

W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

**DATED: 30.06.2025**

WEB COPY

**CORAM :**

**THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N. SENTHILKUMAR**

W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023  
and CMP.No.8885 of 2024, CMP.No.13470 of 2025  
and CMP.Nos.27544, 27547 & 27560 of 2023

**W.A.No.3372 of 2023**

1.Government of Tamil Nadu,  
rep. by Revenue Secretary,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Revenue Officer (DRO),  
Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur.


3.The Tahsildar,  
Ponneri Taluk,  
Thiruvallur District.

.. Appellants

VS

1.Videsh Sanchar Nigam Employees'  
Co-operative Housing Society,  
Rep. by its President Joseph Manoharan  
No.4, Swami Sivandanda Salai,  
Chennai 600 002.

2.M/s.Hemisphere Properties India Limited  
Room No.144, C. wing Niman Bhawan,



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

Maulana Azad Road,  
New Delhi – 110 001.

(R2 impleaded vide Court order dated 22.2.2022, made in  
CMP.Nos.878 & 879 of 2019 respectively in  
WA.SR.Nos.107562 & 107563 of 2018)

3.B.K.Syngal Nagar Plot & Flat Owners'

Association – Padiyanallur,

Rep. by its President K.Muthuchamy,

Plot No.81, MG Road B.K.Syngal

Padiyanallur, Chennai-600 052.

... Respondents

(R3 is impleaded, vide order of Court dated 12.03.2025  
made in CMP.No.14359 of 2024 in WA.No.3372 of 2023)

Prayer : APPEAL filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against order  
dated 02.03.2017 made in W.P.No.23740 of 2014 on the file of this Court.

AND

**W.A.No.3374 of 2023**

1.Government of Tamil Nadu,  
rep. by Revenue Secretary,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai – 600 009.


2.The District Revenue Officer (DRO),  
Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur.

3.The Tahsildar,  
Ponneri Taluk,  
Tiruvallur District.

.. Appellants

VS

1.Tata Communications Limited  
Having its registered office at  
VSB, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort,  
Mumbai 400 001 and



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

Chennai office at No.4, Swami Sivananda Salai,  
Chennai-600 002 and  
Rep. by its Deputy General Manager,  
N.Kesava Prasad

2.M/s.Hemisphere Properties India Limited  
Room No.144, C. wing Niman Bhawan,  
Maulana Azad Road,  
New Delhi – 110 001. ... Respondents  
(R2 impleaded vide Court order dated 8.3.2022, made in  
CMP.Nos.3655 & 3660 of 2022 respectively in  
WA.SR.Nos.107562 & 107563 of 2018)


Prayer : APPEAL filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against order  
dated 02.03.2017 made in W.P.No.23739 of 2014 on the file of this Court.

**CMP.No.8885 of 2024**

P.Gopal .. Petitioner

VS

- 1.Government of Tamil Nadu,  
rep. by Revenue Secretary, Revenue Department,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Revenue Officer (DRO),  
Tiruvallur District,  
Tiruvallur.
- 3.The Tahsildar,  
Ponneri Taluk,  
Thiruvallur District.
- 4.Tata Communication Ltd  
Having its Registered Office  
VSB, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort,  
Mumbai 400 001 and Chennai office at  
No.4, Swami Sivananda Salai, Chennai-600 002 and



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

Rep. by its Deputy General Manager,  
N.Kesava Prasad

WEB COPY

5.M/s.Hemisphere Properties India Limited  
Room No.144, C. wing Niman Bhawan,  
Maulana Azad Road,  
New Delhi – 110 001.

.. Respondents

Prayer : PETITION filed under Order 1 Rule 10(2) r/w 151 of C.P.C. To  
implead the petitioner in W.A.No.3374 of 2023.

| <b>Case Nos.</b>    | <b>For Petitioners/<br/>Appellants</b>                                                                                | <b>For Respondents</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CMP.No.8885 of 2024 | Mr.S.Mukund, Senior Counsel                                                                                           | Mr.P.S.Raman,<br>Advocate General,<br>Assisted by<br>Mr.A.Selvendran,<br>Special Government<br>Pleader (for R1 to R3)<br><br>M/s.A.Rexy Josephine<br>Mary (for R4)<br><br>Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan,<br>Additional Solicitor<br>General<br>for M/s.A.Sella<br>Visalakshmi & Ashwin<br>Shanbhag (for R5) |
| WA.No.3372 of 2023  | Mr.P.S.Raman,<br>Advocate General,<br>Assisted by<br>Mr.A.Selvendran,<br>Special Government<br>Pleader (for R1 to R3) | Mr.C.Mohan<br>assisted by M/s.A.Rexy<br>Josephine Mary (for<br>R1)<br>for M/s.King &<br>Patridge<br><br>Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan,                                                                                                                                                                      |



WEB COPY

| <b>Case Nos.</b>   | <b>For Petitioners/<br/>Appellants</b>                                                                 | <b>For Respondents</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                    |                                                                                                        | Additional Solicitor General assisted by Ashwin Shanbhaga Sella Visalakshi (for R2)                                                                                                                                                            |
| WA.No.3374 of 2023 | Mr.P.S.Raman, Advocate General, Assisted by Mr.A.Selvendran, Special Government Pleader (for R1 to R3) | Mr.C.Mohan assisted by M/s.A.Rexy Josephine Mary (for R1) for M/s.King & Patridge<br><br>Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan, Additional Solicitor General assisted by Ashwin Shanbhaga Sella Visalakshi (for R2)<br><br>M/s.Vidya for Viruksham Legal (for R1) |

### **COMMON JUDGMENT**

*(Judgment of the Court was delivered by Dr.ANITA SUMANTH..J)*

These Writ Appeals have been filed by the State, the District Revenue Officer (DRO) and Tahsildar, Ponneri Taluk challenging the common order passed by the Writ Court on 02.03.2017 in W.P.No.23739 of 2014, filed by Tata Communications Limited (in short 'TCL') and




W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

W.P.No.23740 of 2014, filed by Videsh Sandhar Nigam Employees' Co-operative Housing Society (in short 'Society').

2. The prayer in the Writ Petitions is for a writ of certiorarified mandamus challenging proceedings of the DRO dated 06.06.2011 and a consequential direction to the Tahsildar, Ponneri Taluk to restore the entry in the revenue records reflecting that patta for the property at S.No.155/2 and 156 in Padiyanallur Village, Ponneri Taluk, Tiruvallur District ('property'/'property in question'/'subject property') stood in the name of the writ petitioner/R1 before us.

3. The Writ Petitions came to be allowed on 02.03.2017 directing the respondents to make necessary alteration in the revenue records and to restore the '*original name*' in the patta. The Writ Court also holds that the society members are entitled to include their names in the patta. As against the same, only the State has filed these appeals.

4. We have heard Mr.P.S.Raman, learned Advocate General assisted by Mr.A.Selvendran, learned Special Government Pleader for the State/appellant, Mr.C.Mohan, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Ms.A.Rexy Josephine Mary, learned counsel for TCL/R1, Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan, learned Additional Solicitor General assisted by



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

WEB COPY

Mr.Ashwin Shanbhag and Ms.Sella Visalakshmi, learned counsel for Hemisphere Properties India Limited/R2 (in short 'Hemisphere'), successor in interest to TCL, impleaded on 08.03.2022 and Mr.Mukund, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Mr.Sam Jayaraj Houston, learned counsel for the petitioner in CMP No.8885 of 2024.

5. Having heard all learned counsel, we find that that there are several claims that are being advanced as against the subject land, and accordingly, we segregate the admitted sequence of dates and events into five different streams as follows:

***Stream A***

(i) On 01.01.1947, the Indian Radio and Telecommunication Company Limited, a private company operating India's external telecommunication was taken over by the Government of India (GOI) and vested thereafter as a Department in the GOI under the name and style of Overseas Communications Services (OCS).

(ii) On 29.03.1954, the Government of Madras had, vide Memorandum No.47800/C/52-14, sanctioned transfer of land ad measuring 85.94 acres in Padiyanallur Village to GOI for locating a Radio Telegraph and Radio Telephone receiving station.



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

WEB COPY

(iii) The station was opened on 05.03.1960.

(iv) There are revenue records, such as descriptive memoir of No.8 Padiyanallur Village of Ponneri Taluk, Chengalpet District as on 14.05.1962 which reflect that the subject property was Central Government land.

(v) On 28.01.2008, there was a change of name of VSNL to TCL and on 30.10.2008, there was a consent letter issued by the Ministry of Communication and IT to the Secretary, Revenue Department, Government of Tamil Nadu for issuance of patta in favour of TCL for the subject property.

(vi) Post communications dated 27.01.2009 and 02.07.2009 inter se the State Government Officials, patta was issued by the Revenue Department, Tiruvallur District in favour of TCL. Though learned Advocate General would, incidentally, state that the Tahsildar was not the proper authority to have issued the patta, the State does not dispute the right of TCL in respect of the subject property. We have dilated on this aspect of the matter in paragraphs 6 to 9 of this order. In brief we may state at this juncture that there is no resistance by the State to the grant of relief sought by TCL.



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

**Stream B**

WEB COPY

(i) On 27.03.1986, the assets and liabilities of OCS were transferred to Videsh Sanchar Nigam Limited (VSNL) that was, on 01.04.1986, converted into a fully owned GOI enterprise.

(ii) On 04.10.1995, VSNL petitioned the Collector, Chengalpet, requesting change of name for ownership of the subject property from GOI (OCS) to VSNL (GOI Enterprise). The District Collector, Chengalpet, in turn, directed the Tahsildar, Ponneri to do the needful and there was an exchange of communications inter se the parties post which the change of name was duly carried out. This has been confirmed by the learned Advocate General, on instructions.

(iii) Civil Writ Petition No.12002 of 2006 was filed by VSNL Cooperative Housing Society seeking transfer of 32.5 acres of land in the subject property to its name. An order was passed by the Delhi High Court on 17.05.2007 directing VSNL to transfer 32.5 acres land in the subject property in favour of the Society, which was confirmed in LPA No.1252 of 2007 by the Division Bench of the High Court of Delhi on 29.04.2008.

(iv) The writ Court has accepted the claim of the Society and Mr.C.Mohan, learned counsel for the Society would also confirm that a



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023


sale deed dated 22.07.2009 has been executed in this regard conveying 32.5 acres of land in the subject property for a consideration of Rs.1,29,89,158/- and patta has also been issued in that regard in favour of the Society.

***Stream C***

(i) O.S.No.35 of 1998 had been filed by one P.Venkata Rao against VSNL, Revenue Department, District Collector, Thiruvallur District and the Tahsildar, Ponneri before the District Munsif Court, Ponneri, wherein the prayer was for a permanent injunction restraining VSNL from putting up a compound wall.

(ii) Pending Suit, an interim application in I.A.No.995 of 2009 has been filed by P.Venkata Rao seeking interim injunction restraining the defendants from putting up compound wall. The said interim application has been dismissed on 23.10.2009, as against which C.R.P(PD) No.119 of 2010 has been filed by P.Venkata Rao against TCL, which ultimately came to be dismissed on 23.07.2010. That order has attained finality.

(iii) The suit came to be dismissed on 11.02.2011 and an appeal had been preferred by Venkata Rao before the Sub-Court, Ponneri in A.S.No.70 of 2011 that was allowed on 12.04.2024. A Second Appeal in



*W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023*

S.A.No.935 of 2024 has been filed by Hemisphere, the successor-in-interest of TCL, which is stated to be pending before this Court. This line of events is yet to arrive at a finality.

(iv) Aggrieved by certain proceedings in relation to the subject property, the details of which are unavailable before us, one A.K.K.Elangovan, on behalf of P.Venkata Rao appears to have filed a revision petition on 05.05.2010 before the District Revenue Officer-cum-Additional District Judge, Thiruvallur. The records placed before us reveal a notice dated Nil May, 2010 calling for his attendance on 31.05.2010. We are unaware of the further proceedings in this regard.

(v) On 24.04.2010 and 04.10.2012, representations were made by A.K.K Elangovan, claiming to act on behalf of P.Venkata Rao, wherein he stakes his claim to the subject property on the ground that the same are Janman lands and that settlement patta ought to be issued in his favour. On account of the long pendency of those representations, he filed W.P.No.11859 of 2014, as a power agent of P.Venkata Rao, seeking a mandamus directing Secretary to Government to dispose the same in accordance with law.

(vi) The Writ Petition was ordered on 25.04.2014 noting that the



*W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023*

WEB COPY

Secretary to Government had already sought a report on the representations and hence directing him to consider the representation and pass appropriate orders on merits.

(vii) P.Venkata Rao has filed W.P.No.16308 of 2015 seeking a mandamus for deletion of entry in the revenue records in respect of some portions of the subject land and for issuance of patta in his favour.

(viii) The Writ Petition came to be closed rejecting the grant of relief, the Court noting that there had been no compliance by the authorities of the mandamus issued under order dated 25.04.2014 and the petitioner has also not pursued the matter thereafter, his claim was thus held to be stale. The narration of the Court in order dated 11.06.2015 makes it clear that all parties were well aware that the subject lands had been transferred to OCS as early as in 1954.

(ix) P.Venkata Rao thereafter filed a Writ Appeal in W.A.No.1042 of 2015 challenging order dated 11.06.2015 and withdrew the same which was recorded under order dated 04.08.2015.

(x) Contempt Petition was filed by P.Venkata Rao alleging non-compliance or order dated 25.04.2014 in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 and Review Applications were filed by the State, TCL and the Society seeking



*W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023*

WEB COPY

to review order dated 25.04.2014 in W.P.No.11859 of 2014. As a consequence, order dated 25.04.2014 passed in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 was recalled, thereby rejecting the claim of P.Venkata Rao, vide order dated 19.01.2016.

(xi) W.A.Nos.1903, 1918 and 1919 of 2018 then arose from an order passed in Review Application Nos.192, 197 and 210 of 2015 in W.P.No.11859 of 2014 and W.A.Sr.No.104222 of 2018 arose out of order passed in W.P.No.23739 of 2014, all filed by P.Venkata Rao, represented by his power agent A.K.K.Elangovan and Gopal claiming rights over the subject property. To be noted, TCL was not a party in that litigation. The Writ Appeals have been dismissed.

(xii) The said Venkata Rao passed away on 15.05.2017, as reflected in the cause title of order dated 27.09.2023 passed in the Writ Appeals.

(xiii) Before us, one Gopal, son of Late P.Venkata Rao, seeks to pursue the claim put forth by his father. Various materials are placed before us, on the basis of which, the claim of P.Venkata Rao is sought to be sustained and continued.

(xiv) However, having regard to the detailed narration above, we do not believe that the said Gopal has any locus whatsoever to pursue the



WEB COPY

claim. We find absolutely no merit in the plea put forth by Gopal now, in light of the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court on 27.09.2023 in the following categoric terms:

*29. Coming back to the facts of the present case, in so far as the determination of 44.51 acres under Section 15, in terms of Section 15(1), the appellant's mother/the appellant ought to have filed an appeal within 2 months from the date of order passed in 1957 to the special tribunal constituted for such purpose. Even the tribunal had a discretion to condone a delay only up to a period of 6 months. In fact the import of Section 15 also makes it abundantly clear that the decision of the tribunal on an appeal filed under Section 15 (1) was final and not liable to be questioned in any Court of law. On a conjoint reading of the scheme of the Act and the various provisions as well as the Government Orders, it is clear that Section 5 of the Limitation Act would be of no relevance or application to proceedings under the Act of 1948, especially when the enactment itself has built in provision for specific periods of delay to be condoned. Admittedly neither the appellant's mother nor the appellant challenged the orders passed by the Assistant Settlement Officer in 1957 and they lost their right as soon as the limitation period of 2 months, extendable upto another 6 months also lapsed. Thus, there was absolutely no useful purpose in reopening a concluded matter, by merely sending representations touching the very same subject matter. It is a classic case of 'flogging a dead horse'. The Writ Court has rightly reviewed its earlier order dated 25.04.2014 and allowed the review petition and dismissed the Writ petition. The contempt petition was also rightly closed, holding*



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

*that when the order in the Writ petition had been reviewed, there can be no wilful or deliberate disobedience complained of. A writ of mandamus can ordinarily be issued only where a legal right exists for the petitioner. In cases like these, where the appellant as writ petitioner had lost its right several decades ago, the courts would not come to their rescue of such litigants by issuing a fiat of writ of mandamus. We do not find any reasons warranting interference with the common order passed by the Writ Court.*


(xv) The petition to implead Gopal thus has no merit and is rejected.

With this, the curtains fall on the claim of P.Venkata Rao and his fight of over 13 years.

#### ***Stream D***

(i) Representation dated 23.01.2013 had been filed by one Sundaram and others staking a claim over the subject land, which representation came to be rejected on 28.02.2013, following the dictat of G.O.Ms.No.714 dated 29.06.1987 as against which, W.P.No.9004 of 2013 came to be filed by Sundaram and others. Though TCL was not arrayed initially, it was impleaded on 16.06.2014.

(ii) To be noted, G.O.Ms.No.714, Commercial Taxes and Religious Endowment Department dated 29.06.1987 has been issued in relation to the permissible time for filing appeal under the Tamilnadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948. The sum and



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

WEB COPY

substance of the G.O. is that the authority has no power to condone delay in filing the appeals beyond a period of 30 days from date of publication of G.O.Ms.No.714, which is dated 20.07.1987.

(iii) This Court has had occasion to deal with the issuance of Ryotwari Patta in W.P.No.729 of 2025 (order dated 02.04.2025, in which one of us was a party (Dr.Anita Sumanth,J)), where the learned Special Government Pleader had confirmed that the date of publication of G.O.Ms.No.714 dated 29.06.1987 as 20.07.1987.

(iv) The representation of Sundaram and others was only made on 23.01.2013 and hence invoking the mandate under G.O.Ms.No.714, W.P.No.9004 of 2013 had come to be rejected.

### ***Stream E***

(i) One, Hemisphere, the successor-in-interest to TCL, stakes its claim to a portion of the property by virtue of certain events that had transpired before the National Company Law Tribunal. We see no reason to burden this order with any details of said Hemisphere or its claims. The impugned order passed by the DRO on 06.06.2011 cancels patta granted in favour of TCL and the Society and we restrict ourselves to that cause of action alone.



WEB COPY

6. Summing up, we have considered in detail the various claims in regard to the property in question and have indicated in conclusion, the result, status and, our decision in regard to those claims. We are of the considered view that only the claims by TCL and the Videsh Sanchar Nigam Employees' Co-operative Housing Society are liable to be entertained in this litigation.

7. To begin with, they are the original writ petitioners. Moreover, the State has not really objected to their claim, and rightly so, having regard to Board Standing Order 23 that reads thus:

*BSO 23. TRANSFER OF LANDS AND BUILDINGS  
BETWEEN THE CENTRAL AND THE STATE  
GOVERNMENT*

.....

*(ii) Land surplus to the requirements of the Central Government:- When the Central Government no longer require any land which is in their possession the State Government of the State in which it is situated will be given the option of assuming possession of the whole or any portion thereof subject to the following conditions:-*

*(a) The Central Government themselves will be judges whether they require to retain any particular land or not;*

*(b) If the State Government desire to assume possession of the land, the option to do so should be exercised within six months of the date of which the Central Government signify their intention of surrendering the land;*



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

(c) *The amount payable for the land will in all cases be its market value at the date of transfer; and*

(d) *When the State Government desire to assume possession of only a portion of the land surrendered, they shall be reduced to do so only if the value of the land is not material by the division.*

*Note:- It is for the Central Government to decide whether this option may be given to the State Government.*

8. There is no dispute on the position that the entirety of the sale consideration has been received by the State. Memorandum of the Revenue Department bearing No.47804 C/52-14 dated 29.03.1954, stands testimony to the same, as under:

*EMBLEM OF GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS*

\*\*\*\*\*

*REVENUE DEPARTMENT*

*Memorandum No.47804 C/52-14 dated 29-3-1954*

*Sub : Transfer - Land (Chingleput) - Ponneri  
Taluk - Padianallu Village - S. No.8/2  
and 9 - To the Government of India for  
location of Radio Telegraph and Radio  
Telephone Receiving Station.*

*Ref: From the Engineer-in-charge,  
Overseas. Communication Service  
Letter No. 184/C/1151-52 dated 11-11-  
1952. Government Memo No, 47090  
C/52-5 Revenue dated 2-1-53.  
From the Board of Revenue Reference  
B/W 3555/53-4, dated 25-11-1953.  
Government letter No.47806 C/52-10*



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

*dated 5-2-1954*

*From the Engineer-in-Charge, Overseas  
Communication Service, Madras Lo.*

*No.261 (Rcvg)/54 dated 34-3-1954:*

-----

*The Government Sanction the transfer of S.Nos..8/2 and 9 measuring 85.94 acres in all of Padianallur taluk, Ponneri taluk, Chengleput district to the Government of India, Ministry of communications, Overseas Communications Service for locating a Radio Telegraph Radio Telephone Receiving station. The Transfer will be subject to the payment of a sum of Rs.17725-14-0 (Rupees seventeen thousand seven hundred and twenty six and annas fourteen only) by the Government of India to the state Government.*

*2. The Collector of Chenglepat is requested to hand over possession of the lands to the Engineer-in-charge, Overseas Communications Service, Madras immediately.*

*3. The Director General, Overseas Communications Service, Government of India has asked the Accountant General Bombay to place a sum of Rs. 17726-14-0 at the disposal of the Government. The Board of Revenue is requested to see that the amount is adjusted to the credit of this Government. The amount should be credited to the head - "VII Land Revenue – Sale proceeds of waste lands and redemption of land Tax".*

*Sd/-*

*(T.J. JACQUES)*

*Deputy Secretary to Government*

9. In light of the aforesaid, there is really no doubt in our mind that the transfer of the subject property to TCL as a successor-in-interest of



*W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023*

WEB COPY

VSNL, which, in turn, traces its title from OCS and prior thereto from Indian Radio and Telecommunication Company Ltd, is unimpeachable.

10. In light of the above, impugned communication dated 06.06.2011 is quashed. Since Mr.C.Mohan, learned counsel appearing for the Society states that patta has already been granted in respect of 32.5 acres of land, and Mr.P.S.Raman, learned Advocate General does not dispute this position, the same shall not be disturbed. Patta be issued to TCL as applicable, expeditiously.

11. Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan, learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for Hemisphere states that there has been bifurcation of the land in favour of Hemisphere in the interim. Thus, they are permitted to approach the revenue authorities by filing a representation enclosing documentary evidence for such claim, and the authorities shall dispose the representation within a period of four (4) weeks from date of receipt thereof, after hearing the parties and in accordance with law.

12. We reiterate the liberty granted by the Writ Court to the effect that members of the Society who seek individual patta post sub-division, may approach the concerned authority and seek the same.



W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023

13. Both the Writ Appeals are disposed in the aforesaid terms.

C.M.P.No.8885 of 2024 is dismissed and CMP.No.13470 of 2025 and  
CMP.Nos.27544, 27547 & 27560 of 2023 are closed.

[A.S.M., J] [N.S., J]  
30.06.2025

sl

Index:Yes

Speaking order

Neutral Citation:Yes

To

- 1.The Revenue Secretary,  
Revenue Department,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Revenue Officer (DRO),  
Tiruvallur District,  
Tiruvallur.
- 3.The Tahsildar,  
Ponneri Taluk, Thiruvallur District.



WEB COPY



*W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023*

**DR. ANITA SUMANTH,J.**  
**and**  
**N. SENTHILKUMAR.,J**

sl

**W.A.Nos.3372 & 3374 of 2023**  
**and CMP.No.8885 of 2024, CMP.No.13470 of 2025**  
**and CMP.Nos.27544, 27547 & 27560 of 2023**

**30.06.2025**