



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 10.01.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

W.P(MD)No.592 of 2014

and

M.P(MD) No.1 of 2014

V.Nagavalli

..... Petitioner

- Vs-

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Collectorate,
Ramanathapuram.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.

3. The Thasildar,
Mudukulathur Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

4. A.Ramachandran

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records relating to the proceedings of the first respondent in P.M.27435/2013(P5), dated 13.12.2013 and quash the same as illegal.



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Anbarasu
For Respondents : Mr.G.Siva Raja
Government Advocate
(For R1 to R3)

ORDER

The present Writ Petition has been filed challenging the impugned order passed by the first respondent granting patta in respect of Survey Nos. 288/27, 288/28 and 288/29 in Venkalakurichi Village, Mudukulathur Taluk, Ramanathapuram District.

2. In view of the Rule 4 (4) of the Tamil Nadu Patta Pass Book Act, 1983, when the revenue authorities come across the dispute of title as regards the property, for which, patta has been granted, it is incumbent on them to refer the parties to the civil Court and they cannot proceed to adjudicate the dispute and decide, who is entitled for patta. For better appreciation, the said Rule is extracted hereunder:

4 (4). In the event of the Tahsildar being satisfied that a dispute concerning ownership of patta is already pending in a Court or issues are raised before him which impinge on personal



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

laws or laws of succession and all the parties interested do not agree on the ownership in writing, he shall direct the concerned parties to obtain a ruling on ownership from a competent Civil Court having jurisdiction before changing the entries as already recorded and existing in the various revenue records.

3. This Rule has been reiterated by the Honourable Apex Court in the judgment reported ***in 2021 (11) SCC 98 (Edelweiss Asset Constructions Company Limited Vs- R.Perumalswamy and others)*** in which it has been held as follows:

“18. The Tamil Nadu Patta Pass Book Rules, 1987 provide for the procedure to be adopted to deal with enquiries with respect to the entries made in the Patta Pass Book. Rule 4 provides for the procedure on receipt of an application or information with respect to an entry in the Patta Pass Book. The relevant portion of Rule Provides thus:

“4. Procedure on receipt of application or information -

(1) On receipt of the application or information, the Tahsildar shall make an entry



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

in the “Register of Applications Received” in the order of receipt in Form III. The Register shall be maintained village – wise.

(2) On the basis of the information furnished in the application and as available in the existing land records or obtained otherwise, the Tahsildar shall cause to be served or despatched, under certificate of posting, to the persons having interest on the land a notice in Form IV calling upon them to make representation either orally, or in writing at a specified place on a specified date which shall be not less than fifteen days and forty days later than the date of receipt of the application or information.

(3) On the prescribed date, the Tahsildar shall conduct a summary enquiry. At the enquiry, on consideration of age, literacy and occupation, the Tahsildar may permit an authorised agent of the owner to appear on his behalf to supplement whatever the owner has to state orally or in writing. No legal practitioner in his professional capacity shall be allowed to represent any party at such an enquiry. There



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

shall not be adjournment of the enquiry not more than twice and that adjournment shall be granted only on application made by the parties requesting for adjournment. Reasons for granting or refusing the adjournment shall be recorded by the Tahsildar in writing.

(4) In the event of the Tahsildar being satisfied that a dispute concerning ownership of patta is already pending in a Court or issues are raised before him which impinge on personal laws or laws of succession and all the parties interested do not agree on the ownership in writing, he shall direct the concerned parties to obtain order on the ownership from a competent Civil Court having jurisdiction before changing the entries as already recorded and existing in the various revenue records. (emphasis supplied)

In terms of Rule 4(4), the Tahsildar upon being satisfied that a dispute concerning the ownership of patta is already pending in a Court or any issue that is raised before him impinges on personal or laws of succession shall direct the parties concerned to obtain and “order of ownership” from a competent civil



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

Court having jurisdiction and accordingly change the entries recorded in various revenue records.

19. Under the Tamil Nadu Patta Pass Book Act, 1983 and the Tamil Nadu Patta Pass Book Rules, 1987 the Tahsildar is not empowered to adjudicate upon a “title dispute”. A combined reading of Section 14 and Rule 4(4) indicates that where there exists a dispute with respect to ownership of a land between parties with respect to a patta entry, the correct procedure to be adopted is to approach a civil Court having competent jurisdiction. The entry records will be updated on the basis of the decree of the civil court upon adjudication.

20. In the present case, Government Order dated 17.08.2004 revoked the powers of rectification of defects in updating of registry cases conferred upon the Tahsildar by Government Order No.921 dated 15.08.2001. Instead, Government Order dated 17.08.2004 empowered the DRO to cure any defects occurring in the land registry after enquiry. In the present case, the first respondent by an application dated 07.09.2015 approached the DRO for change of patta in respect of the disputed lands. The DRO issued summons to the appellant to prove its legal



WEB COPY



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

ownership and possession. By an order dated 28.12.2015, the DRO solely relied on the report of the Revenue Divisional Officer and ordered deletion of the appellant's name from the land records and replaced it with the first respondent's name. The Revenue Officer had no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon title. A dispute with respect to the title of land is a mixed question of fact and law, which needs to be raised before a competent civil Court.

21. The narration of facts in the earlier part of the judgment makes it clear that on 26.02.1964, the State of Tamil Nadu executed a deed of assignment in favour of WSIL. The deed of assignment specifically records that the lands vested in the State of Tamil Nadu free of all encumbrances and were allotted to WSIL. The entire case of the first respondent, was founded on an alleged sale deed of 09.10.1929, under which his father acquired the land and an alleged oral lease, by which the land was leased in favour of WSIL in 1963. Neither the sale deed nor the terms of the alleged oral lease have been produced in the course of the proceedings. Once the lands were acquired by the State of Tamil Nadu, any pre-existing claim of the first respondent would stand extinguished. The purpose of the Government Order dated 17.08.2004, is to enable the DRO to rectify the defects in the land registry. The DRO exceeded his jurisdiction by engaging in



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

an exercise of investigating the title to the disputed land and substituting the first respondent with the appellant in the land records. The learned Single Judge was correct in holding that the DRO in the guise of acting in accordance with the said Government order, wrongly adjudicated upon the question of title which was beyond jurisdiction”.

4. In view of the same, the parties are at liberty to approach the Civil Court seeking redressal of their grievances and thereafter, to approach the revenue authorities for issuance of patta in consonance with the decision in the civil proceedings.

5. With the above said observation, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

10.01.2023

NCC: Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
ebsi



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

WEB COPY

To

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Collectorate,
Ramanathapuram.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Thasildar,
Mudukulathur Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD).No.592 of 2014

K.KUMARESH BABU, J.

ebsi

Order made in
W.P(MD)No.592 of 2014

10.01.2023