IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

W.P.Nos.42144, 42163, 42168 & 42157 of 2025
AND
W.M.P.Nos.47196, 47198, 47211 & 47217 of 2025

W.P.Nos.42144, 42163 & 42168 of 2025

R.Subramani .. Petitioner in WP.42144/25
S.E.Dhandapani .. Petitioner in WP.42163/25
M.Vijaya .. Petitioner in WP.42168/25

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

2.The Commissioner of Land Administration
Land Administration Office
Chepauk, Chennai

3.The District Collector
Thirupattur, Thirupattur District

4.The District Revenue Officer
District Collector Office
Thirupattur District
5.The Revenue Divisional Officer
Thirupattur, Thirupattur District

6.The Sub Collector
Sub Collector Office
Thirupattur Taluk, District

7.The Tahsildar
Thirupattur District

8.The Sub Registrar
Jolarpet
Thirupattur Taluk
Thirupattur District .. Respondents

Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of certiorarified mandamus calling for the entire records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Tirupattur, Tirupattur District 5th respondent herein *vide* his proceedings in No.Moo.Mu.A5/536/2025 dated 07.07.2025 and quash them as illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable being violative of rules and principles of natural justice thereby direct the respondents herein to lift the ban order imposed by the 5th respondent *vide* his proceedings in Na.Ka.No.A3/1776/2006 dated 10.08.2007 insofar as the petitioner land are comprised in S.No.86/1 to an extent of 4.10 Acres, S.Nos.86/10 & 86/11 to an extent of 1.30 cents and S.No.260 to an extent of 0.26 cents in Athanuvur Village, Yelagiri Hills, Thirupattur Taluk and District, respectively.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.V.Thirupathi
For RR1 to 7	:	Mr.D.Ravichander Special Government Pleader
For R8	:	Mr.R.Sasikumar Government Advocate

W.P.No.42157 of 2025

R.Anisha .. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009

2.The District Collector
Tirupattur, Tirupattur District

3.The District Revenue Officer
Tirupattur
Tirupattur District

4.The Revenue Divisional Officer
Tirupattur, Tirupattur District

5.The Sub Collector
Sub Collector Office
Tirupattur, Tirupattur District

6.The Tahsildar
Tirupattur Taluk
Tirupattur District .. Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the 6th respondent herein transfer of patta in the petitioner name in respect of 1.67 acres of Punja Land in S.No.311 of Paduvanur Village, Elagiri Hills, Tiruppathur Taluk and District in the light of the order 3.3.2025 in W.P.Nos.5476, 5484, 5499 and 5500/25.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Thirupathi

For Respondents : Mr.D.Ravichander
Special Government Pleader

COMMON ORDER

Writ petitions *viz.*, W.P.Nos.42144, 42163 & 42168 of 2025 have been filed challenging the impugned proceedings of the 5th respondent dated 07.07.2025 and for a consequential direction to the respondents to lift the ban imposed by the 5th respondent by order dated 10.08.2007 insofar as the petitioners lands are concerned.

2. W.P.No.42157 of 2025 has been filed for the issue of a writ of mandamus directing the 6th respondent to transfer the patta in the name of the petitioner with respect to the subject property, by considering the representation made by the petitioner on 16.06.2025, in line with the order passed by this Court in

W.P.No.15644 of 2025 dated 30.04.2025.

3. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

4. I had an opportunity to deal with the issue regarding the ban order that was imposed by the District Collector, through proceedings dated 10.08.2007 and passed a common order in W.P.No.5476 of 2025 etc. batch. Those writ petitions were allowed by an order dated 03.03.2025 and the relevant portions are extracted hereunder :

> "2. W.P.Nos.5476 and 5493 of 2025 have been filed challenging the impugned proceedings of the Sub-Registrar, Jolarpet dated 07.10.2024 and for a consequential direction to the revenue authorities to lift the ban imposed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Thirupattur District through proceedings dated 10.08.2007 insofar as the subject property belonging to the petitioner.
>
> 3. W.P.Nos.5499 and 5500 of 2025 have been filed challenging the ban order imposed by the third respondent dated 10.08.2007 and for a direction to the second and third respondents to lift the ban imposed in proceedings dated 10.08.2007 of the third respondent insofar as the subject property belonging to the petitioners.
>
> 4. W.P.No.5484 of 2025 has been filed challenging the proceedings of the District Revenue Officer, Thirupattur Taluk dated 02.07.2024 and for a consequential direction to the third and fifth respondents to lift the ban

imposed by the sixth respondent through proceedings dated 10.08.2007 insofar as the properties belonging to the petitioner.

5. The case of the petitioners in W.P.No.5476 and 5493 of 2025 is that they are the owners of the subject property situated in S.Nos.287 and 311 at Aathanavur Village, Elagiri, Thirupattur Taluk. They wanted to deal with the property and accordingly, they executed a sale deed, which was kept as a pending document in pending document Nos.8 and 11 of 2014. The petitioners approached this Court and filed W.P.Nos.34621 of 2022 and 10085 of 2023 for a direction to the Sub-Registrar, Jolarpet to release the sale deeds which are kept as pending document from the year 2014. These writ petitions came to be disposed of by this Court by a common order dated 25.07.2024 and relevant portions are extracted hereunder:

> "*2. It is the case of the writ petitioner in W.P. No.34621 of 2022 that the property of an extent of 50 cents in S. No.311 of Athanoor village, Yelagiri Hills, Thirupattur Taluk originally belonged to one Chinnakutti and he has settled the same in favour of Senthil under a Settlement Deed dated 12.08.1994 and registered as Document No.932 of 1994 on the file of SRO, Vaniyambadi. When the petitioner has presented the document for sale executed by Senthil, the said document has been kept pending in Pending No.11 of 2014 without any valid reasons. Hence seeks a direction.*
>
> *3. It is the case of the writ petitioner in W.P. No.10085 of 2023 that the property of an extent of Acre 2.75 cents in S. No.287 originally belonged to one Somagoundar. He sold the said property to one Ramagoundar. The said Ramagoundar had executed a settlement deed dated 25.03.1955. After the death of Ramagoundar, his legal heirs have sold the property to various persons. The petitioner has purchased the above property from one A.Gopi, Power Agent. When the petitioner presented the sale deed dated 08.10.2014 for registration before the 3rd respondent, the same was kept pending in Pending No.8 of 2014 based on the letter of the 4th respondent without any valid reasons. Hence seeks a direction*

4. The counter of the Sub Registrar would indicate that, as there was no proper entries in the revenue records, the petitioner has also not obtained a No Objection Certificate from the revenue department, the document is kept pending. According to them, as per the letter of Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007, R.S. No.267/2 comes under the prohibited document. Hence it is their contention that, only for that reason, the document has been kept pending.

5. In the last hearing, I have directed the learned Additional Government Pleader to produce the 'A' Register from the revenue department. Today, the records have been produced. This court has verified the same. As far as S. No.311 is concerned, there is no entry. However, as far as other survey number is concerned, it is recorded as patta land. Further RTI reply issued by the Special Tahsildar indicate that Survey Nos.287 & 311 are not referred as Government poramboke lands in the 'A' Register. Hence the property is not belonged to the Government. One of the survey number is mentioned as patta and other survey number though entries have been made, the earlier one is the registered document in the year 1994, let the petitioner produce the copy of the reply furnished under the RTI Act dated 12.04.2024 to the Sub Registrar. On such production, the documents shall be released on its own merits, within a period of 10 days thereafter."

Pursuant to the above order, the Sub-Registrar, Jolarpet issued the impugned proceedings dated 07.10.2024, which has been put to challenge in these two writ petitions.

6. When these writ petitions were heard along with the connected writ petitions on 21.02.2025, this Court passed the following order:

"*Mr.K.Karthick Jagannath, learned Government Advocate, takes notice for respondents 1 to 8. 2. The subject matter of challenge in these two writ petitions pertain to the proceedings of the Sub Registrar, Jolarpet dated 07.10.2024. This Court went through the earlier order passed in WP Nos.34621 of 2022 and 10085 of 2023 dated 25.07.2024 and the relevant portion is extracted hereunder :-*

"5. In the last hearing, I have directed the learned Additional Government Pleader to produce the "A" Register from the revenue department. Today, the records have been produced. This court has verified the same. As far as S. No.311 is concerned, there is no entry. However, as far as other survey number is concerned, it is recorded as patta land. Further RTI reply issued by the Special Tahsildar indicate that Survey Nos.287 & 311 are not referred as Government poramboke lands in the "A" Register. Hence the property is not belonged to the Government. One of the survey number is mentioned as patta and other survey number though entries have been made, the earlier one is the registered document in the year 1994, let the petitioner produce the copy of the reply furnished under the RTI Act dated 12.04.2024 to the Sub Registrar. On such production, the documents shall be released on its own merits, within a period of 10 days thereafter."

3. Inspite of the above order passed by this Court, the Sub Registrar, Jolarpet, has issued the impugned proceedings dated 07.10.2024, virtually overlooking the order passed by this Court. On the face of the impugned order, it reflects the contumacious conduct on the part of the Sub Registrar. Hence, Sub Registrar, Jolarpet, who is the 8th respondent in this writ petition is directed to be present before this Court during the next date of hearing on 03.03.2025.

4. Post these writ petitions on 03.03.2025 at 2.15 p.m."

7. When the writ petitions were taken up for hearing today, the Sub-Registrar, Jolarpet was present and two individual affidavits were filed in W.P.No.5476 and 5493 of 2025. The relevant portions are extracted hereunder:

"1. The aforementioned Writ Petition has been filed challenging the Refusal Order dated 07.10.2024. At the outset, I tender my unconditional apology for passing the Refusal Order dated 07.10.2024 without properly understanding the tenor of the Order passed by this Hon'ble Court dated 25.07.2024 made in W.P.No.34621 of 2022. I have the highest regard and respect for the majesty of the judiciary. I have

been complying with the Orders and directions of this Hon'ble Court in letter and spirit. I tender my unconditional apology for passing a Refusal Order dated 07.10.2024. I submit that the Writ Petitioners have presented one Sale Deed dated 28.11.2024 for registration in respect of lands comprised in Survey No.311 of Athanavur Village, Yelagiri Mathura, Thirupathur Taluk, totally measuring to an extent of 50 cents. The document was entertained for admission and kept as pending document to seek clarification from the Revenue Department in respect of the genuineness of revenue records.

2. The Writ Petitioner has obtained information under the RTI Act on 04.08.2024 from the Special Tahsildar in respect of the subject lands and sought for registration of documents. This Hon'ble Court vide order dated 25.07.2024 directed the jurisdictional Sub-Registrar to register the document and release the same within the stipulated time.

3. I submit that the District Registrar has addressed a letter dated 03.09.2024 to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Thirupathur, seeking clarification and patta details in respect of Survey No.311 and 287 of Athanavur Village. The Revenue Divisional Officer vide Letter dated 04.09.2024, has observed that the directions issued by the Revenue Department in proceedings dated 10.08.2007 in respect of Survey Nos.311 and 287 should be scrupulously followed by the registering authority. The Revenue Department, vide proceedings dated 10.08.2007, directed the Sub Registrar not to register any document in respect of Survey Nos.311 and 287 of Athanavur Village. As a consequence, the District Registrar, Thirupathur vide letter dated 05.09.2024 has issued instructions to deal with the pending document in accordance with the instructions issued by the Revenue Department. Accordingly, I had passed the Refusal order on 07.10.2024.

4. I have passed an order declining to register the document on the basis of instructions issued by the Revenue Department. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Thirupathur vide proceedings dated 10.08.2007 has issued directions to the registering authority not to register any document in respect of lands comprise in Survey Nos.311 and 287. I regret that I should not have passed a Refusal order solely on *the basis of instructions issued by the Revenue Department, without securing any clarification from this Hon'ble Court. I once again tender my unconditional apology for passing a Refusal order without understanding the tenor of the directions issued by this Hon'ble Court."*

8. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the registering authorities submitted that the Sub-Registrar did not properly understand the tenor of the earlier order passed by this Court and he merely went by the proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007, which was followed by the letter of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 04.09.2024 which was directed to be complied with while dealing with any document that is presented for registration. In view of the same, the Sub-Registrar had issued refusal order on 07.10.2024.

9. The learned Special Government Pleader submitted that the Sub-Registrar ought not to have issued the refusal order considering the positive direction that was issued by this Court on 25.07.2024 in the earlier writ petitions.

10. The learned Special Government Pleader also brought to the notice of this Court the proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007. The subject property has been mentioned in Serial Nos.113 and 124 in those proceedings and it is clear that there was no specific endorsement made with respect to these two properties and there was no bar imposed for dealing with these properties in the said proceedings.

11. The Sub-Registrar, Jolarpet ought not to have issued the rejection order. If there was any clarification required, he should have obtained proper opinion from the Office of the Government Pleader, instead he unnecessarily invited the wrath of this Court. The Sub-Registrar, who was

present in person, tendered his unconditional apology and he undertook that he will not repeat this conduct in future.

12. It is quite apparent from the proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007 that there is absolutely no bar imposed insofar as the subject properties in S.Nos.287 and 311 are concerned. Therefore, there was no need for keeping those sale deeds pending without registering the same.

13. Insofar as W.P.Nos.5499, 5500 and 5484 of 2025 are concerned, these are writ petitions which arise out of a wrong understanding of the proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007. In W.P.Nos.5499 and 5500 of 2025, the petitioners have sought for lifting the ban order with respect to the subject property. The subject property in these two writ petitions are S.Nos.155/4 and 311. Insofar as S.No.311 is concerned, this Court has already held that there was no bar. Insofar as S.No.155/4 is concerned, even as per the proceedings of Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007, there is no bar with respect to dealing with the entire property in S.No.155. Therefore, when there is no bar in dealing with these properties, there is no requirement to issue any further directions to the respondents to lift the ban order. The requirement for lifting the ban order will arise only if the proceedings dated 10.08.2007 has categorised the properties as one of Government lands and in the absence of the same, there is no need for issuing any direction and these properties can be dealt with since there is no bar / ban imposed by the proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007.

14. Insofar as the writ petition in W.P.No.5484 of 2025 is concerned, the subject matter of challenge pertains to the proceedings of the District Revenue Officer dated 02.07.2024. The subject matter in this writ petition is S.No.260. With respect to this survey number also, there is no ban /bar under the proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007.

The proceedings of the District Revenue Officer dated 02.07.2024 proceeds as if there is a bar and the District Revenue Officer has come to a conclusion that all the properties that have been mentioned in the earlier proceedings belong to the Government and therefore, the same cannot be dealt with by the private individuals. The said finding of the District Revenue Officer runs contrary to the proceedings dated 10.08.2007 and in these proceedings S.No.260 is dealt with in Serial No.105. It clearly states that 'பதிவு இல்லை'.

15. Thus, this survey number has not been categorized as Government land or as a pathway, which forms part of the entire list containing 262 serial numbers. That does not mean that the owner of the property can never deal with the property. Accordingly, the proceedings of District Revenue Officer dated 02.07.2024 relying upon the earlier proceedings dated 10.08.2007 also suffers from illegality and non-application of mind.

16. Accordingly, the proceedings of the District Revenue Officer dated 02.07.2024 is liable to be interfered with by this Court.

17. In the result, all these writ petitions are allowed and there shall be a direction to the Sub-Registrar, Jolarpet to register the sale deeds and release the same to the petitioners within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Insofar as other three writ petitions are concerned, since the proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 10.08.2007 does not categorize any of these properties as Government lands or any other lands prohibited from being dealt with, the respective petitioners will be entitled to deal with the same. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs."

5. In W.P.Nos.42144, 42163 & 42168 of 2025, request was made by the petitioners to lift the ban, in line with the earlier order passed by this Court. The 5th respondent, through proceedings dated 07.07.2025, has rejected the representations only on the ground that the title documents were not submitted by the petitioners.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners brought to the notice of this Court the fact that the title documents have already been placed before the 5th respondent and in spite of the same, the 5th respondent, without taking note of the earlier order passed by this Court, has mechanically rejected the representations made by the petitioners.

7. Insofar as W.P.No.42157 of 2025 is concerned, the petitioner is only seeking for a direction to the 6th respondent to transfer the patta in the name of the petitioner, in line with the earlier order passed by this Court.

8. In the considered view of this Court, the official respondents are bound by the earlier order passed by this Court and therefore, what is left is to only pass consequential orders and grant the relief sought for by the petitioners. The

petitioners shall submit all the relevant documents before the authority concerned and on receipt of the same, orders shall be passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Thirupattur, in line with the earlier order passed by this Court in W.P.No.5476 of 2025 etc. batch dated 03.03.2025. In the same manner, the Tahsildar, who is the 6th respondent in W.P.No.42157 of 2025, shall also deal with the representation made by the petitioner therein and pass orders, in line with the earlier order passed by this Court in W.P.No.5476 of 2025 etc. batch dated 03.03.2025. The said process shall be completed by the respective respondents within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

In the result, W.P.Nos.42144, 42163 & 42168 of 2025 are allowed and W.P.No.42157 of 2025 stands disposed of. No costs. Connected W.M.Ps are closed.

13.11.2025

gya
Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No

To

1.The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort St. George, Chennai-9

2.The Commissioner of Land Administration
Land Administration Office
Chepauk, Chennai

3.The District Collector
Thirupattur, Thirupattur District

4.The District Revenue Officer
District Collector Office
Thirupattur District

5.The Revenue Divisional Officer
Thirupattur, Thirupattur District

6.The Sub Collector
Sub Collector Office
Thirupattur Taluk, District

7.The Tahsildar
Thirupattur District

8.The Sub Registrar
Jolarpet
Thirupattur Taluk
Thirupattur District

N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

gya

W.P.Nos.42144, 42163, 42168
& 42157 of 2025

13.11.2025