



Rev.Aplw (md)No.58 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 27.06.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BALAJI

Rev.Application Writ.(MD) No.58 of 2025

S.Latha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Collector,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Cheranmahadevi,
Tirunelveli District.
3. The Tahsildhar,
Tisaiyanvilai Taluk,
Tirunelveli District.
4. The Special Tahsildhar,
Tamil Nadu Backward Classes Economic Development Department,
Tirunelveli District.

5. Selvaraj

... Respondents

Prayer: Review Application filed under Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P.C. against the order passed in W.P.(MD).No.5283 of 2025 dated 27.02.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Balakrishnan

For Respondents : Mr.B. Saravanan, AGP



Rev.Aplw (md)No.58 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This review application has been filed against the order passed in W.P. (MD).No.5283 of 2025 dated 27.02.2025.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.Saravanan, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would state that the respondents had resisted the writ petition on the ground that the assignment had already been cancelled and therefore no orders can be passed in the writ petition.

4. Recording the said statement, I had directed the petitioners request to be considered sympathetically and the petitioners were called upon to make a fresh application to the fourth respondent which was directed to be considered on merits and in accordance with law, taking an overall view of the special circumstances of the case.



Rev.Aplw (md)No.58 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. Today the learned counsel for the petitioner states that the assignment has not been cancelled till date and his name also does not reflect in the impugned proceedings.

6. However, Mr.B.Saravanan, the learned Additional Government Pleader inviting the attention of the show cause notice would state that Plot No.99 is mentioned and included in the list of assignments cancelled and admittedly Plot No.99 belongs to writ petitioner. He would therefore state that there is no necessity for any clarification.

7. However, considering the fact that in the impugned proceedings according to the petitioner, the name of the petitioner is not reflected and some other name is reflected, the said objection of the petitioner shall also be taken up for consideration and if the same is found to be true, then the requirement of allotting any other alternate site would not arise. If, however the petitioner's assignment has been cancelled, then the petitioner's fresh application shall be considered along with her explanation as ordered in the writ petition.



Rev.Aplw (md)No.58 of 2025

8. With the above observation this review application is disposed of.

WEB COPY No costs.

27.06.2025

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order / Nonspeaking order
Netrual Citation Case : Yes / No
(rap)



WEB COPY



Rev.Aplw (md)No.58 of 2025

P.B. BALAJI, J.

rap

Rev.Application Writ.(MD) No.58 of 2025

27.06.2025