



W.P.No.49259 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.12.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

W.P.No.49259 of 2025

Arul

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Land Commissioner,
Land Administration Department,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai – 600 005.

2.The District Collector,
Chengalpattu.

3.The District Revenue Officer,
Chengalpattu.

4.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Tambaram.

5.The Tahsildar,
Vandalur, Chengalpattu District.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the 1st respondent in Letter No.F2/10941390/2025 dated 23.09.2025 and set aside the same and direct Denovo enquiry of the revision by the 1st respondent.



W.P.No.49259 of 2025

For Petitioner : Ms.T.Gnana Banu
For Respondents : Mr.C.Jayaprakash
Government Advocate

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the impugned letter dated 23.09.2025 sent by the 1st respondent refusing to entertain the revision filed by the petitioner on the ground that the said revision has been filed belatedly.

2. Mr.C.Jayaprakash, learned Government Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

3. The petitioner has challenged the impugned letter on the ground that in the order under challenge passed by the 2nd respondent, no time limit was prescribed for the petitioner to file a revision petition before the 1st respondent.

4. This Court perused and examined the impugned letter, dated 23.09.2025. As rightly contended by the petitioner before this Court the



W.P.No.49259 of 2025

WEB COPY

impugned letter is a non-speaking letter with regard to the fact that in the order passed by the 2nd respondent, which is the subject matter of challenge before the 1st respondent, there was no time limit prescribed by the 2nd respondent for preferring a revision petition by the petitioner.

5. In view of the same, this Court is of the considered view that, being a non-speaking order and that too, when the order passed by the 2nd respondent, which has been challenged by the petitioner by way of revision petition before the 1st respondent, has not stipulated the time limit within which a revision has to be filed, this Court has to quash the impugned communication, dated 23.09.2025 issued by the 1st respondent and remand the matter back to the 1st respondent for fresh consideration of the revision petition, on merits and in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, the impugned letter, dated 23.09.2025 sent by the 1st respondent is hereby quashed and the matter is remanded back to the 1st respondent for fresh consideration. The 1st respondent shall entertain the revision petition filed by the petitioner, aggrieved by the order, dated 18.10.2024, and pass final orders, on merits and in accordance with law,



W.P.No.49259 of 2025

WEB COPY

on the revision petition, within a period of four (4) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, by adhering to the principles of natural justice.

7. With the aforesaid directions, this Writ Petition is disposed of.

No costs.

19.12.2025

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order / Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation Case : Yes/No
sp



W.P.No.49259 of 2025

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Land Commissioner,
Land Administration Department,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai – 600 005.
 - 2.The District Collector,
Chengalpattu.
 - 3.The District Revenue Officer,
Chengalpattu.
 - 4.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Tambaram.
 - 5.The Tahsildar,
Vandalur, Chengalpattu District.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.49259 of 2025

ABDUL QUDDHOSE, J.

sp

W.P.No.49259 of 2025

19.12.2025