



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI
(Civil Appellate Jurisdiction)

Thursday, the Ninth day of January Two Thousand and Twenty Five
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN

and

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

WRIT APPEAL(MD)No.207 of 2020

1. The District Collector,

Trichirappalli District,Trichirappalli.

2. The District Revenue Officer,

District Collectorate,

Trichirappalli District,Trichirappalli.

3. The Tahsildar

Srirangam Taluk,

Trichirappalli District,Trichirappalli.

..Appellants

Vs.

1. C.Vadivel

2. The Block Development Officer

Panchayat Union Office, Manickadam Panchayat,

Srirangam Taluk, Trichirappalli District,Trichirappalli.

..Respondent

Prayer in WA(MD). 207/ 2020 :This Writ Appeal is filed under Clause XV of Letters Patent,to set aside the order passed in WP(MD)No.3185 of 2018, dated:14.03.2018 on the file of this Court.

Prayer in WP(MD). 3185/ 2018:Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the proceedings in Na.Ka.Aa2/39993/2013 dated 01.02.2018 on the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same.

ORDER:- This Writ Appeal coming on for orders on this day and upon perusing the petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of

Mr.V.Illanchelian,Advocate for the Respondent No.1, this Court made the following



The matter is listed today under the caption “for being mentioned” at the instance of the learned Counsel for the first respondent/Writ Petitioner.

2.The learned Counsel for the first respondent/Writ Petitioner submitted that this Court has given a finding, as if the impugned order in the Writ Petition was passed by the District Revenue Officer and according to the learned Counsel for the first respondent/Writ Petitioner, the impugned order was passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer.

3.On verifying the submission made by the learned Counsel for the first respondent/Writ Petitioner, we find that the impugned order was passed by the District Revenue Officer and the learned Counsel for the first respondent/Writ Petitioner without verifying the order passed by the second appellant/District Revenue Officer, made a wrong mention.

4.In view of the same, the order of this Court, dated 06.12.2024 needs no modification and the submission of the learned Counsel for the first respondent/Writ Petitioner is rejected.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS I)

// True Copy //

/02/2025

Sub Assistant Registrar
(CS- I/ II / III / IV)



TO

1. The District Collector,
Trichirappalli District,
Trichirappalli.
2. The District Revenue Officer,
District Collectorate,
Trichirappalli District,
Trichirappalli.
3. The Tahsildar,
Srirangam Taluk,
Trichirappalli District,
Trichirappalli.
4. The Block Development Officer,
Panchayat Union Office, Manickadam Panchayat,
Srirangam Taluk, Trichirappalli District,
Trichirappalli.

ORDER DATED :09.01.2025

=====

O R D E R

=====

WRIT APPEAL(MD)No.207 of 2020

Giving direction and etc.
as stated within.

MGJ(04.02.2025) 3P 5C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing certified copies in this format from 17.07.2023