



WEB COPY

WP No. 47341 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 09-12-2025**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY**

**WP No. 47341 of 2025  
and WMP.No.52850 of 2025**

V.Rajeshwari,  
W/o. Vadivel Gounder, No. 39/65,  
Rose Cottage , Kotagiri, Nilgiris District.

..Petitioner

Vs

1.The District Collector,  
Collectorate, Udhagamandalam,  
Nilgiris District 643 001.

2.The District Revenue Officer,  
Collectorate, Udhagamandalam,  
Nilgiris District 643 001.

3.The Tahsildhar, Taluk Office, Kotagiri,  
Nilgiris District 643 216.

4.The Special Tahsildar, Conoor Taluk,  
Kotagiri, Nilgiris District 643216.

..Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India



praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the 4th respondent dated 03.10.2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents any, their men from in any manner interfering with petitioner's patta land except by due process of law.

For Petitioner: Mr. J.Suresh

For Respondents: Mr.Abishek Murthy, Govt. Advocate

### **ORDER**

The petitioner asserts that he purchased land ad measuring 59 ¼ cents in S.No.1446/8 in document no.1078/2008. In relation thereto, it is stated that third parties had filed civil suits and that such third parties failed to obtain any orders in relation to the petitioner's property. In these circumstances, it is stated that the said third parties have influenced respondents herein to issue the impugned notice under the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Land for Harijan Welfare Schemes Act, 1978 (Act 31 of 1978).

2. Mr.Abishek Murthy, learned Government Advocate, accepts notice for all the respondents. He submits that the petitioner has challenged a show cause notice after submitting a reply dated 03.11.2025 in relation thereto.



WEB COPY

3. On the ground that civil suits filed by private persons were rejected, the petitioner cannot forestall the initiation of acquisition proceedings. Undoubtedly, it is open to the petitioner to raise objections in relation to the proposed acquisition in accordance with the provisions of Act 31 of 1978 and rules framed thereunder. It is needless to say that any such objections would have to be considered before a decision is taken with regard to the proposed acquisition.

4. With the above observations, the writ petition is disposed of without any order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

**09-12-2025**

Index : Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

kj

To



1. The District Collector,  
Collectorate, Udhagamandalam,  
Nilgiris District 643 001.
2. The District Revenue Officer,  
Collectorate, Udhagamandalam,  
Nilgiris District 643 001.
3. The Tahsildhar, Taluk Office, Kotagiri,  
Nilgiris District 643 216.
4. The Special Tahsildar, Conoor Taluk,  
Kotagiri, Nilgiris District 643216.



WEB COPY

WP No. 47341 of 2



**SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.**

kj

WP No. 47341 of 2025



WEB COPY

WP No. 47341 of 2



09-12-2025