



W.P.(MD).No.12131 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 14.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

W.P.(MD).No.12131 of 2025

V.Rengapandishwari

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The District Collector,
Collector Office Campus,
Dindigul District.
- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
RDO Office,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Nilakkottai Taluk,
Dindigul District.
- 4.The Village Administrative Officer,
Sithargalnatham Village,
Nilakkottai Taluk,
Dindigul District.

5.K.Murugan

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent No.1 to issue necessary direction to the respondent Nos.2 and 3 for cancellation of the said three pattas which issued by the 2nd respondent in the name of the respondent No.5 vide in



Patta Nos.4066, 4323 and 1960, based on the petitioner's representation given on 25.03.2025 to the respondent No.1.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.S.Murugan


For R-1 to R-4 : Mr.D.S.Nedunchezian
Government Advocate

For R-5 : Mr.S.Sivakumar

ORDER

The Writ Petition is filed seeking a direction to the first respondent to issue necessary direction to the respondents 2 and 3 for cancellation of three pattas issued by the second respondent in the name of the fifth respondent in Patta Nos.4066, 4323 and 1960 by considering the petitioner's representation dated 25.03.2025.

2. According to the petitioner, the subject property belonged to her maternal grandfather, Nagul Naidu. The petitioner is also entitled to a share in the subject property. However, the revenue documents had been mutated in favour of Nagul Naidu's grandson, Murugan, namely, the fifth respondent herein. Hence, the petitioner submitted instant representation dated 25.03.2025 seeking cancellation of patta issued in the name of the fifth respondent. The same has not been considered. Hence, the petitioner has come before this Court.



W.P.(MD).No.12131 of 2025

3. The contesting fifth respondent filed counter affidavit and submitted that after the death of Nagul Naidu, his sons, Kuppusamy, Perumal and Ramaiah partitioned the property and enjoyed the property by mutating the revenue records. The partition was very well known to the mother of the petitioner, Chinnaponnu and during her life time, she did not raise any objection. The fifth respondent also produced the patta issued in the name of his father, Kuppusamy, in Patta No.550 and pattas issued in the name of Kuppusamy's brothers, namely, Perumal and Ramaiah in respect of separate portion of the lands.

4. Whether there was a valid partition in the family, whether it was admitted and accepted by the petitioner's mother and whether the petitioner's mother was ousted from the subject property, these are all the questions, which can be considered only by the Civil Court. It appears that the revenue records had been mutated long back in favour of the father of the fifth respondent as early as 2003. In these circumstances, this Court is not inclined to issue any direction to the official respondents to consider the representation submitted by the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. The dismissal of the Writ Petition will not come in the way of the petitioner in filing a civil suit



W.P.(MD).No.12131 of 2025

seeking partition of her alleged share in the subject property. There shall be no

order as to costs.

14.07.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Lm

To

- 1.The District Collector,
Collector Office Campus,
Dindigul District.
- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
RDO Office,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Nilakkottai Taluk,
Dindigul District.
- 4.The Village Administrative Officer,
Sithargalnatham Village,
Nilakkottai Taluk,
Dindigul District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).No.12131 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR,J.

Lm

W.P.(MD).No.12131 of 2025

14.07.2025