



W.P.(MD)No.2015 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.12.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDER

W.P.(MD)No.2015 of 2025

and

W.M.P.(MD)No.1422 of 2025

P.Vellaisamy

... Petitioner

-VS-

- 1.The District Collector,
District Collectorate Office,
Dindigul District.
- 2.The District Revenue Officer,
District Revenue Office,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Thasildar,
Thasildar Office,
Nilakottai Taluk,
Dindigul District.
- 4.Ramakrishnan
- 5.Kanmani
- 6.Papathi
- 7.Meenatchi



W.P.(MD)No.2015 of 2025

8.Subbuthai

9.Ketchiya

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relates to the impugned order passed by the second respondent in respect of the petitioner's property bearing Na.Ka.No.541180/2023/A4 dated 17.12.2024 and quash the same and consequently, directing the respondents 2 and 3 to restore the patta in respect of S.No.46/3A measuring an extent of 0.79.00 hectares, situated at Sevugampatti Village, Nilakottai Taluk, Dindigul District, in the name of petitioner's grandfather namely, Veillaya Kudumban.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Samidurai

For R1 to R3 : Mr.D.Sadiq Raja
Additional Government Pleader

For R4 to R8 : Mr.A.Jayaramachandran

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking to quash the impugned order passed by the second respondent in respect of the petitioner's property bearing Na.Ka.No.541180/2023/A4 dated 17.12.2024 and consequently, to direct the respondents 2 and 3 to restore the patta in respect of S.No.46/3A, measuring an extent of 0.79.00 hectares, situated at Sevugampatti Village, Nilakottai Taluk, Dindigul District, in the name of the petitioner's grandfather, Veillaya Kudumban.



W.P.(MD)No.2015 of 2025

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties.

3. According to the petitioner, the property in S.No.46/3A, measuring 0.79.00 hectares in Sevugampatti Village, Nilakottai Taluk, Dindigul District, belongs to the petitioner's family and the patta has been historically standing in the name of the petitioner's grandfather, Veillaya Kudumban. The petitioner contends that the impugned order is arbitrary, contrary to the revenue records, and violative of the principles of natural justice. The petitioner therefore prays to quash the impugned order dated 17.12.2024 issued by the second respondent; and direct the respondents 2 and 3 to restore the patta in respect of S.No.46/3A in the name of the petitioner's grandfather, Veillaya Kudumban, as it stood prior to the impugned order.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Patta stood in the name of the petitioner prior to the UDR entries made in the year 1984, and no notice was issued to the petitioner. It is also submitted that it is not clear as to how the private respondents were included as Pattadars in respect of the petitioner's property.



W.P.(MD)No.2015 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. The learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents 1 to 3 submits that the Patta was not wrongly issued and that the UDR (Updating of Registry) proceedings carried out in the year 1984 were done after due verification of revenue records. It is further submitted that the inclusion of the private respondents as Pattadars was based on long-standing possession and enjoyment, and not by any arbitrary act of the authorities. The learned Additional Government Pleader contends that the petitioner has not produced any contemporaneous revenue documents to establish exclusive title or possession prior to the UDR entries. Therefore, the impugned order does not warrant interference.

6. Upon hearing the learned counsel appearing for the parties, this Court is of the view that the issue involved in the present writ petition pertains to rival claims over the title and ownership of the property. This Court, in exercise of its writ jurisdiction, cannot adjudicate disputed questions of fact or determine whether the property belongs to the petitioner or to the private respondents.



W.P.(MD)No.2015 of 2025

7. In the event of there being any rival claims in respect of the property, the appropriate remedy for the parties is to approach the competent Civil Court for adjudication of title. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of, granting liberty to the petitioner to work out his remedy before the Civil Court. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
smn2

(K.SURENDER, J.)
09.12.2025

To:-

- 1.The District Collector,
District Collectorate Office,
Dindigul District.
- 2.The District Revenue Officer,
District Revenue Office,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Thasildar,
Thasildar Office,
Nilakottai Taluk,
Dindigul District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.2015 of 2025

K.SURENDER, J.

smn2

W.P.(MD)No.2015 of 2025

09.12.2025