



WEB COPY

W.P.No.24742 of



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.08.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.24742 of 2023

Mrs.M.Sakunthala

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by The District Revenue Officer,
Uthangarai,
Krishnagiri District.

2.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by The Tahsildar,
Uthangarai,
Krishnagiri District.

3.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by Head Quarter Surveyor,
Taluk Office, Uthangarai,
Krishnagiri District.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to dispose of the petitioner's representation dated 03.05.2023.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.R.Krishnakumar
For Respondents	:	Mr. G. Krishna Raja, Additional Government Pleader.



ORDER

WEB COPY

The relief sought for in the present writ petition is to direct the 1st respondent to dispose of the petitioner's representation dated 03.05.2023.

2. The issues raised in the present writ petition were adjudicated by this Court in a batch of writ petitions in ***W.P.No.37519 of 2016 [S.Sakkarai Vs. The Tashildhar, Dharmapuri District] etc., and batch***, and a judgment was delivered on 19.06.2023 and the relevant paragraphs of the judgment are extracted hereunder:

“36. Section 9 of the Code of Civil Procedure unambiguously contemplates that “The Courts shall have jurisdiction to try all suits of a civil nature excepting suits of which their cognizance is either expressly or impliedly barred.

37. Therefore, a special enactment has no relevance with reference to a right of the parties to approach the competent Civil Court of law to resolve all nature of civil disputes including boundary dispute, survey dispute, title dispute, ownership or otherwise. Therefore, neither the parties nor the authorities need to create an impression that in the event of boundary



WEB COPY

W.P.No.24742 of



dispute, the parties have to approach the authorities at the first instance. It is not required that the aggrieved persons, in the event of boundary dispute has to approach the authorities for fixing the boundary, they are at liberty to approach the Civil Court of law under Section 9 of the Code of Civil Procedure, which is unambiguous in this regard.

38. Submitting an application for fixing boundary is an option available to the aggrieved persons. Once an application is filed, whether the application is entertainable under the provisions of the Act is to be determined by the authorities and only if it is falling within the ambit of the Act, then alone the survey or fixing of boundary is to be undertaken. Even in this case, the authorities are bound to relegate the parties to the competent Civil Court of law under Section 14 of the Act.

39. It is contended by the petitioner that the authorities are making certain findings regarding the title, ownership in their order, while rejecting the applications. Such findings made by the authorities either in the patta proceedings or in the proceedings under the Survey and Boundaries Act are restricted



WEB COPY

W.P.No.24742 of



and to be understood only for the purpose of arriving a conclusion under the provisions of the Act and the said patta proceedings or the proceedings under the Survey and Boundaries Act would not confer any title or be taken as a conclusive decision, more specifically under Section 35 of the Evidence Act.

40. Accordingly, the respondents are directed to consider the representations / applications submitted by the petitioners in the order of seniority and by following the procedures as contemplated under the Governmental orders and in consonance with the provisions of the Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923 and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law. Wherever the applications are already disposed of and appeals provided under the Act has been filed, then such appeals are to be decided on merits and in consonance with the provisions of the Survey and Boundaries Act.”

3. In view of the fact that the case of the petitioner is also similar to that of the cases (cited *supra*), the case of the petitioner is also to be considered on the same line.



4. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. No costs.

WEB COPY

22.08.2023

cse

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

To

1. The District Revenue Officer,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Uthangarai,
Krishnagiri District.

2. The Tahsildar,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Uthangarai,
Krishnagiri District.

3. The Head Quarter Surveyor,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Taluk Office, Uthangarai,
Krishnagiri District.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.24742 of

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

cse

W.P.No.24742 of 2023

22.08.2023