



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 25..07..2024

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

Writ Petition No.19975 of 2023

K.Yuvaraja

..... Petitioner

-Versus-

- 1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By its Secretary, Revenue Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Land Administration,
Land Administration Department,
2nd Floor, Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai 600 005.
- 3.The District Collector,
1st Floor, Main Building,
District Collectorate,
Tiruchengode Road,
Namakkal 637 003.
- 4.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Namakkal District,
Namakkal-637 003.
- 5.The Tahsildar,
SH 79, VIP Nagar,
Rasipuram Taluk, Namakkal 637 408.
- 6.The Engineer-in-Chief and Chief Engineer,
Water Resources Organization,
Public Works Department,
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005.



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

7.The Assistant Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Water Resources Organization,
Rasipuram 637 408.

8.K.Ammasi

..... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari Mandamus, calling for the records pertaining to the impugned Order passed by the 5th respondent dated 28.04.2023 vide Na.Ka.No.10626/2022/B5 and to quash the same and further direct the respondents 3 to 5 to take necessary steps to sub-divide the land in respect of the water canal and canal bund / pathway (Plan Marked Channel) running through the land in S.No.40/2 situate in Mathiyampatti village, Rasipuram Taluk, Namakkal District and for a consequential direction to mutate the revenue records thereon to reflect the name of the Government of Tamil Nadu within a time frame to be specified by this court.

For Petitioner : *Mrs.Anu Ganesan &
Mr.Vignesh Venkat*

For Respondent (s) : *Mr.P.Sathish,
Additional Government Pleader
for RR1 to 7
Mr.N.Subramaniyan for R8*



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

ORDER

WEB COPY

Challenge in this writ petition is to the Order of the the 5th respondent dated 28.04.2023 made in Na.Ka.No.10626/2022/B5 whereby the 5th respondent -Tahsildar turned down the request of the petitioner to cancel the patta issued in the name the 8th respondent for an extent of 0.40.5 Hectares of land comprised in S.No.40/2, Mathiyampatti Village, Rasipuram Taluk, Namakkal District.

2. The petitioner 's request for cancellation of patta in respect of the entire land in S.No.40/2 standing in the name of the 8th respondent and for subdivision plan-marked canal and registration of the same in the name of the government was turned down by the 3rd respondent byway of impugned order on the following grounds:-

(i) the entire land measuring an extent of 0.40.5 Hectares comprised in S.No.40/2 of Mathiyampatti village has been registered in revenue accounts as ryotwari patta land in favour of the 8th respondent – K.Ammasi; (ii) the said land owner obtained a decree of permanent injunction against the defendants in the civil court restraining them from interfering with his peaceful possession and enjoyment ; and (ii) there is no disturbance caused to the plan-marked canal which runs on the patta land of K.Ammasi and therefore, no separate subdivision in respect of the plan-marked canal could be made and registered as



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

government land.

WEB COPY

3.0 The case of the petitioner in brief is as follows:-

3.1 The petitioner owns the land in S.No.40/7B jointly and the land in S.No.40/7C absolutely. The 8th respondent owns the subject land measuring 1.00 Acre.

3.2 In the land owned by the 8th respondent, there runs a plan marked canal. The canal and the canal bund / pathway are being maintained by the 7th respondent to distribute water from Thirumanimuthaaru. The petitioner claims that he and many other villagers including the petitioner were using the canal bund as a pathway to reach their respective agricultural fields from time memorial. Further, the said canal bund is the only pathway / access to the temple situated in S.No.40/11 and land belonging to the temple situated in S.No.40.

3.3 While so, in 2010, the 8th respondent blocked the canal bund / pathway and obstructed the public access alongside the plan marked canal. Immediately, the petitioner and the villagers and other adjoining land owners insisted the 8th respondent to forthwith remove the obstructions caused by him and advised him not to cause any hindrance to the public for ingress and egress of their properties. However, to their shock and dismay, the 8th respondent approached the District Munsif, Rasipuram, by way of suit in O.S.No.180 of



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

2010 and O.S.No.4 of 2011. Suit in O.S.No.4 of 2011 was filed seeking permanent injunction against (1) K.Ganesan, (2) F.S. @ Kandasamy Gounder, (3) P.Sengottaiyan, (4) S.Ammasi, (5) Arumugam, (6) Komathi Arumugam and (7) M.E.Madheswaran of Mathiampatti village restraining their men from in any way disturbing the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the subject land in S.No.40/2, while the other suit in O.S.No.180 of 2010 was filed by the 8th respondent and one Lakshmi against (1) Komathi Arumugam, (2) Arumugam, (3) M.E.Madheswaran and (4) K.Ganesan for permanent injunction restraining them or their men from in any way interfering from in any manner claiming right to pathway on the lands in S.No.40/1, 40/2 & 40/3. The father of the petitioner was one of the private parties who were arrayed as defendants in the said suit. The learned District Munsif, Rasipuram, by common judgement and decree dated 24.10.2023 decreed the suit thereby granting permanent injunction against the defendants. The respondents 1 to 7 herein were not at all made as party defendants in the said suit.

3.4 In the meanwhile, on 07.10.2010, the 7th respondent surveyed the subject land and erected boundary stones clearly demarcating the area belonging to the Government in S.No.40/2. While so, suddenly, on 10.10.2010, the 8th respondent removed the boundary stones laid by the 7th respondent and cut / obliterated the canal bund thereby not only caused damage to the property



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

belonging to the Government but also encroached upon the government land and obstructed the access to the pathway.

3.5 Upon an information from the residents, a police complaint was lodged by the 7th respondent against the 8th respondent which was registered in Cr.No.487 of 2010 for the alleged offence under Sections 434, 447 of IPC and Section 3(ii) of the Tamil Nadu Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992. On committal the case was taken on file in S.C.No.237 of 2018 by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Namakkal. On trial, by judgement dated 11.03.2020, the 8th respondent was found guilty of offences with which he was charged and he was accordingly convicted and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for four years apart from sentence of fine. Aggrieved by the judgement and order of conviction and sentence, the 8th respondent preferred an appeal in CrI.A.No.216 of 2020 before this court which was dismissed by this court by judgement dated 02.01.2023. The 8th respondent taken up the judgement of this court on further appeal to the Hon'ble Supreme Court in CrI.A.No.1520 of 2023 and the same is pending. The petitioner was enlarged on bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by order dated 15.05.2023 pending disposal of the said criminal appeal.

3.6 In the meanwhile, during the pendency of criminal case, the 8th respondent filed a writ petition in W.P.No.9300 of 2017 claiming to be in



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

possession of 'River Poramboke' land in S.No.67 said to have been in occupation and seeking reclassification and assignment of the said land in lieu of 6 cents of patta land situated in S.No.40/2 occupied by the government for running the water canal on oral agreement reached several decades ago. A Division Bench of this court, by order dated 22.06.2018, while returning a finding that the land in S.No.67 is a highly questionable water course and as per the RSO 26(15), a plan marked water canal or pathway running in the patta land is a government land, dismissed the writ petition. It was, however, directed by the Division Bench that in the event the 8th respondent made any encroachment in the objectionable land, he should be evicted.

3.7 Thereafter, the 8th respondent once again started blocking public access and usage of the canal and the canal bund / pathway and was orally threatening the petitioner and other villagers who attempted to use / access the same. Therefore, the petitioner made a representation dated 06.09.2021 to the 6th respondent, however, the representation of the petitioner was rejected stating that the matter relates to revenue department. Thereafter, the petitioner sent another representation dated 17.10.2021 to the 5th respondent which was also rejected. Therefore, left with no other option, the petitioner lodged a police complaint on 09.11.2021. The 8th respondent appeared for enquiry before the police and during the inquiry, he gave an oral undertaking that he would not



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

cause any disturbance to the general public. Therefore, the petitioner withdrew the police complaint on 11.11.2021. Contrary to the oral undertaking, the 8th respondent again continued to block public access to the canal and its bund, stating that it is on his patta land and that the general public is not allowed to have access to any part of it.

3.8 Thereafter, left with no other option, the petitioner again approached the revenue authorities during public grievance day and made a petition dated 15.11.2021 to the 3rd respondent for sub division of the Government property from the patta land of the 8th respondent. Though an enquiry was held on 21.03.2022 on the representation of the petitioner dated 15.11.2021, no order was passed thereof. Hence, the petitioner had to approach this court by way of a writ petition in W.P.No.27522 of 2022 seeking a direction to the respondents 3 and 5 therein to sub divide the land in respect of the water canal and canal bund / pathway running through S.No.40/2 and mutate the revenue records to reflect the name of the Government of Tamil Nadu. This court, by order dated 14.10.2022 disposed of the writ petition directing the 5th respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 15.11.2021 and pass appropriate orders thereon on merits and in accordance with law after providing opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as other interested parties within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

3.9 Pursuant to the said order of this court, the impugned order came to be passed after the legal notice of the petitioner rejecting the petitioner's request to cancel the patta for the entire subject land standing in the name of the petitioner mainly based on the civil court decree.

3.10 The present writ petition challenges the impugned order mainly on the grounds that (i) water canal is a government land the government being the rightful owner of the plan marked channel, can take on record the same; (ii) the official respondents ought to have taken necessary steps to take on record the land belonging to the government and fulfilled their bounden duty to hold and protect as trustees of such lands under the 'Public Trust Doctrine' as held by the constitutional courts; (iii) as per the relevant provision of law, the said area has to be sub divided; (iv) the suits were for bare injunction and no suit for declaration of title was filed; (v) a decree will bind only the parties **to its** or those claiming through them and it will not bind on the 5th respondent or any other Government authorities as no official respondents were added as party defendants in the suits.

4. A counter affidavit has been filed by the 8th respondent opposing the writ petition and *inter alia* contending as follows:-

(i) He is the absolute owner of the subject lands including the lands over which the canal is running. The running canal is depicted in FMB sketch of the



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

S.No.40/2 by drawing a line. The Public Works Department (PWD) is having only a right to pass water through the canal lying in his lands and to carry out any works therefor.

(ii) The lands in S.No.40/2, including the land over which said canal is running, are absolutely owned by the petitioner. The Public Works Department will have a right only to pass water through the canal lying in his lands and to carry out any works therefor. All other rights to use the said canal lands including the bunds are only with him.

(ii) All other rights to use the said canal lands, including the bunds, are only with him and he only enjoys the same by planting trees, taking the cattle for grazing the grass / plants, etc., on the bunds / canal, etc., without any hindrance to the running water through canal. No private persons claim a right to pathway and the Public Works Department alone can enjoy the easement right to carry water through the canal running through his patta lands to the extent of carrying out the attendant works. In 2021, the petitioner having known the fact that he has no right and cannot move the civil court, with ill intention to circumvent the situation and the rule of law, made a representation dated 15.11.2021 set up a claim as if the canal is a pathway for all and the lands through which the canal is running are the Government lands. The



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

petitioner has also filed a writ petition for sub division of the lands in S.No.40/2 to have separate survey number for the water canal making all sorts of false allegations without any legal right which was disposed of on 14.10.2022. He filed two suits and obtained permanent injunction from interfering with his peaceful possession and enjoyment by judgement and decree dated 24.10.2013 which attained finality without any challenge by anyone.

(iii) The petitioner having known well about the civil court decree, filed this writ petition falsely stating as if the canal bund is used as pathway for all and the lands through which the canal is running are Government lands.

(iv) The petitioner has no enforceable right and the writ petition is not at all maintainable. The 3rd respondent rejected the representation of the petitioner recording the fact that the entire land in S.No.40/2 is a private property. The P.W.D has only an easement right to run the water through canal and right to carry out any sort of repair to achieve the said right of running water and not beyond that. In the land comprised in S.No.40/2, a PWD water-irrigation canal is running for several decades without acquiring the land and without paying any compensation to the petitioner.

5. The respondents 1 to 7 have not filed any counter affidavit.

6. Heard Mr.Vignesh Venkat, learned counsel for the petitioner and



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

Mr.P.Sathish, learned Additional Government Pleader for RR1 to 7 and also

Mr.N.Subramaniyan, learned counsel for the 8th respondent.

7.1. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the 8th respondent already filed a writ petition in respect of S.No.67 of Mathiyampatti Village seeking to classify the land from river poramboke to ordinary poramboke and to assign the same in his favour, in lieu of 6 cents of his patta land situated in S.No.40/2 situated in the same village and occupied by the government for running the water canal. A Division Bench of this Court, by order dated 22.06.2018, dismissed the writ petition placing reliance upon RSO 26(15) – Encroachment on plan-marked details, held that the plan marked water canal running in a patta land is a Government land. If anyone interferes with the plan marked water canal, he is liable to be evicted. If the said canal is interfered with the plan marked water canal, they are liable to be evicted. Therefore, even though the water canal goes through the patta land of the petitioner, he cannot be compensated by assignment, that too highly objectionable water course poramboke. The Division Bench has further held that subject land in question classified as river poramboke and it falls under the highly objectionable category.

7.2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would also draw the



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

attention of this court to the judgement of a Full Bench of this Court in the case

of **T.K.Shanmugam, Secretary, C.P.I.(M) v. The State of Tamil Nadu,**

reported in 2015 (5) LW 397 wherein the Full Bench of this Court has held that the water bodies vest with the Government by complying the principle of public trust doctrine placing the Government in the capacity of a trustee. If the Government has failed to protect the water bodies, it amounts to breach of public trust and in such cases, the duty of the Government is more onerous to restore the land back to its original position and thereby the trust reposed on it.

7.3. Placing reliance on the judgement of the Full Bench of this court in **T.K.Shanmugam's** case (cited supra) and RSO 15(4), the learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that a bank or irrigation work runs through or near the land, the extent of land required to allow a margin of 20 metres along the foot of the bankments should be set apart if the irrigation work is an important one such as main canal, a main distributory or a main drainage channel; and in the case of subordinate or minor distributories or minor drains, a margin of 6 metres will be sufficient; detailed lists of both the classes of work above referred to will be furnished by the public works department (PWD); in any case, irrigation work concerned is not found in either list, a margin of 20 metres should be set apart or reference made to the Executive Engineer; in the cases of channels without embankments, however, it will suffice to set apart a margin of



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

3 metres. If a stream runs through or near the land, a margin not less than 10 metres on either bank should be as a general rule be reserved and registered as poramboke. Land set apart as above should be shown in the accounts as road, tank, channel or stream poramboke, as the case may be. Thus, according to the learned counsel for the 8th respondent, the impugned order does not refer to the relevant RSO and 5th respondent was just carried away by the civil court decree. The impugned order therefore is not sustainable in the eye of law.

8.1. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the 8th respondent would contend that the writ petition in W.P.No.9300 of 2017 was filed by him seeking reclassification of land (river poramboke) in S.No.67 and assignment of the same in his favour in lieu of 6 cents of patta land situated in S.No.40/2 occupied by the government for running the water canal on oral agreement reached several decades ago wherein this court relying upon the revenue standing order RSO 26(15) held that a plan marked water canal or pathway running in the patta land is a government land and if anybody interferes with the plan marked water canal, they are liable to be evicted. It is only a water course poramboke. According to him, as far as running the canal, he has no grievance and he has never obstructed the canal. Taking advantage of the DB order the petitioner and others try to use the patta land of the petitioner to reach the other side of their land and village. It is only an issue. In this regard, two



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

suits had already been filed and the same were decreed in favour of the 8th respondent and against the petitioner's father and other defendants. The petitioner in order to circumvent the civil court decree has come up with the present writ petition, challenging the order of the 5th respondent-Tahsildar. In fact, the impugned order came to be passed taking into consideration the rights of the parties.

8.2. As far as the canal is concerned, the Division Bench of this Court has already held that it is only a government land. But, in respect of the bund and the other area of patta lands cannot be classified as poramboke land. Hence, according to the learned counsel the impugned order does not require any interference.

9. This court has considered the rival submissions and perused the available records carefully.

10. Earlier, the 8th respondent filed a writ petition in W.P.No.9300 of 2017, challenging the order dated 27.01.2017 passed by the government vide G.O.Ms.No.26 Revenue [NI.MU.3(2)] and seeking a consequential direction to the 1st respondent to reclassify the land comprised in Survey No.67 ad measuring 42 cents situated at Mathiampatti Village, Rasipuram Taluk, Namakkal District, from river poramboke to ordinary poramboke or tharisu land and assign the same in his favour, in lieu of the own patta land having an



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

extent of 6 cents comprised in Survey No.40/2 of the same village, which is occupied by the Government for running a water canal.

11. No doubt, the Division Bench of this court, by order dated 22.06.2018, dismissed the writ petition in W.P.No.9300 of 2017. The relevant portion of the order of the Division Bench reads as follows:-

“6. The further contention of the petitioner is that he is enjoying the Government poramboke land classified as dry waste land and some portion of the land classified as river poramboke with mutual agreement by the Public Works Department, since a portion of patta land comprised in Survey No.40/2, is being under the use of small water canal maintained by the Public Works Department to distribute the water from the river namely Thirumanimutharu and the said land allowed to be used without any acquisition and compensation and as such, to compensate the same in lieu of the permission granted by the Public Works Department Officials to his forefathers to enjoy the land comprised in Survey No.67 ad measuring 42 cents. Therefore, he is entitled for assignment of the said subject land. It is seen from the Revenue Standing Order 26 (15), which reads as follows :

"15. Encroachments on plan-marked details:- A plan-marked channel or pathway running in a patta land is a Government land. Eviction of encroachments in such lands need be invoked only in cases where the



WEB COPY



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

encroacher has interfered with the plan marked detail so as to close its entrance to and exit from his lands. In the case of pathways and cart tracks which have been used by the public till recently, the ryot should not be allowed to shift the course of the details to suit his own convenience. However, such diversions of plan marked channel from its original course, with a view to consolidate his holding or to facilitate irrigation of the portions which would be otherwise severed need not be treated as encroachment."

Therefore, the plan marked water canal running in a patta land is a Government land. If the said canal is interfered with the plan marked water canal they are liable to be evicted. Therefore, even though the water canal goes through the patta land of the petitioner, he cannot be compensated by assignment, that too highly objectionable water course poramboke. Further his family was already assigned land and derived the benefit of said scheme under the Revenue Standing Order 15 and as of now his family is having land for cultivation. Further the land classified as river poramboke is encroached by the petitioner and it cannot be assigned for the grounds raised by the petitioner, as if he is entitled for assignment of land as landless poor S.C. person as per the Revenue Standing Order clause 15. The subject land in question classified as river poramboke and it falls under the highly objectionable category. There is an existing ban order



WEB COPY



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

by the Government to regularise the encroachment in the water course poramboke vide G.O.Ms.No.43, Revenue Department dated 29.01.2010.”

12. As also following the Full Bench judgement of this Court in the case of **T.K.Shanmugam** (cited supra) wherein it has been held that as per RSO 15(38)(ii) which deals with water course poramboke, a great care should be taken to preserve the margins of canals, channels and streams and the transfer and assignment of such water course source poramboke can be ordered only by Government in consultation with the Commissioner of Land Administration and the Chief Engineer (PWD), the Division Bench of this Court in para 12 of the said judgement has held as follows:-

“12. In the light of the above, the petitioner is not entitled to reclassify the subject land namely comprised in Survey No.67 ad measuring 42 cents of land situated at Mathiampatti Village, Rasipuram Taluk, Namakkal District, from river poramboke to ordinary poramboke or tharisu lands and assignment of the same. Further he is also not entitled for issuance of patta for his house situated in Survey No.67/1 ad measuring 6 cents in the same village. In respect of the consequential direction sought for by the petitioner to remove the water canal from his land comprised in Survey No.40/2, situated at the same village is also negative, since as per the Revenue Standing Order 26(15), the plan marked canal or



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

WEB COPY

path way running in the patta land is a Government land.

Therefore, if the petitioner makes any encroachment in such lands, he should be evicted. Hence, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.”

13. The issue involved in the earlier writ petition was not with respect to the assignment of objectionable land to any individual. The canal is already running on the 8th respondent's land in S.No.40/2. The 8th respondent also has no objection as far as running of canal is concerned. Since the land on which the canal is running is held to be the government land, the petitioner, and others, taking advantage of the same, tried to use to other patta lands of the petitioner as public pathway. In this regard, the 8th respondent filed two different civil suits in O.S.No.180 of 2010 and O.S.No.4 of 2011 on the file of the District Munsif, Rasipuram against some of the private individuals including the father of the petitioner for permanent injunction restraining the defendants in the suit and their men from in any way interfering with the 8th respondent's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the lands in S.Nos.40/1, 40/2 & 40/3 by claiming right of pathway on the land in S.No.40/2. The issue regarding right to use the canal bunds as pathway was considered in the suits. The learned District Munsif having considered the issues involved in the suits by a common judgement dated 24.10.2013, held that there were no revenue records to show that the land on which canal is passing through is the government land and



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

granted decree of permanent injunction in favour of the 8th respondent in both suits thereby restraining the defendants in the suit from interfering with his possession and enjoyment. It seems that there were no appeals filed by the defendants and the judgement and decrees of the District Munsif granting permanent injunction have become final.

14. Thereafter, the petitioner by way of representation dated 15.11.2021 sought to sub divide the land on which canal is running and the canal bund along sides of canal as the same has been declared to be government land. The 5th respondent, however, while holding that when no disturbance is caused to the canal and running the water through the patta land, there is no need for separate subdivision, turned down the request of the petitioner for sub division of patta lands in S.No.40/2 belonging to the petitioner.

15. It is relevant to note that if the canal is really disturbed, obstructed, or deviated, the contention of the petitioner may be worth considering. As long as there is no dispute regarding the running of the canal, the 8th respondent does not dispute the running of the canal, and it is not their case that the 8th respondent has obstructed the canal. In such a case, when there is a canal already running without any disturbance, this court is of the view that though the canal runs on private land, as per RSO, the land on which it runs would be treated as government land, and the same cannot be taken advantage of by any



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

private party to use the land abutting the canal on either side as a public pathway.

16. The learned counsel for the petitioner would draw the attention of the court placing much reliance on RSO 15(4).

17. A perusal of the RSO makes it clear that only for the purpose of the Standing Order, the land be classified as detailed under 15(4), following the parameters laid down under the same. If such parameters are applied mechanically to the irrigation canal that normally runs on the patta and if the land on which the canal runs is treated as poramboke land, it would take away the very constitutional right of the land owner. The Board Standing Order sets only some guidelines for the classification of land. That cannot be pressed into service for a canal running on patta land. If such guidelines, as argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner, are made mandatory for the patta land, the land owner may lose a considerable amount of land without even getting any compensation. That cannot be allowed to be permitted.

18. Insofar as RSO 15(38) is concerned, it deals with general procedures in respect of assignment of poramboke and reserve lands. Though materials have been placed before this court to show that canal runs on the patta land, the land on which the canal is running has been declared as government land.

19. Even though the land on which the water canal goes through is the



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

patta land of the petitioner, such a plan-marked area is government land. That finding would apply only to the area on which the canal is running, and at no stretch of imagination, it could be extended to canal bunds on either side of the patta lands belonging to the petitioner. Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the general public, including the petitioner, has a right to access and reach their lands through the canal bund, cannot be countenanced. As long as there is no disturbance caused to the water running through the canal on the patta land, no third parties can take advantage of the fact to contend that the canal bunds on either side of the canal are maintained by the PWD, and the same would also come under the category of government land to claim the right of pathway over the same.

20. This aspect of the matter has been clearly held by the 5th respondent - Tahsildar in his order impugned in the writ petition that there has been no disturbance caused to the canal and the water running through the canal, there should not be any obstruction caused to the canal. That finding would itself take care of the entire issue. When the private individual and the villagers have already suffered a decree of permanent injunction, merely on the ground that the Division Bench of this court has held that canal is also public land, no third parties could claim right over the larger extent of the patta land belonging to the



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

petitioner along the canal on either side as public pathway. If that be so, the 8th respondent would get divested his right over the land in respect of a larger extent. This court do not find any merit in the writ petition and thus, the writ petition deserves only to be dismissed.

In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. It is, however, made clear that the 8th respondent shall not cause any disturbance to the plan marked channel and shall also not cause any obstruction by way of removing the boundary stones already fixed by the Public Works Department. No costs.

Index : yes / no
Neutral Citation : yes / no
kmk

25..07..2024



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

To

WEB C

- 1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By its Secretary, Revenue Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of Land Administration,
Land Administration Department,
2nd Floor, Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai 600 005.
- 3.The District Collector,
1st Floor, Main Building,
District Collectorate,
Tiruchengode Road,
Namakkal 637 003.
- 4.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Namakkal District,
Namakkal-637 003.
- 5.The Tahsildar,
SH 79, VIP Nagar,
Rasipuram Taluk,
Namakkal 637 408.
- 6.The Engineer-in-Chief and Chief Engineer,
Water Resources Organization,
Public Works Department,
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005.
- 7.The Assistant Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Water Resources Organization,
Rasipuram 637 408.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.19975 of 2023

N.SATHISH KUMAR.J.,
kmk

W.P.No.19975 of 2023

25..07..2024