



W.A.No.2456 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.09.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

W.A.No.2456 of 2025
and
C.M.P.Nos.18917 and 18918 of 2025

T.Karunanithi,
S/o.Thirunavukarasu

... Appellant / Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Revenue Officer,
Thiruvallur District,
Thiruvallur.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Thiruvallur Revenue Division,
Thiruvallur.

3.The Tahsildar,
Thiruvallur Taluk,
Thiruvallur District.

4.Suyam Prakash,
S/o.Chandraiah

... Respondents/Respondents

Prayer: Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, against the Order dated 12.03.2025 passed in W.P.No.6 of 2023.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.2456 of 2025

For Appellant : Mr.Pranesh Vilvan
For Respondents :
For R1 to R3 : Mr.D.Ravichander
Special Government Pleader

JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by **S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.**)

The present Intra-Court Appeal has been instituted challenging the Writ Order dated 12.03.2025 in W.P.No.6 of 2023.

2. The Writ Petitioner is the Appellant before this Court. The order passed by the 1st Respondent granting patta in the name of the 4th respondent came to be challenged in the writ petition. The learned single Judge of this Court considered the issue and gave a finding in Paragraph No.4, which reads as under:-

“4. O.S.No.879 of 1988 was filed by the father of the petitioner seeking relief of permanent injunction and O.S.No.711 of 1989 was filed by the rival party who was also seeking permanent injunction, not to grant any electricity connection to the father of the petitioner. Both the suits were taken up together and joint trial was conducted. One of the main issue that was framed by the trial Court is, as to whether the predecessor-in-title had the right to convey the property in favour of the petitioner's father. On appreciation of evidence, the trial Court came to a conclusion that predecessor-in-title had no right to convey the property and therefore, no title



WEB COPY



W.A.No.2456 of 2025

passed on to the petitioner's father. Accordingly, the suit filed by the petitioner's father in O.S.No.879 of 1988 was dismissed and the suit filed by the rival party in O.S.No.711 of 1989 was allowed. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that the appeal filed against the said judgment and decree with delay also came to be dismissed."

3. The Writ Petition was dismissed mainly on the ground that the Judgment and Decree passed by the Civil Court are binding on the Revenue Authorities and the Revenue Authorities cannot disregard the Judgment of the Civil Court while considering the application seeking Patta, Cancellation of Patta or to mutate the revenue records.

4. The legal position reiterated by the learned Single Judge of this Court in the Writ Order impugned is in consonance with the established principles and this Court does not find any infirmity in respect of the order impugned. Consequently, the Writ Appeal stands dismissed. No costs. Connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

[S.M.S., J.]

[C.S.N., J.]

11.09.2025

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

arb

3/5



W.A.No.2456 of 2025

WEB COPY

- 1.The District Revenue Officer,
Thiruvallur District,
Thiruvallur.
- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Thiruvallur Revenue Division,
Thiruvallur.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Thiruvallur Taluk,
Thiruvallur District.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.2456 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
C.SARAVANAN, J.

arb

W.A.No.2456 of 2025
and
C.M.P.Nos.18917 and 18918 of 2025

11.09.2025