



W.A.No.390 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23.04.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C. KUMARAPPAN**

**Writ Appeal No.390 of 2025 and
CMP.No.3182 of 2025**

1.The Inspector General of Registration,
Registration Department,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
R.A.Puram, Chennai-600 028.

2.The District Registrar,
District Registrar Office,
Chidambaram.

3.The Deputy Inspector General of Registration Department,
Thirupathiripuliyur, Cuddalore-2.

4.The Sub-Registrar,
Office of the Sub-Registrar,
Sethiathope, Cuddalore -608 702

.. Appellants

VS

1.T.Annadurai

2.The Tahsildar,
Bhuvanagiri Taluk,
Cuddalore District.

3.Pandidurai

.. Respondents



W.A.No.390 of 2025

WEB COPY

Prayer : APPEAL filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the order dated 08.04.2024 in W.P.No.9004 of 2024 on the file of this Court.

For Appellants : Mr.K.Karthik Jagannath
Government Advocate

For Respondents : Mr.S.Arockia Mani Raj (for R1)

Mr.C.Gowtham Raj (for R2)
Government Advocate

No Appearance – (for R3)

JUDGMENT

(Delivered by Dr.ANITA SUMANTH.,J)

The State is in appeal as against order dated 08.04.2024 passed in WP.No.8994 of 2024. One T.Annadurai, R1 in appeal had filed the above captioned writ petition seeking a mandamus directing the official respondents to pass orders on his representation dated 08.02.2024 deleting the alleged wrong entry for classification of his lands from Government Poramboke to Grama Natham in the guideline value register in respect of property in Survey No.33/2 bearing patta No.208, admeasuring 2392 sq. ft. at Anaivari Village, Bhuvanagiri Taluk, Cuddalore District ('property'/'property in question').



W.A.No.390 of 2025

2. One Pandidurai has been arrayed as private respondent in that writ petition. The writ petition was disposed on 08.04.2024 without reference to Pandidurai. The learned Judge has accepted the case of R1 that there was a mistake in the classification of the property in question and directed rectification of the same within a period of two weeks from date of receipt of a copy of that order.

3. Aggrieved, the State is in appeal. There have been some events that have transpired post passing of the impugned order dated 08.04.2024. Pandidurai appears to have made a complaint/representation before the Revenue Divisional Officer (RDO) concurring the same property. The order of the RDO states that though notice was issued to R1, he did not appear. However, learned counsel appearing for R1 would dispute this position.

4. Be that as it may, the RDO has passed an order on Pandidurai's representation accepting his prayer. An appeal was filed by R1 before the District Revenue Officer (DRO) on 15.05.2024 that has come to be dismissed on 10.03.2025.

5. The petitioner now, only seeks liberty to challenge the order of DRO dated 10.03.2025 in a manner known to law. With this, and as



W.A.No.390 of 2025

nothing further survives as far as the grievance of the State is concerned,

WEB COPY

as order dated 08.04.2024 is concerned, and recording the aforesaid trajectory of events, the writ appeal is closed. No costs. Connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

[A.S.M., J] [C.K., J]
23.04.2025

vs

Index:Yes/No

Speaking order

Neutral Citation:Yes

To

The Tahsildar,
Bhuvanagiri Taluk,
Cuddalore District.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.390 of 2025

DR. ANITA SUMANTH,J.
and
C. KUMARAPPAN.,J

VS

Writ Appeal No.390 of 2025 and
CMP.No.3182 of 2025

23.04.2025