with law. In the Rev.P.No.210 of 2014, the order in writ petition is sought to be reviewed on the ground that the writ petitioner had suppressed material particulars and has also not impleaded the proper and necessary parties in the writ petition and that further a new writ petition had been filed pending the contempt petition,

touching the same subject matter. In Rev.P.No.197of 2015, the order in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 is sought to be reviewed on the ground that the writ petitioner had suppressed the pendency and disposal of the Civil Suit which was pending in appeal and that the review petitioner ought to have been impleaded in the writ petition, being a proper, necessary and interested party and further on the ground that the writ petition itself was filed invoking equitable relief after a lapse of 60 years.

4. All these review petitions and the Contempt petition were heard together and in and by a common order in the Writ Court, the same Learned Single Judge who passed the earlier order in the W.P.No.11859 of 2014 dated 25.04.2014, ultimately allowed all the review petitions, dismissed the contempt petition and additionally for reasons specifically mentioned in the order, recalled the order dated 25.04.2014 passed in W.P.No.11859 of 2014.

5. It is this common order which is under challenge before us at the instance of the Writ petitioner who was the petitioner in the contempt

petition and 1st respondent in all the review petitions.

6. We have heard Mr.P.V.Muralidhar, Counsel for the appellant and Mr. U.M.Ravichandran, Special Government Pleader for respondents and Ms. A.SellaVisalakashi for the petitioner in CMP.No.21741 of 2021 who sought to implead the petitioner in CMP in the present proceedings.

7. The Counsel for the appellant would submit that originally the entire lands comprised in Padianallur and Pannivakkam villages were owned by the great grandfather of the appellant, he having purchased the same as early as on 1888 in Registered Document No. 1661/1888. The said Venkat Rao died leaving behind 3 sons as his legal heirs, out of which 2 of his sons died as bachelors. The eldest son, P.Suryanarayana Rao had 2 sons by name P.Venkatachalapathy Rao and P.VenkataGopal Rao. The appellant claims to be the son of the said P.Venkata Gopala Rao. It is the case of the appellant that his father died in the year 1943,leaving behind his wife, Sundaramma, two sons, namely the appellant and his brother P.Venkata Sethurama Rao and they have succeeded to the Zamin Estate of

the Padianallur and Pannivakkam villages and that they have been possession and enjoyment of the same. It is further contended that subsequently in the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari)Act, 1948 was enacted and on the date of notification under the Act vide G.O.Ms.No.3157(Revenue) dated 09.12.1950, the appellant, his mother and brother were the principal land holders. According to the Counsel for the appellant the estate was taken over by Survey officials on 03.01.1951 and the Revenue Department by Memorandum dated 29.03.1954 sanctioned transfer of 85.94 acres of land in Padianallurvillage in favour of Central Government (Overseas Communication Service, Ministry of Communication) for the purposes of locating a radio telegraph and radio receiving station. In the year 1954, the appellant's mother, Sundramma applied to the Assistant Settlement Officer seeking patta for the Zamin lands and after enquiry in the year 1957, out of 1117 acres of lands in the above mentioned two villages. Settlement orders were passed allowing ryotwari patta only for 44.51 acres under Section 15A of the Act and 5.44 acres under Section 11 of the Act, in favour of the mother of the appellant.

8. It is further contended by the Counsel for the appellant that there was an oral partition on 30.01.1958 between the appellant and his brother and the same was reduced to writing by a deed of confirmation dated 06.06.1958 and according to the counsel for the appellant, subsequent to the said family arrangement,the appellant has been in possession and enjoyment of the lands allotted to him. It is the further case of the appellant that his mother wrote to the Assistant Settlement Officer on 06.10.1970 and again on 11.02.1972 seeking certain documents in respect of the lands comprised in S.Nos.155/2. Subsequently, the mother of the appellant died in the year 1975. The appellant issued a notice in 1997 to Videsh Sanchar Nigam Limited (VSNL) calling upon them to remove unauthorised hoardings and also encroachments put up in the appellant's lands and pursuant to the reply notice dated 02.01.1998, the appellant has filed a civil suit in O.S.No.35 of 1998 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Ponneri. It is also fairly conceded by the Counsel for the appellant that Videsh Sanchar Nigam Limited Cooperative Housing Society filed a writ petition before the Delhi High Court in W.P.No.12002 of 2006 seeking issuance of direction to complete the transfer of 32.5 acres in favour of the society and the said writ petition was allowed on 17.05.2007 and the appeal filed by

Union of India in LPA.No.1252 of 2007 also came to be dismissed on 28.01.2008. According to the counsel for the appellant lands,comprised in S.Nos.155/2 and 156 came to be assessed only after the application made by VSNL (subsequently recrescent as Tata Communication Limited) and the Revenue authorities also ordered issuance of patta in favour of Tata Communications Limited. Challenging the issuance of the said patta to Tata Communications Limited, the appellant preferred an appeal to seeking to set aside the patta granted to Tata Communications Limited and for issuance of ryotwari patta in favour of the appellant. These proceedings were initiated by the power agent of the appellant,one Mr.A.K.K.Elagovan. However, all the applications and representations were rejected upto the Government of Tamil Nadu,Revenue Department and finally the appellant had given representations to the Principal Secretary,Revenue Department and it is only these representations that were sought to be disposed of by seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus in W.P.No 11859 of 2014.

9. According to the Counsel for the appellant, the order originally passed by the Writ Court did not warrant any review or modification as it

was a harmless order directing the authorities to only consider the appellant's representations for issuance of patta. According to the Counsel for the appellant, unfortunately the Writ Court not only reviewed the earlier order, but also dismissed the Writ petition on unsustainable grounds. The counsel for the appellant further contended that the suit filed by the appellant had no bearing or relevance on the writ proceedings and the Court ought to have seen that the appellant has been fighting right from 1970 and therefore the Writ Court ought not have non suited the appellant on the grounds of delay and laches. He would also contend that the review petitioners in Rev.P.No.197 and 210 of 2015 were not necessary parties and the Writ Court has not even discussed as to how their non-impleadment has prejudiced their rights and interest in the subject matter. The counsel for the appellant would also pray for the contempt petition being allowed since the same came to be dismissed only on erroneous considerations that came to be applied in allowing the review petitions. The Learned Counsel for the appellant would also place reliance on a Division Bench order of this Court in W.P. (MD)No. 3583 of 2023 dated 24.02.2003, to which one of us (Justice Mr.D.Krishnakumar) was one of the author.We find that the said decision will not come to the aid of the appellant for the reasons that proceedings before the Division Bench in the said case were arising under Act 30 of 1963 and not Act 26 of 1948, with which we are concerned here. Moreover, the Division Bench clearly held that the writ petition is not maintainable as the prayer was one for cancellation of pattas there was an alternate remedy available before the Commissioner Land Administration Department and in such circumstances the writ petition was disposed of,directing the petitioner therein to approach the authorities concerned for seeking cancellation of the patta, in a manner known to law.

10. Per contra, Mr.U.M.Ravichandran, Special Government Pleader would support the findings of the Writ Court in allowing the review petitions and also dismissing the Contempt Petition as well as theWrit petition, by recalling the earlier order dated 25.04.2014 passed by the very same Learned Single Judge. According to the Special Government Pleader, the appellant has slept over the matter and admittedly his mother gave a representation in 1970 and subsequently no action was taken by either the appellant's mother or the appellant until 1998, when a Civil Suit, that too

for bare injunction was filed before the District Munisf Court, Ponneri. The representations which were sought to be decided/disposed of were also of the year 2010 and 2012 only. Therefore, the Special Government Pleader prayed for dismissal of all the Writ appeals.

11. We have carefully considered the rival submissions advanced by the counsel on either side. We have also perused the records, including the order originally passed in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 dated 25.04.2014 and subsequent order passed on 19.01.2016, along with the review petitions and contempt petitions.

12. At the outset, we notice that though the prayer sought for by the appellant in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 appears to be very innocuous, seeking issuance of only a Writ of Mandamus, to consider and pass orders on the appellant's representations dated 24.04.2010 and 04.10.2012, the subject matter does not appear to be as simple as set out in the affidavit in support of the said Writ petition.

13. Admittedly, the State Government took over the lands measuring 85.94 acres in S.No.8/2 & 9 of Padianallur village and handed over the same to the Overseas Communication Service, Ministry of Communication, Government of India. Though it is argued by the Counsel for the appellant that the appellant's mother made an application to the Assistant Settlement Officer in 1954, it is seen that in 1957, orders were passed by the Assistant Settlement Officer after conducting an enquiry,directed ryotwari patta to be issued only in respect of 49.95 acres as against 1117 acres comprised in the two villages namely, Padianallur and Pannivakkam which were claimed by the appellant's mother. Subsequent to the said proceeding in the year 1957, there was dead silence on the part of the appellant's mother or the appellant until 1970, that too when only letters were written, seeking information. In the meantime, much water has flown and the beneficiaries, in Overseas Communication Service (OCS), a Central Government undertaking was converted into a fully owned Government of India enterprise styled as Videsh Sanchar Nigam Limited (VSNL) and all the assets and liabilities of the said OCS stood transferred and vested with VSNL. In respect of an extent of 32.5 acres of land in Padianallur village the same was proposed to be allotted to VSN Cooperative Housing Society. In order to expedite the

same,Cooperative Housing Society also moved the Delhi High Court and it is an admitted fact that the said writ petition was also allowed and the same was unsuccessfully challenged by the Central Government in LPA proceedings before a Division Bench of the Delhi High Court. Thereafter,VSNL was renamed as Tata Communication Limited (TCL) and thereafter, on applications made by TCL,patta was also granted to them. The appellant, through his power agent made applications to the District Collector, Thiruvallur only on 05.05.2010, seeking to cancel thepatta issued to TCL and to grant patta in favour of the appellant. The said applications were rejected, as against which admittedly an appeal was filed under Section 22 of the Act,1948. The said appeal was also dismissed by the State Government in June 2011.

14. Pursuant to all these unsuccessful steps taken by the appellant through his power agent, once again reminders were sent, seeking disposal of further representations given by the appellant. We notice from the affidavit filed in support of W.P.No.11859 of 2014 that the appellant has not disclosed the fact that he had made earlier attempts to get patta and

also for cancellation of patta issued to TCL. The appellant sought to project the case as if several of his representations have gone unheard and undisposed and the appellant innocently sought for the last two of those representations dated 24.04.2010 & 04.10.2012 to be disposed off, in accordance with law. Apparently, the Writ Court proceeded to allow the Writ petition initially on 25.04.2014 only in view of the position stated and disclosed by the appellant in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ petition. If really the appellant had disclosed the fact the his applications through power agents for issuance of ryotwari patta and for cancellation of patta granted to TCL had been rejected by the authorities throughout, upto the State Government, then the order passed by the Writ Court on 25.04.2014may have been entirely different.

15. We also do not appreciate the conduct of the appellant in trying to obtain orders and directions from the Writ Court, knowing fully well that the patta had already been granted to TCL in the meantime and consciously choosing not to make TCL a party in the Writ petition. We can at best see this only as an attempt to hoodwink the Court and obtain favourable

orders. This is more evident from the fact that pursuant to the order passed by the Writ Court on 25.04.2014, within one year a contempt petition was also filed in Cont.P.No.935 of 2015, alleging wilful disobedience and non-compliance of the order dated 25.04.2014 and such attempts on the part of the appellant seem to be nothing but arm-twisting tactics indulged and attempted to coerce the authorities into granting patta to him.

16. One another important and relevant circumstance is the fact that under the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, Chapter III deals with grant of ryotwari pattas.

17. Section 11 sets out the lands in which the ryots are entitled to ryotwari pattas. Section 12 sets out lands in zamindari estates in which the land holders are entitled to ryotwari patta. Both Sections 11 as well as 12 fixed an outer limit of 1st July 1945 to be the cut-off date to establish a right or entitlement to ryotwari patta. Subsequently, in order to tide over the difficulties faced by ryotsand zamindars, the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.1300 (Revenue Department) dated 30.04.1971. This G.O is

extracted for ready reference:-

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

ABSTRACT

G.O.Ms.No.1300 Dated.30.04.1971 of Revenue Department

Lands-Lands in Estates taken over under the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948- Grant of Patta to persons in continuous possession and enjoyment-Orders passed:

Read:-

1. G.O.Ms.No.1501, Revenue, dated 8.07.1958

2. Govt. Memo No.68348/Ji/63-3, Revenue, dt.19.9.1963

3. G.O.Ms.No.1312, Revenue, dt 26.7.1967

4. G.O.Ms.No.1925, Revenue, dt. 3.11.1967

5. Govt. Memo No.41399/JI/68-2, Revenue, dt.16.7.1968

6. G.O.Ms.No.641, Revenue, dt 28.2.1970 ---------

ORDER:-

In the G.O first read above, the Government passed orders that landlords who could not apply of ryotwari patta in time under the Tamil Nadu Estate

(Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu XXVI of 1948) (hereinafter referred to as the Act) but who would have got patta if they had applied in time, might be granted patta outside the scope of the Act, if they apply to the Collector of the District concerned. In the Memo, second read above, the Government ordered that the vendees from the landholders might also be treated on the same basis as landholders. Subsequently in 1967, the Government passed orders in the G.O third read above that the concession allowed to the landholders should be executed to the ryots also and that they should be granted patta outside the scope of the Act on the same basis as laid down in the first read above. Thus the existing orders Provide for cases for the grant of patta to the landholders and ryots outside the scope of the Act in cases:-

(i) Where the landholder or the ryot or the vendee have got patta if he had applied in time under the Abolition Act but failed to make the application in time.

(ii) Where the parties case into possession of better documentary evidence showing better title to grant of patta which were not available at the time when the applicants were heard by the appropriate

authorities under the Act.

(2). It has been brought to the notice of the Government that even the implementation of the orders referred to above, there are yet a large number of persons who have been in continuous possession and enjoyment of the land for years together in estate, taken over under the Act. Such persons have not been granted patta either because they did not come under the eligible category for the grant of patta under the Act or under the orders of the Government referred to above. It has been represented that it will be a hardship if such persons who have been in continuous possession and enjoyment of their lands for together are not granted pattas.

3. The land in respect of which these persons have been in continuous possession and enjoyment have vest in the Government absolutely under the Act. The Government after careful consideration have decided that patta should be granted to such persons on the basis of such continuous possession and enjoyment of the land. The Government therefore direct that such persons may be granted patta in accordance with the instructions given below:-

(i) Any person who has been in continuous

possession and enjoyment of any land in the estates taken over under the Act, may apply for the grant of patta in respect of such land.

(a) To the Revenue Divisional Officers in cases where the extent of such land does not exceed 5 acres of wet or irrigable dry or 10 acres of dry lands; and

(b) To the District Revenue Officer-Collector in all other cases.

Persons whose claims have been rejected under the Act or under the orders referred to above, may also apply this order, if such persons have been in continuous possession and enjoyment of the lands.

(2). he Revenue Divisional Officer/District Revenue Officers/Collector may grant patta of such application after the usual enquiry and after satisfying himself that the applicant has been in continuous possession and enjoyment of the land.

(3). he extent of the land for which patta is to be granted either by himself or together with the lands already held by the applicant shall not exceed the ceiling limit fixed under the Tamil Nadu Land Reforms (Fixation of Ceiling on land) Act, 1961, as modified by the Tamil Nadu Land Reforms (Reduction of Ceiling on land) Act, 1970.

(4). n cases where there are rival claims for the grant of patta in respect of the same land, the authority concerned may, in appropriate cases direct the portion to obtain a declaration from the Civil Court that they have been in continuous possession and enjoyment of the lands.

(5). In respect of cases whose land has been classified during settlement as communal poromboke but on ground, it has been converted as dry or wet field and the applicant has been in continuos possession and enjoyment of the land, the appropriate authority may grant patta in respect of such land after following the prescribed procedure for changing the classification of the land.

(6). Consultation with the settlement authorities before the grant of patta will not be necessary unless the Revenue Divisional Officer/District Revenue Officer/Collector is of the view that the matter on such required scrutiny from the settlement point of view.

(7). No market value of the land shall be collected for the grant of patta underthese orders.

(8). Adequate publicity in the village and its neighbourhood shall be given by the appropriate authority about the proposal to grant patta under these orders.

(9). The orders of the Revenue Divisional Officer/Collector as the case may be granted or refusing to grant patta are subject to revision by the Board of Revenue (Settlement of Estates) Madras either suo motu or on application to be filed within sixty days of services of the order.

(10) The Board of Revenue (SE) Madras is requested to issue suitable instructions for the proper implementation of these orders to their subordinate authorities."

/By order of the Governor/

Sd/-A.Pasupathi.

Secretary to Government.

Sd/-xxx

Tahsildar

Namakkal

18. This G.O was promulgated to extend a one time benefit to the persons who would have got patta if they had applied within time. Initially, G.O.Ms.No.1501 (Revenue) dated 08.07.1958 was passed to enable the land owners to make an application for issuance of ryotwari patta. Subsequently in and by G.O.Ms.No.1312 (Revenue) dated 26.07.1967, the

concession was extended toryots, also apart from land holders, entitling them to get patta outside the scope of the Act. Thereafter, in G.O.Ms.No.1300 dated 30.04.1971, the board of revenue was requested to suitably implement the said G.O. Pursuant to the same G.O.Ms.No.589(Commercial Taxes and Religious Endowments Department) dated 14.05.1975 was issued in furtherance of G.O.Ms.No.1300 dated 30.04.1971, regarding time limit for grant of pattas outside the scope of Estates Abolition Act, 1948. Thus, it is seen that,in any by G.O.Ms.No.589, the time limit for preferring applications for grant of ryotwari patta outside the scope of the Abolition Act, 1948was extended upto 30.06.1975 across districts in the State. The said G.O is extracted for easy reference:-

> *"G.O.Ms.No.589, Commercial Taxes and Religious Endowments Department dated 14.5.1975.*
>
> *LANDS - Lands in estates taken over under the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948-Grant of patta to persons outside the scope of the Abolition Act -Time Limit for preferring applications fixed in G.O.Ms.No.1300, Revenue, dated 30.4.71-Extended upto 30.6.75*
>
> *Read:*

1. G.O.Ms.No. 1300, Revenue, dated 30.4.71

2. Government Memo No.33148/31/72-1, Revenue, dated 6.3.72.

3. Government Memo, No.9317/J1/73-4, Revenue dated 2.5.73

4. Government Merno, No.159682/J1/73-1, Revenue dated 26.12 74.

5. From the President, Madural District, Agriculturists Sangam, Tenkarai, Periakulam, letter No. 665/74, dated 29.12.74

6. Government D.O.No.2126/VIII(1)/75-1, Commercial Taxes and Religious Endowment Department, dated 24.1.75.

7. From the Board of Revenue (SE)A1, 12406/74 dated 22.3.75.

ORDER

In G.O.Ms.No.1300, Revenue, dated 30.4.71, as clarified in Government Memo 23148/J1/72-1. Revenue, dated 6.8.72, instructions were issued for the grant of pattas outside the scope of the Estates Abolition Act, 1948 to any person who has been in continuous possession and enjoyment of any land which have vested in the Government absolutely under the Act. In Government Memo 9317/31/73-4, Revenue, dated 25.73, the Government extended *the time limit for preferring claims for pattas outside the scope of the Abolition Act 1948 under above G.O.Ms.No. 1300, Revenue, dated 30.4.71 upto 1.8.73 in Dharmapuri District and upto 30.6.73 in respect of other District. Subsequently on the recommendation of the Board of Revenue, the Government in Memo No.159682/J1/73-1, Revenue, dated 26.12.73 directed that the time limit for preferring applications outside the scope of the Abolition Act, 1948 under G.O.Ms.No.1300, Revenue, dated 30.4.71 be extended upto 30.6.74 in all Districts.*

2. It has now been represented to the Government that a large number of applications are yet to be submitted for issue of such pattas and that as such the time limit may be further extended. The Board of Revenue has examine the question of extending the time limit in consultation with all the Collectors and District Revenue Officers and has recommended that the time limit for preferring applications for the grant of patta outside the scope of the Abolition Act, 1948 under G.O.Ms.No. 1300, Revenue, dated 30.4.71 may be extended upto 30.6.75. The Government after careful examination accept the recommendation of the Board and direct that the time limit for preferring applications outside the scope of the Abolition Act, *1948 under G.O.Ms.No. 1300, Revenue, dated 30.4.71 be further extended upto 30.6.75 in all the Districts.*

3. The Board of Revenue (SE) is requested to issue suitable instructions to the subordinate officers concerned in the matter under intimation to Government.

(By Order of the Governor)

Sd./ C.N.Raghavan,

Secretary to Government"

19. Subsequent to the said G.O there has been no further extension of time and therefore all or any application made by either ryots or land holders for grant of ryotwari pattas outside the purview of the Abolition Act of 1948 ought to have been made on or before30.06.1975. Any application made thereafter was clearly not maintainable and liable to be rejected at the threshold.

20. In the instant case, it is seen that the appellant's mother had earlier requested for the grant of patta by an application in the year 1954

which was certainly within the time stipulated under the Act and subsequent Government orders. However, in and by proceedings in the year 1957, orders came to be passed holding that the appellant's mother was entitled only to 44.51 acres under Section 15 of the Act and 5.44acres under Section 11 of the Act.

21. In the facts of the case on hand, the course open to the appellant's mother/ the appellant were two-fold. One, in so far as the order passed under Section 11, entitling the mother to 5.44 acres, the said proceedings were of the year 1957.Applying the mandate of G.O.Ms.No.1300 dated 30.04.1971 and G.O.Ms.No.589 dated 14.05.1975, the rights that were available to the appellant's mother/ the appellant got extinguished in the year 1975, more specifically 30.06.1975.

22. In so far as entitlement of 44.51 acres under Section 15 of the Act, the said proceedings were also of the year 1957. In order to better appreciate the distinction, we deem it fit to discuss the relevant provisions of the statute namely The Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion

into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, Act 26 of 1948, a time limit was prescribed for making a original application for grant of ryotwari patta. The said period was over as in when the classification of lands were settled or published, thereafter the only remedy to get a ryotwari patta was to challenge the classification made under the original proceedings or filing an appeal before the designated forum, that too only within the permissible time limit. We have already seen Section 11 which deals with ryotwari patta to ryots in ryoti lands. Section 12 to 14 deal with grant of ryotwari patta to landholders in respect of his/her private lands in zamindari estates (Section 12) Inam estate (Section 13), Tenure estate (Section 14).

23. In so far as Sections 12 to 14 are concerned, Section 15 provides for an appeal to be filed. However, in so far Section 11 is concerned, there is no express provision available in the statute enabling an aggrieved land holder or a ryot to prefer an appeal. Here Section 5 of the Act would assume relevance. Section 5 runs as follows:

> *5. Appointment and functions of Settlement Officer. - (1) As soon as may be after the passing of this Act, the Government shall appoint one or more*

Settlement Officers to carry out the functions and duties assigned to them under this Act.

(2) Every Settlement Officer shall be subordinate to the Director and shall be guided by such lawful instructions as he may issue from time to time; and the Director shall also have power to cancel or revise any of the orders, acts or proceedings of the Settlement Officer, other than those in respect of which an appeal lies to the Tribunal.

24. It is clear that an order passed under Section 11 can be sought to be cancelled or revised before the Director. Now, we proceed to discuss various G.Os issued under the act.

25. In and by G.O.Ms.No.3190, Revenue dated the 17.10.1955 which is extracted hereunder for ready reference:-

"Rules Under the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948

Published vide Notification No. G. O. No. 1685, Revenue, dated 25th June 1949

Last Updated 22nd May, 2019 [tn438]

Rules For Determination of Inam Estates and Date of Creation of Under-Tenure Estates

[G. O. No. 3190, Revenue, dated the 17th October, 1955.]

In exercise of the powers conferred by section

67(2)(d) of the [Tamil Nadu] (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 ([Tamil Nadu] Act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of [Tamil Nadu] hereby makes the following rule: -

Revision petitions against the orders of an Assistant Settlement Officer under section 11 of the said Act shall be presented to the Settlement Officer concerned within fifteen days from the date of conduct of Rough Patta Objection Hearing or the date of publication of this notification, whichever is later, in the areas where section 11, enquiries have already been conducted separately under the old procedure and within thirty days of the conduct of final settlement Enquiry or within fifteen days of the date of publication of this notification, whichever is later, in areas where section 11 enquiries are conducted with the Rough Patta Objection Hearing under the new procedure. Further, revision petitions shall lie to the Director of Settlements and the [Board of Revenue] against the orders of the Settlement Officer and the Director of Settlements, respectively, within thirty days of the date of their respective orders.

[Subject to the provisions of the Act and this rule, every revision petition presented to the authorities or officers, having jurisdiction under this rule, after the period of limitation prescribed therefore in this rule, shall be dismissed although limitation has not been a set up is a defence.

No such revision petition filed shall be admitted after the period of limitation prescribed therefore in this rule on the ground that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not preferring the petition within such period.]

26. In so far as Section 11, ryotwari pattas are concerned, a 30 day

period for filing an appeal was stipulated and in so far as Section 12 to 14, 3 months period came to be stipulated. Thereafter, in and by G.O.Ms.No.1400 Commercial Taxes and Religious Endowments Department dated 21.11.1975, time for preferring appeals was extended, however, without any limitation which is extracted hereunder, for ready reference:-

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Abstract

Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion in to Ryowari) Act. 1948- Rules under sections 11,18,19 19A, 65 & 67 of the Act - Amendments - Issued.

COMMERCIAL TAXES AND RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS DEPARTMENT.

G.O.Ms.No 1400
Dated. 21.11.75

Read :

1. From the Board of Revenue (Settlement, B.P.1918 dated 29.8.74.

2. Govt. Memo.No.83508/VIII (1)/ 74-4 Commercial Taxes & Religious Endowments Department & RE dated 1.2.75.

3. From the Board of Revenue (Settlement) Ref (CI) 2779/76 dated 11.4.75

O R D E R

The Notifications in the Annexure to this order will be published in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette.

(BY ORDER OF THE GOVERNOR)

C.N.Raghavan,

Secretary to Government

To

The Board of Revenue (Settlement), Madras – 5 (5 copies)

The Director of Survey and Settlement, Madras – 5 (5 copies)

The Collectors of all Districts.

The Registrar, High Court (With C.L) (20 Copies)

The Director of Stationery and Printing Madras – 1 for

Publication of the notification in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette.

Copy to Law Department.

Copy to IX Section.

Copy to CTVIII (1) for action to place on the Table of both Houses of Legislature

Copy to CTVIII(2) for watching publication.

/ True Copy /

Forwarded By Order

Section Officer (2)

ANNEXURE

NOTIFICATION - I

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 67 read with section 63 of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu Act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of Tamil Nadu hereby makes the following amendment to the Rules published with the Revenue Department Notification at pages 25-26 in the Rules Supplement to Part-I of the Fort St. George gazette, dated the 17th January 1950, as subsequently amended.

AMENDMENT

In the said rules, in rule 6, for the proviso, the following provisos shall be added, namely.

" Provided that the Director or the Board of Revenue may admit an appeal or revision petition as he case may be made after the period aforesaid

if he or it is satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not making the appeal or revision petition within the said period".

NOTIFICATION- II

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) and clauses (c) and (d) of sub-section (2) of Section 67 read with sections 19 and 19-A of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of Tamil Nadu hereby makes the following amendments to the rule published with the Revenue Department Notification dated the 5th August 1949, at pages 249-250 of the Rules Supplement to Part I of the Fort St, George Gazette, dated the 16th August 1949, as subsequently amended.

AMENDMENTS

In the said rule, in the Schedule, in the entries in column (3),

(1) against "19 Second Proviso" in column (1), after the provisos to item II (e), the following provisos shall be added, namely.

" Provided further that the Board of Revenue or the Government may admit a revision petition presented after the period aforesaid if it or they is

or are satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not presenting the petition within the said period" and

(2) against '19A" in column (1), after the proviso to item II (e), the following proviso shall be added, namely:-

"Provided further that the Board of Revenue or the Government may admit a revision petition presented after the period aforesaid, if it or they, is or are satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not presenting the petition within the said period'.

(3)

NOTIFICATION - III

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 67 read with sub - section (2) of section 5, clauses (c) and (d) of section 7 and sections 18 and 19 of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of Tamil Nadu hereby makes the following amendment to the rules published with the Revenue Department Notification No. SRO A.1226 of 1961 at pages 1269 and 1270 of part V of the Fort St, George Gazette, dated the 13th December 1961, as subsequently amended:-

AMENDEMENT

In the said rules, in rule 2, to the second paragraph, the following provisos shall be added, namely.

" Provided that the Settlement Officer, the Director of Settlements or the Board of Revenue may admit a revision petition preferred after the period aforesaid, if he or it is satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not preferring the petition within the said period".

NOTIFICATION - IV

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 67 (2) (d) of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu Act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of Tamil Nadu hereby makes the following amendments to the rules published with the Revenue Department Notification dated the 17th October, 1955, at page 435 of the Rules supplement to part I of the Fort St. George, Gazette, dated the 19th October, 1955 as subsequently amended.

AMENDMENT

In the said rule, for the second and third sub-paragraphs the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:-

"Provided that the Settlement Officer, the Director of Settlements or the Board of Revenue may admit a revision petition presented after the period aforesaid, if he or it is satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not presenting the petition within the said period".

// True Copy //

Section Officer

27. In order to have proceedings concluded one way or other, G.O.Ms.No.714 Commercial Taxes and Religious Endowments Department dated 29.06.1987 was issued, qualifying G.O.Ms.No.1400 dated 21.11.1975. G.O.Ms.No.714 Commercial Taxes and Religious Endowments Department dated 29.06.1987 were extracted hereunder for ready reference:-

GOVERMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Abstract

Tamil Nadu state (Abolition a d Conversion into Ryotwari) Act 1948- Admission of belated appeals and revisions - Amendment to the rules prescribed under Section 63, 19, 19A, 5(2), 7(d) ad 67 (2) (d) of Act withdraw-notifications- Issued. COMMERCIAL TAXES AD RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS DEPARTMENT

G.O.Ms.No.714 Dated: 29-6-87

Aari 15, Prabava, Thiruvalluvar Aadu 2018

Read again

1. G.O. Ms.No. 2043, Revenue, dt. 5.8.49.

2. G.O.Ms.No, 39,Revenue, dt. 7.1.50

3. G.O. Ms.No.1393, Revenue, dt. 14.7.69.

4. G.O.Ms.No. 3261, Revenue, dt. 3.12.61

5.G.O.Ms. No.1393, Revenue dt.14.7.69. Read also:

6. G.0. Ms. 0.1400, Commercial Taxer and Religious Endowment, dt. 21.11.75.

7. From the Commissioner for Land Adm.Lr. o. (K1)12817/80,dt. 15.9.81 and Lr. o. (K1) 7365/82 dt. 20.7.82.

ORDER:

Consequent on the judgment of the High Court, Madras in Writ Appeal No.98 of 1971, the erstwhile Board of Revenue submitted proposals for amendment of the relevant rules under the Tamil Nadu estate (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Art, 1948 (Tamil Nadu Act 26 of 1948) so as to provide for admission of Belated appeals or revisions on grounds of the Petitioner haring reasonable cause for not malting the appeals or revisions within the prescribed periods, accepting *the suggestion of the erstwhile Board of Revenue, the Government issued orders amending the rules framed under the Tamil Nadu Estate (Abolition and Conversion into to Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu Act 26 of 1948).*

2. The Government have also afforded certain special concessions by way of grant of patta outside the scope of the Abolition Acts, even after the completion of settlement proceedings and introduction of settlement. The Commissioner for Land Administration has now stated that even then the claims rejected during the "settlement proceedings are reopened within the provisions of the Art by way of a revision petition with petition for condonation of delay. Considering the ample opportunities give to get the claim for land established under the Government Order relating to assignment outside the scope of the Abolition Acts, there is no real need to provide for condonation of delay for consideration of claims under the Tamil Nadu Estate (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 after such a long-time lag. He has opined that there, should be some finality to these settlement proceedings and that reopening of closed cares on one ground or other by the authorities by virtue of the lowers conferred on them would only unsettle the settled *issues and lard the state in continued litigation and expenditure in contesting such cases in Courts and that he has suggested that the amendments issued in G.O.Ms.No.1400 Commercial Tax and Religious Endowments, dt. 21.11.1975 may be suitably modified to that effect.*

3. The Commissioner for Land Administration has also suggested that since a provision for condonation of delay has been made, it is desirable that while withdraw that concession, provision may be made for such procedure, be availed for limited period, after the proposed amendment since the condonation being discretionary, nobody can object on the ground that any right vested in, him had been taken away, an could be the contention if the period for appeal is sought to be interfered with. He has further suggested that as a matter of equity, a limited period, after the amendment equal to the period, upto which the delay canbe condoned in the normal course, may be allowed in the proposed amendments in respect of older cases. The Commissioner of Land Administration has also submitted necessary amendments in this regard.

4. The Government have examined the proposals of the Commissioner for Land Administration and decided to approve the draft amendments *suggested by him with slight modification*

5. The notifications annexed to this order will be published in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette,

(BY ORDER OF THE GOVERNOR)

SUKAVA ESHVAR,

COMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

//True Copy//

ANNEXURE

NOTIFICATION - I

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 67 read with section 63 of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu Act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of Tamil Nadu hereby makes the following amendment to the Rules published with the Revenue Department Notification at pages 25-26 in the Rules Supplement to Part-I of the Fort St. George gazette, dated the 17th January 1950, as subsequently amended.

AMENDMENT

In the said rules, in rule 6, for the proviso, the following provisos shall be added, namely.

" Provided that the Director or the

Commissioner of Land Administration may condone delay upto a period of thirty days beyond the period aforesaid, if he is satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not presenting the petition within prescribed time: Provided further that in respect of cases disposed of prior to the date of publication of this amendment in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazatte, the period of thirty days shall be counted from the date of such publication:

Provided also that suo motu powers of the Commissioner of Land Administration under Section 7 of the Act shall not be barred in any case."

NOTIFICATION- II

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) and clauses (c) and (d) of sub-section (2) of Section 67 read with sections 19 and 19-A of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of Tamil Nadu hereby makes the following amendments to the rule published with the Revenue Department Notification dated the 5th August 1949, at pages 249-250 of the Rules Supplement to Part I of the Fort St, George Gazette, dated the 16th August 1949, as subsequently amended.

AMENDMENTS

In the said rule, in the Schedule, in the entries in column (3), (1) against "19 Second Proviso" in column (1), after the provisos to item II (e), the following provisos shall be added, namely.

"Provided that the Settlement Officer or the Director or the Commissioner of Land Administration may condone delay up to a period of thirty days beyond the period aforesaid, if he is satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not presenting the petition within prescribed time:

Provided further that in respect of cases disposed of prior to the date of publication of this amendment in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazatte, the period of thirty days shall be counted from the date of such publication

Provided also that suo motu powers of the Commissioner of Land Administration under Section 7 of the Act shall not be barred in any case."

(3)

NOTIFICATION - III

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 67 read with sub - section (2) of section 5, clauses (c) and (d) of section 7 and sections 18 and

19 of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of Tamil Nadu hereby makes the following amendment to the rules published with the Revenue Department Notification No. SRO A.1226 of 1961 at pages 1269 and 1270 of part V of the Fort St, George Gazette, dated the 13th December 1961, as subsequently amended:-

AMENDEMENT

In the said rules, in rule 2, to the second paragraph, the following provisos shall be added, namely.

"Provided that the Settlement Officer or the Director or the Commissioner of Land Administration may condone delay up to a period of thirty days beyond the period aforesaid, if he is satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not presenting the petition within prescribed time:

Provided further that in respect of cases disposed of prior to the date of publication of this amendment in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazatte, the period of thirty days shall be counted from the date of such publication

Provided also that the powers of the Commissioner of Land Administration under Section 7 of the Act shall not be barred in any case.”

NOTIFICATION - IV

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 67 (2) (d) of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 (Tamil Nadu Act XXVI of 1948), the Governor of Tamil Nadu hereby makes the following amendments to the rules published with the Revenue Department Notification dated the 17th October, 1955, at page 435 of the Rules supplement to part I of the Fort St. George, Gazette, dated the 19th October, 1955 as subsequently amended.

AMENDMENT

In the said rule, for the proviso, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:-

“Provided that the Settlement Officer or the Director or the Commissioner of Land Administration may condone delay up to a period of thirty days beyond the period aforesaid, if he is satisfied that the petitioner had sufficient cause for not presenting the petition within prescribed time:

Provided further that in respect of cases disposed *of prior to the date of publication of this amendment in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette, the period of thirty days shall be counted from the date of such publication*

Provided also that suo motu powers of the Commissioner of Land Administration under Section 7 of the Act shall not be barred in any case."

// True Copy //

SUKAVA ESHVAR,

COMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

//True Copy//

28. The said G.O.Ms.No.714 CT & RE Department dated 29.06.1987 was issued by fixing one time window of 30 days for preferring appeal/revisions and the said period ended on 20th August 1987, thus fixing a last day to apply for condonation of delay under Section 11. Therefore, any opportunity to apply for ryotwari patta under Section 11 either stood extinguished by 30.06.1975 or 20th August 1987 which provided another opportunity to make an application with condonation of delay. On and from 21.08.1987, no authority, be it the appellate forum or the revisional

authority, namely The Director of Survey and Settlement or the Commissioner of Land Administration had any power to condone delay in making an application for grant of ryotwari patta or to even remand a matter to the Assistant Settlement Officer or the Settlement Officer for any enquiry in connection with grant of ryotwari patta. It is needless to state that the revenue authorities, namely the Tahsildar or VAO also have absolutely no power to entertain or issue ryotwari pattas, usurping the powers of the Assistant Settlement Officer/ Settlement Officer.

29. Coming back to the facts of the present case, in so far as the determination of 44.51 acres under Section 15, in terms of Section 15(1), the appellant's mother/the appellant ought to have filed an appeal within 2 months from the date of order passed in 1957 to the special tribunal constituted for such purpose. Even the tribunal had a discretion to condone a delay only up to a period of 6 months. In fact the import of Section 15 also makes it abundantly clear that the decision of the tribunal on an appeal filed under Section 15 (1) was final and not liable to questioned in any Court of law. On a conjoint reading of the scheme of the Act and the

various provisions as well as the Government Orders, it is clear that Section 5 of the Limitation Act would be no relevance or application to proceedings under the Act 26 of 1948, especially when the enactment itself has built in provision for specific periods of delay to be condoned. Admittedly neither the appellant's mother nor the appellant challenged the orders passed by the Assistant Settlement Officer in 1957 and they lost their right as soon as the limitation period of 2 months, extendable upto another 6 months also lapsed. Thus, there was absolutely no useful purpose in reopening a concluded matter, by merely sending representations touching the very same subject matter. It is a classic case of "flogging a dead horse". The Writ Court has rightly reviewed its earlier order dated 25.04.2014 and allowed the review petition and dismissed the Writ petition. The contempt petition was also rightly closed, holding that when the order in the Writ petition had been reviewed, there can be no wilful or deliberate disobedience complained of. A writ of mandamus can ordinarily be issued only where a legal right exists for the petitioner. In cases like these, where the appellant as writ petitioner had lost its right several decades ago, the courts would not come to their rescue of such litigants by issuing a fiat of writ of mandamus. We do not find any reasons warranting interference with the common order passed by the Writ Court.

In fine, the writ appeals are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(D.K.K.J) & (P.B.B.J)
27.09.2023

Internet: Yes
Index:Yes/No
Neutral Citation:Yes/No
mjs
To

1.The Secretary to the Government
Revenue Department
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009

2.The District Collector
Tiruvallur District
Tiruvallur

3.The District Revenue Officer (DRO)
Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur

4.The Tahsildar
Ponneri Taluk,
Tiruvallur District

D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.,
and
P.B.BALAJI,J

mjs/kpr

Pre-delivery judgment in
W.A.Nos.1903,1918 and 1919 of 2018
& W.A.Sr..104222 of 2018

27.09.2023