



Cont.P.No.3031 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 13.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

Cont.P.No.3031 of 2025

S.Udayakumar

... Petitioner

Versus

1.Vasudevan

Tahsildar

Thirukazhukundram Taluk Chengalpattu.

2..CHANDRA SEKAR

The Zonal Deputy Tashildhar,

Thirukazhukundram Taluk, Chengalpattu.

3. SUDHARSHAN

The Village Administrative Officer,

Thirukazhukundram Taluk, Chengalpattu

(Currently Posted at Sadras, Thirukazhukundram Taluk)

4. ELUMALAI


.. Respondents

Prayer: Contempt Petition filed section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, to punish the respondents for having committed contempt of this Court by disobeying the order in WP.11352/2024 dated 07.04.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Ravi
For Respondent : Mr.D.Ravichander for R1 to R3
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

This contempt petition has been filed seeking to punish the respondent for having committed contempt of this Court by disobeying the order in



WP.No.11352/2024 dated 07.04.2024.


WEB COPY

2. This Court allowed the writ petition in WP.No.11352 of 2024 vide order dated 07.04.2024 on the following terms:

“2.It is the case of the writ petitioner that as far as the abovesaid survey Nos.546/50A and 546/50B are concerned, the petitioner became entitled to 00036sq.m., vacant site and 800sq.ft., of building. The said right has already been established in the Civil Suit in O.S.No.28 of 2010 on the file of Additional Subordinate Judge, Chengalpattu. However, the remaining area is in his possession. Now the impugned order cancelling the patta is not only in respect of the vacant site but also the extent covered under the settlement deed, which is the subject matter of the suit in O.S.No.28 of 2010, which was decreed in favour of the petitioner and reached finality. In this regard, he had also filed an affidavit and the same is taken on file.

3.The fourth respondent-contesting party has also filed an affidavit and the memo accepting the contention of the petitioner. As the contesting party has no dispute with regard to the respective entitlement, the impugned order cancelling patta in respect of 00036 sq.m., of vacant land and building thereon in Survey No.546/50B alone stands quashed. In respect of other area, let the parties work out their remedy in appropriate Court.”

3. Now, the grievance of the petitioner that though the patta in S.No.546/50B is issued in favour of the petitioner, S.No.546/50A has been issued in the names of his father and his uncle. Hence, according to him, the respondents have violated the order of this Court.



Cont.P.No.3031 of 2025

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Special

Government Pleader and perused the materials placed on record.

5. This Court is of that while allowing the writ petition had quashed the cancellation proceedings in respect of 546/50B, however, with respect to other area directed to parties to work out their remedy in the appropriate Court. Such being the position, even assuming that patta has been issued, the same will not take away the rights of the petitioner, the petitioner may establish the same in the Civil Court. Accordingly, no contempt is made out by the official respondents.

6. Accordingly this contempt petition stands closed. No costs.

13.10.2025

Internet : Yes

Index : Yes / No

dhk

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.3031 of 2025

dhk

Cont.P.No. 3031 of 2025

13.10.2025