



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

REV.APPL No. 185 of 2025

1. Thevayal

W/o late Pattappan,

Anna Nagar Thoppampalayam Village

Sathyamangalam Taluk Erode District

2. Easwaramoorthy

S/o late Pattappan,

Anna Nagar Thoppampalayam Village

Sathyamangalam Taluk Erode District

3. Saikala

D/o late Pattappan,

Anna Nagar Thoppampalayam Village

Sathyamangalam Taluk Erode District

Appellant(s)

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. by its District Collector,

Erode District.

2.District Revenue Officer

Erode District



3. Tahsildar
Tahsildar Office Sathyamangalam
Erode District

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To review the order dated 20-01-2021 passed in SA.No.1400 of 2008.

For Appellant(s): Chockalingam SP

For Respondents: Mr.B.Tmailnidhi, AGP (CS)

ORDER

This petition seeks to review the order passed in Second Appeal No.1400 of 2008 dated 20.1.2021.

2. I heard Mr.S.P.Chockalingam, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr.Tamil Nidhi, learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents.

3. The plea of Mr.S.P.Chockalingam is that the first appellant/first review petitioner's husband and father of the second and third appellant/second and third review petitioners, one Mr.Pattappan, had purchased the suit property on 24.1.1985 from one Madhaian. The said Madhaian had purchased the property from one Gopal on 19.11.1983. The petitioner had been benefited with a D.

நபுணா on 10.8.1973. He pleads that as the sale had taken place after a period



of ten years post assignment, the finding of this court in the Second Appeal suffers an error apparent on the face of the record and therefore, he is entitled for the review.

4. Per contra, Mr.Tamilnidhi, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents, points out that it is not the case of the sale by Mr.Gopal in favour of Mr.Madhaian, which had culminated in the cancellation proceedings. The oral transfer of the property by way of lease by Gopal in favour of Madhaian, which attracted the attention of the Revenue Department. Both Madhaian and Gopal had been put on notice in the year 1983 and the order of cancellation had been passed on 24.1.1986. Hence, he pleads that there is no error apparent on the face of the record warranting interference of this court by way of review and seeks for dismissal of the review.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for both side and gone through the records.

6. Whatever the view I might have taken if the Second Appeal had been heard by me, cannot be considered by me while dealing with a Review Application. If a party seeks to review an order in appeal, he should point out



the error apparent on the face of the record. The review should not be an attempt to re-argue the appeal in its entirety.

7. The findings of the learned Judge, while dismissing the second appeal was passed on the fact that there had been oral transfer by the predecessor in title of the plaintiff's father. Though, Mr.S.P.Chockalingam attempted to point out that there cannot be a sale, this issue was not a subject matter of pleading before the learned Trial Judge, or a ground taken in the Appeal. No such ground can be raised for the first time in Review.

8. As I do not find any error apparent on the face of record in the order, I do not find any ground to review the order passed in the appeal. The review application is dismissed. No costs.

15-10-2025

ssk.

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



To

WEB COPY

1.State of Tamil Nadu

Rep. by its District Collector,
Erode District.

2.District Revenue Officer

Erode District

3.Tahsildar

Tahsildar Office Sathyamangalam
Erode District



WEB COPY



V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.

ssk.

REV.APPL No. 185 of 2025

15-10-2025