



WEB COPY

W.P.No.22768 of



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.08.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.22768 of 2023

S.Senthamil Selvi

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Tahsildar,
Avadi Taluk Office,
Avadi, Thiruvallur District.

... Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent to consider the petitioner's representation 13/03/2023 and to survey and fix the boundary stones for a land measuring Acre 2.27 cents comprised in S.No.54/1A1A1A1 part, situated in Madhura Pulikuthi Morai Village, Ambattur Taluk, Thiruvallur District.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Gopinathan

For Respondent : Mr.C.Jayaprakash,
Government Advocate



WEB COPY

W.P.No.22768 of



ORDER

The relief sought for in the present writ petition is to direct the respondents to take appropriate action upon the petitioner's representation dated 13.03.2023.

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,



WEB COPY

W.P.No.22768 of



ownership or otherwise. Therefore, neither the parties nor the authorities need to create an impression that in the event of boundary 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



WEB COPY

W.P.No.22768 of



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 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.”



W.P.No.22768 of

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

4. At this juncture, learned Government Advocate made a submission that the copy of the application is not available with the respondent. Thus, the petitioner is at liberty to submit a fresh application along with a copy of this order.

09.08.2023

nl

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

Speaking order



WEB COPY

To

Tahsildar,
Avadi Taluk Office,
Avadi, Thiruvallur District.

W.P.No.22768 of





WEB COPY



W.P.No.22768 of

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

nl

W.P.No.22768 of 2023

09.08.2023