



**SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025**

**WEB COPY**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

**DATED: 17-04-2025**

**CORAM**

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M. SUNDAR  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE K. GOVINDARAJAN  
THILAKAVADI**

**SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025  
AND  
CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025**

1. Mr. P.Rajendran,  
S/o. M.Pachaiyappan, 471,  
Chinnakalanthal Village, Arpakkam  
Post, Kalasapakkam Taluk,  
Tiruvannamalai District-606752.


... Applicant(s)

**Vs**

1. Thiru. K.Tharpagaraj, I.A.S.,  
The District Collector  
The District Collector Office,  
Tiruvannamalai District-606 604

2.Thiru. Ramakrishnan,  
The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Arani Town,  
Tiruvannamalai District-632 301

3.Tmt. Rajarajeswari,  
The Tahsildar Kalasapakkam Taluk,  
Tiruvannamalai District-606 751



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*

4.R.Balamurugan,  
The Block Development Officer,  
BDO Office, Kalasapakkam,  
Tiruvannamalai District-606 751

... Respondent(s)

**PRAYER**

To DISPENSE WITH the production of Original Impugned order passed by his Hon'ble court in W.P.No. 9155 of 2025 dated 17.03.2025

For Petitioner : Ms.Vijayakumari Natarajan

**ORDER**

**(Order of the Court was made by M.Sundar J.)**

Captioned sub-application has been filed with a prayer to dispense with production of 'original order dated 17.03.2025 in W.P.No.9155 of 2025' [hereinafter 'said order' for the sake of brevity]. To be noted, captioned main contempt petition, viz., Contempt Petition (DR) No. 52573 of 2025 has been filed complaining of breach/non-compliance qua said order.

2. Said order has been uploaded in the official website of the Madras High Court on 19.03.2025 at 01:48:29 pm.

3. This Court, vide order dated 18.02.2025 in Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024 in Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of



***SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025***

WEB COPY

2024, has made it clear that Registry should not insist on filing of certified copies of orders when downloads from the official website i.e., web copies or in other words, hard copies of the downloads from the website are filed. In the case on hand, we find that hard copy of the said order, which is a download from the official website, has been filed.

4. Ms.Vijayakumari Natarajan, learned counsel for applicant / petitioner submits that the Registry insisted on filing of a dispense with petition i.e, captioned sub-application in spite of being made aware of the obtaining position.

5. We express no opinion one way or the other on this as there is no written objection from the Registry in this regard. However, for the sake of convenience of all concerned, order dated 18.02.2025 in Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024 in Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024 is scanned and reproduced *infra*.



WEB COPY



***SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025***



WEB COPY



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.02.2025

CORAM:


THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE K. GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI

Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

|               |                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Thilakamani   | Petitioner in Sub Appl. No.1253 of 2024                                                                                           |
| Vijayalakshmi | Petitioner in Sub Appl. No.1254 of 2024                                                                                           |
| vs.           |                                                                                                                                   |
| 1.            | Dr. R. Brindha Devi, I.A.S.<br>District Collector<br>O/o District Collector<br>Salem District                                     |
| 2.            | Mr. S. Ramesh<br>Tahsildar<br>Tahsildar Office<br>Mettur<br>Salem District                                                        |
| 3.            | Mr. Sathishkumar<br>Assistant Engineer<br>Water Resources Department<br>Civil Section<br>Mettur Dam - 1<br>Salem District 636 401 |
|               | Respondents in both applications                                                                                                  |

Page Nos.1/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



***SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025***



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

Sub Applications filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, seeking to dispense with the certified copy of common order dated 26.07.2024 in W.P. Nos.21022 of 2024 and 21018 of 2024 respectively.

For applicant  
in both sub applications

Mr. R. Thirumoorthy

**COMMON ORDER**


[made by M.SUNDAR, J.]

Captioned sub applications have been filed with a prayer for dispensing with production of certified copy of common order dated 26.07.2024 made in W.P. Nos.21018 and 21022 of 2024 (To be noted, this 26.07.2024 order is a common order in three writ petitions, viz., W.P. Nos.21018, 21022 and 21027 of 2024 but as of now, contempt has been filed *qua* only two writ petitioners).

2. The point is, the aforementioned common order which shall hereinafter be referred to as 'said order', has not only been promptly uploaded in the official website of Madras High Court but it has also been reported in the neutral citation portal of Madras High Court and the neutral citation is 2024:MHC:2918.

Page Nos.2/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



WEB COPY



WEB COPY

Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024




3. Mr. R. Thirumoorthy, learned counsel for sub applicants in the sub applications is before us. Learned counsel points out that print outs of said order, as downloaded from the official website, together with neutral citation thereat, have been enclosed but the Registry insisted on filing dispense with petitions *i.e.*, petitions with prayer to dispense with production of certified copies of said order and that has necessitated the captioned sub applications.

4. This Court, *vide* order 01.08.2024 in C.M.P.No.14960 of 2024 in C.M.A.SR.No.86395 of 2024, has held that uploaded copies of orders/proceedings, as uploaded in the official website of Madras High Court, are on par with certified copies. To be noted, orders uploaded in the official website are both watermarked and QR coded. QR Code would take a person directly to the website and therefore, the authenticity and integrity of the uploaded copies are secure. Notwithstanding judicial order dated 01.08.2024 in C.M.P.No.14960 of 2024 in C.M.A.SR.No.86395 of 2024, the Registry appears to have insisted on production of certified copies.

Page Nos.3/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



***SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025***



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

5. Order dated 01.08.2024 in C.M.P.No.14960 of 2024 in  
C.M.A.SR.No.86395 of 2024 reads as follows:

'C.M.P.No.14960 of 2024  
in  
C.M.A.SR.No.86395 of 2024

M.SUNDAR, J.  
and  
K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.

(Order of the court was made by M.SUNDAR, J.)

Captioned 'Civil Miscellaneous Petition' [hereinafter 'CMP' for the sake of convenience] has been filed with a simple and innocuous prayer to dispense with production of certified copy of an order dated 03.01.2024 made in Commercial Original Suit No.7 of 2023 [previously O.S. No.11/2010 of II Additional District Judge, Salem (CNR No.TNSA 23-000054-2023)] on the file of the Commercial Court (District Judge cadre), Salem. This '03.01.2024 order' shall be referred to as 'impugned order' and 'Commercial Court (District Judge cadre), Salem' shall be referred to as 'said Commercial Court', both for the sake of convenience and clarity.


2. Mr.M.S.Seshadri, learned counsel for petitioner, averting to support affidavit submitted that a web copy (hard copy) of the impugned order as downloaded from the e-Court website, i.e., [https://ecourts.gov.in/ecourts\\_home](https://ecourts.gov.in/ecourts_home) has been filed and on that basis, pleaded that aforementioned dispense with prayer may please be acceded to.

3. In the normal circumstances, a simple terse order will suffice but this Court finds that such requests i.e., CMPs with dispense with prayers saying that web copy has been filed are recurring in multiple kinds of appeals. Therefore, with the intention of putting the matter in clear perspective, so that the same will serve as guidelines in days to come, more so owing to advent and advancement of technology and ICT (Information and Communication Technology) in court proceedings, the following order is made:

(i) 'The Code of Civil Procedure, 1908' ['CPC' for the sake of brevity] has a definition clause and the same is Section 2. Sub sections (2), (9) and (14) of section 2 define 'decree', 'judgment' and 'order' respectively and these three provisions read as follows:

Page Nos.4/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



**SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025**



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

**'2.Definitions.-**In this Act, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context,-

(1) xxxxxxxx

(2)"decree" means the formal expression of an adjudication which, so far as regards the Court expressing it, conclusively determines the rights of the parties with regard to all or any of the matters in controversy in the suit and may be either preliminary or final. It shall be deemed to include the rejection of a plaint and the determination of any question within section 144, but shall not include--

(a)any adjudication from which an appeal lies as an appeal from an order, or

(b)any order of dismissal for default.

*Explanation.--*A decree is preliminary when further proceedings have to be taken before the suit can be completely disposed of. It is final when such adjudication completely disposes of the suit. It may be partly preliminary and partly final;

(3) to (8) xxxxxxxx

(9)"Judgment" means the statement given by the Judge on the grounds of a decree or order;

(10) to (13) xxxxxxxx

(14)"order" means the formal expression of any decision of a Civil Court which is not a decree;


(ii) As regards appeals to this Court, four Orders under First Schedule to CPC are of relevance and they are Orders XLI, XLI-A, XLI-B and XLIII of CPC.

(iii) In Order XLI captioned 'Appeals from Original Decrees', there is a Madras amendment to Rule (1) thereat. This order provides for appeals against judgments and decrees. The Madras amendment makes filing of certified copy of decree imperative and provides for certified copy of judgment being dispensed with by the appellate court.

(iv) Order XLI-A provides for 'Appeals to the High Court from Original Decrees of Subordinate Courts'. In Order XLI-A also, there is a Madras insert and as regards Rules (1) to (3), Madras insert adopts

Page Nos.5/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



***SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025***



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

Kerala which says that one certified copy of judgment is imperative and there is no dispense with provision.

(v) Order XLI-B captioned 'Letters Patent Appeals' ('LPA' for the sake of brevity) also has a Madras amendment and the proviso to Rule (1) thereof makes it clear that it shall not be necessary to file copies of the judgment and decree appealed from. To be noted, Order XLI-B provides for intra-court appeals.

(vi) Order XLIII captioned 'Appeals From Orders' gives an adumbration of orders qua Section 104 CPC which are appealable. These adumbrations are (a) to (w) but making provision for additions and deletions, there are 18 kinds of orders.

(vii) All aforementioned insertions were made prior to advent (much less advancement) of ICT providing for web copies. Before we proceed further, it is deemed appropriate to write that as regards Madras High Court judgments, decrees and / or orders uploaded in the official website, they are both water marked and QR Coded. To be noted, QR Code necessarily means that one can go to the website and cross check the authenticity of the web copy as unlike the bar code which gives certain particulars, the QR Code takes you to website directly.


(viii) Reverting to dispense with prayer as regards appeals from Original Decrees, one has to necessarily understand the same as appeals to appellate courts other than the High Court as Order XLI-A provides for appeals to High Court from original decrees of subordinate Courts. As already alluded to supra, as regards Order XLI, appeals to appellate courts other than High Court, there is a provision for dispensing with certified copy of the judgment but certified copy of the decree is imperative, number of copies are set out there in Rule (1) but considering the scope of the matter at hand, it is not necessary to go into the same.

(ix) As regards appeals to this Court, i.e., High Court from original decrees of Subordinate Courts, there is no provision for dispensing with printed copies of judgments. As regards intra court appeals under Order XLI-B, as already alluded to supra, the proviso to rule (1) [as in Madras and Pondicherry] makes it clear that it is not necessary to file copies of judgment and decree appealed from.

(x) Order XLIII is a mere adumbration of 18 kinds of orders which are appealable and there is allusion to this supra in this order.

Page Nos.6/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

(xi) For the present, we are putting aside Order XLI as that deals with appeals from original decrees to the appellate court other than High Court.


(xii) As regards Order XLI-A, we are of the view that if it is not necessary to file copies of judgment and decree in intra court appeal under Order XLI-B, there is no reason as to why it should be imperative for Order XLI-A, as the only conceivable reason has paled into insignificance owing to availability of web copies which are authenticated by water marked and QR Coded. To be noted, the only conceivable reason is, in a intra court appeal, records were and are available in the same court and authenticity can be readily ascertained or the case file can be looked into, whereas in appeals under Order XLI-A, records will have to be summoned from the court which made original decree but this territorial barrier has now been eliminated owing to ICT advancement as an order/decreed/judgment made by any court anywhere in Tamil Nadu which is uploaded in the official web site is readily available. Therefore, with regard to Order XLI-A appeals, we direct the Registry to place this file before Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice for referring the matter to Hon'ble Rule Committee for considering an appropriate amendment to Rules. In the interregnum, dispense with petitions shall be filed and the same shall be considered on case to case basis.

(xiii) As regards Order XLI-B intra court appeals, we make it clear that Registry shall not insist on certified copies of impugned judgments and/or decrees, i.e., judgments and / or decrees appealed from in the light of Madras amendment to proviso to Rule (1).

(xiv) As a extension of previous point, we deem it appropriate to add that intra court appeals under Section 37 of 'The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996)' [hereinafter 'A and C' Act for the sake of convenience] are not LPAs and Clause 15 will not apply in the light of **Fuerst Day Lawson** principle, namely **Fuerst Day Lawson Ltd. Vs. Jindal Exports Ltd.**, reported in **(2011) 8 SCC 333**. However, a set of rules have been made by Madras High Court by exercise of powers under Section 82 of A and C Act. We deem it appropriate to write that in a statutory appeal under Section 37 of A and C Act, which will not qualify as an appeal under Clause 15 of Letters Patent also, Registry shall not insist on certified copy of judgment and/or decree appealed from as long as hard copies of web copies which are downloaded from the official website of Madras High Court (watermarked and QR Coded) are produced. Hon'ble Rule Committee shall consider suitable amendments to Rules of this Court made inter-alia under Section 82 of A and C Act too.

Page Nos.7/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

(xv) As regards Order XLIII, as already alluded to supra, it is only an adumbration of 18 kinds of orders which are appealable and it will suffice to say that if orders appealed against fall under intra court category under Order XLI-B, Registry shall not insist on certified copies of judgment / order as long as hard copies of web copies which are downloaded from the official website of Madras High Court (watermarked and QR Coded) are produced but if the orders appealed against fall under XLI-A category, a dispense with petition shall be filed for the present (until Hon'ble Rule Committee takes a decision subject to reference to Hon'ble Rule Committee at the discretion of Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice) and the same shall be decided on case to case basis.

(xvi) To be noted, in cases of this nature, limitation will be computed from the date of the order but where certified copies are filed, the obtaining computation now in vogue shall continue.

4. Reverting to the case on hand, it is an appeal against an order which fall under Clause (a) of Rule (1) of Order XLIII, as it is a order returning a plaint under Order VII Rule 10 CPC but this order has been made by said Commercial Court, it qualifies as Subordinate Court within the meaning of Order XLI-A and therefore, in this case, we accept the web copy and accede to the dispense with prayer.

5. Before we conclude, we make it clear that ideally we would prefer to use the nomenclature 'District Court' and not 'Subordinate Court' but considering the language in which the Order is couched, we have reproduced the same.

6. Captioned CMP is ordered as prayed for. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S., J.) (K.G.T.,J.)  
01.08.2024

vvk


P.S. I : Registry is directed to place this order before Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice and seek suitable orders inter-alia regarding reference to Hon'ble Rule Committee.

P.S.II : Upload forthwith.

P.S.III : All concerned including the Registry of Madras High Court to act forthwith on the uploaded soft copy of this proceedings as uploaded in the official website of this Court. To be noted, the soft copies uploaded in the official website of this Court are water marked, besides being QR Coded.'

Page Nos.8/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

6. In the light of the narrative thus far, we make the following order:


(i) Orders uploaded in the official website of Madras High Court which are watermarked and QR coded are on par with certified copies;

(ii) Whenever print outs of orders, as uploaded in the official website of Madras High Court (watermarked and QR coded), are produced, Registry shall not insist on production of certified copies and compel applicants to take out dispense with applications; and

(iii) It has already been held in the above order *vide* sub-paragraph (xvi) of paragraph 3 that when such orders from the website of Madras High Court are produced, computation of limitation will be from the date of the order.

Page Nos.9/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



***SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025***



Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

**M.SUNDAR, J.**

and

**K. GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.**

cad

7. Captioned sub applications are disposed of as closed/unnecessary and Registry is directed to process the contempt petitions and assign numbers to the same, if they are otherwise in order *i.e.*, if other objections are removed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(M.S., J.) (K.G.T., J.)  
18.02.2025**

cad

Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024  
in  
Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024

Page Nos.10/10

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>




*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*

WEB COPY

6. As would be evident from the earlier order, we make it clear that the web copies are QR coded and watermarked and this ensures integrity of the web copies. QR code takes one to the website and watermark ensures integrity of the data and the copy.

7. Be that as it may, post aforementioned 18.02.2025 order in Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 & 1254 of 2024 in Cont. P. DR Nos.157645 & 157646 of 2024, the practice of putting in the date and time of uploading of the order in the official website, is also available. As already alluded to supra, said order has been uploaded on 19.03.2025 at 01:48:29 pm and a scanned reproduction of the said order, together with the date and time is as follows:



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



*W.P.No.9155 of 2025*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE **K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI**  
**W.P.No.9155 of 2025**  
and  
**W.M.P. No.10257 of 2025 in W.P.No.9155 of 2025**

P.Rajendran


... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The District Collector,  
The District Collector Office,  
Tiruvannamalai District – 606 604.
- 2.The Divisional Monitoring Committee  
rep. By the Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Arani Town,  
Tiruvannamalai District – 632 301.
- 3.The Tahsildar,  
Kalasapakkam Taluk,  
Tiruvannamalai District – 606 751.
- 4.The Block Development Officer,  
BDO Office,  
Kalasapakkam,  
Tiruvannamalai District – 606 751.
- 5.Poovarasi
- 6.Kumari

... Respondents

Page Nos.1/8



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*WP.No.9155 of 2025*

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India  
praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records relating to  
the impugned order passed by the fourth respondent in  
Na.Ka.Va.A2/522/2022 dated 12.02.2025 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Ms.Vijayakumari Natarajan  
For Respondents : Mr.T.K.Saravanan,  
Additional Government Pleader  
for R1 to R4


**ORDER**

[Order of the Court was made by **K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.,**]

Captioned writ petition has been filed assailing an 'order dated  
12.02.2025 bearing reference Na.Ka.Va.A2/522/2022 passed by the  
fourth respondent' (hereinafter 'impugned order' for the sake of  
brevity).

2. It is the case of the writ petitioner that the 'land comprised in  
Survey No.98/1A measuring 5 cents classified as ryotwari punja land'  
(hereinafter 'said land' for the sake of convenience and clarity) is the  
ancestral property of the writ petitioner and that he has constructed a  
house in said land. Alleging that writ petitioner has encroached upon

Page Nos.2/8



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*




*W.P.No.9155 of 2025*

the said land belonging to the Government, respondents 5 and 6 approached this Court by filing W.P. No.39419 of 2024 for removal of alleged encroachment in the said land. On 02.01.2025, this Court passed the following order:

*'10. This Court directs the jurisdictional Divisional Monitoring Committee to examine if there is encroachment qua said land. The Divisional Monitoring Committee shall also ensure that adequate and ample opportunity is given to persons concerned more particularly alleged encroachers (R5 and R6) before taking a call. In this regard, we are acutely conscious that the matter is being disposed of in Admission Board without notice to alleged encroachers and therefore, this safety valve is put in place. To be noted, all the rights and contentions of alleged encroachers are preserved for being raised before the Committee concerned which shall consider the same on its own merits and in accordance with law untrammelled by this proceedings in this Court, within a period of twelve weeks from today i.e., by 27.03.2025.*

*11. The Divisional Monitoring Committee qua G.O.(Ms)No.64, Revenue and Disaster Management Department, Land Disposal Wing, dated 08.02.2022, shall (if it comes to the conclusion that there is encroachment) report the encroachment for further action (for removal of*

Page Nos.3/8



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



*WP.No.9155 of 2025*


*encroachment which again shall be after giving adequate and ample opportunity to alleged encroachers).*

*12. It is open to the WP petitioner and/ or anyone concerned with this matter to come to this Court on the same issue even with a similar / same prayer if there are any change of circumstances.*

*13. We make it clear that we have not expressed any view or opinion as to whether there is encroachment or not qua said land as it turns on facts and it is for the Divisional Monitoring Committee to take a call on this aspect of the matter. We also make it clear that this exercise will not apply to patta land and it will apply only to public land, if there is any encroachment in public land.'*

3. Despite the above directions, no notice was issued to the writ petitioner. However, based on the petitions received from the respondents 5 and 6, the fourth respondent viz., Block Development Officer issued a notice under Section 7 of 'The Tamil Nadu Land Encroachment Act, 1905 (Tamil Nadu Act III of 1905)' {hereinafter 'said 1905 Act' for the sake of brevity}' on 18.12.2024 for which the writ petitioner sent his reply on 31.12.2024. But, without considering the representation made by the writ petitioner, the fourth respondent passed the impugned order for eviction under Section 6 of the said

Page Nos.4/8



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*W.P.No.9155 of 2025*


1905 Act, which is contrary to the order of this Court in W.P. No.39419 of 2024 dated 02.01.2025. Hence the writ petitioner is before this Court assailing the impugned order dated 12.02.2025.

4. Issue notice.

5. Mr.T.K.Saravanan, learned Additional Government Pleader accepts notice for respondents 1 to 4 and submits that on perusal of records, notice under Section 7 of said 1905 Act was issued by an authority who is not competent to take action under the said 1905 Act. Learned State counsel submits that notice to the writ petitioner under Section 7 and order under Section 6 of said 1905 Act will be withdrawn and a fresh notice will be issued to the writ petitioner in accordance with the provisions contemplated under the said 1905 Act by the appropriate authority.

6. Heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned State counsel.

Page Nos.5/8



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



*W.P.No.9155 of 2025*

7. The object of said 1905 Act is to remove the unauthorised occupation/encroachment in the public land. However, the said action has to be initiated only by an appropriate authority in accordance with the provisions contemplated under the said 1905 Act. On perusal of records, it is seen that the notice in favour of the writ petitioner was not issued by a competent authority. Hence we deem it appropriate to pass the following order:


*7.1 Notice issued under Section 7 and order under Section 6 of said 1905 Act shall be recalled;*

*7.2 Fresh notice under said 1905 Act or any other appropriate statute shall be issued by the competent authority for removal of the alleged encroachment;*

*7.3 If any representation is received from the writ petitioner, the same shall be considered on its own merits and in accordance with law before passing any final orders;*

*7.4 All actions mentioned in the impugned order*

Page Nos.6/8



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*



WEB COPY



WEB COPY



*WP.No.9155 of 2025*

*shall stand effaced.*

8. With the abovesaid observations and directions, captioned writ petition is disposed of. Consequently, connected writ miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.


(M.S.,J.) (K.G.T.,J.)  
17.03.2025

Index : Yes / No  
Neutral Citation : Yes / No  
mmi

To

- 1.The District Collector,  
The District Collector Office,  
Tiruvannamalai District – 606 604.
- 2.The Divisional Monitoring Committee  
rep. By the Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Arani Town,  
Tiruvannamalai District – 632 301.
- 3.The Tahsildar,  
Kalasapakkam Taluk,  
Tiruvannamalai District – 606 751.
- 4.The Block Development Officer,  
BDO Office,

Page Nos.7/8



**SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025**



WEB COPY



WEB COPY

**Kalasapakkam,  
Tiruvannamalai District – 606 751.**



**W.P.No.9155 of 2025**

**M.SUNDAR, J.,  
and  
K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.,**  
mmi

**W.P.No.9155 of 2025**

**17.03.2025**

Page Nos.8/8

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>


( Uploaded on: 19/03/2025 01:48:29 pm )



***SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025***

WEB COPY

8. As would be evident from sub paragraph (xvi) of Paragraph 3 of our order dated 01.08.2024 in C.M.P.No.14960 of 2024 in C.M.A.SR.No.86395 of 2024 ad sub paragraph (iii) of paragraph 6 of our earlier order dated 18.02.2025 made in Sub Application (OS) Nos.1253 and 1254 of 2024 in Cont.P DR Nos.157645 and 157646 of 2024, it was earlier held that whenever order from the website of Madras High Court is produced, computation of limitation will be from the date of the order. These two orders were written on 01.08.2024 and 18.02.2025 when the date and time of uploading was also not being uploaded as part of the order (though a record of same was being maintained separately). Now that the date and time of uploading of the order is also being uploaded along with the order as would be evident from the said order, limitation will start running from the date of uploading of the order in the official website. Registry is also directed to place a copy of this order before Hon'ble Chief Justice for suitable orders qua awareness and sensitizing the staff in the Registry and seek orders.



*SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025*

Captioned sub-application ordered as above. There shall be no

order as to costs.

[M.S.,J.] [K.G.T.,J.]  
17-04-2025

gpa


To

1. The District Collector The  
District Collector Office,  
Tiruvannamalai District-606 604

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Arani Town, Tiruvannamalai  
District-632 301

3. The Tahsildar Kalasapakkam  
Taluk, Tiruvannamalai District-606  
751

4. The Block Development Officer,  
BDO Office, Kalasapakkam,  
Tiruvannamalai District-606 751



WEB COPY



***SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025 AND CONT P DR No. 52573 of 2025***

**M.SUNDAR J.  
AND  
K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI J.**

**SUB APPL No. 507 of 2025  
AND  
CONT P SR NO. 52573 OF 2025**

17.04.2025