



WEB COPY



1

W.A.(MD)NO.1333 OF 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 03.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

W.A.(MD)No.1333 of 2025 AND

C.M.P.(MD)No.8128 of 2025

V.Malaichamy

... Appellant/ 4th Respondent

Vs.

1. All India Islamic Foundation,
Rep. by its Secretary,
Buhari Towers, Ground Floor,
4, Moores Road,
Chennai – 600 006. ... Respondent No.1/Writ petitioner
2. The District Collector,
O/o.the District Collector,
Madurai.
3. The District Revenue Officer,
O/o.the District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
4. The Tahsildar,
Madurai North Taluk,
Madurai District. ... Respondents 1 to 3 / Respondents 1 to 3



Prayer: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent, to allow the writ appeal and set aside the order in W.P.(MD)No.1673 of 2025 dated 12.03.2025 on the file of this Court.

For Appellant : Mr.C.Ezhilarasu

For R-1 : Mr.B.Saravanan,
Senior counsel,
for M/s.Ajmal Associates.

For R-2 to R-4 : Mr.N.Satheesh Kumar,
Additional Government Pleader.

* * *

J U D G M E N T

(Order of the Court was delivered by G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.)

Heard both sides.

2. This writ appeal is directed against the order dated 12.03.2025 made in W.P.(MD)No.1673 of 2025. The said writ petition was filed by the first respondent herein challenging the proceedings dated 27.11.2024 passed by the District Revenue Officer, Madurai in favour of the appellant herein.

3. The learned single Judge had taken note of the fact that there are too many contentious aspects involving the question of title and



therefore, in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court reported in **2011 (5) CTC 94 (Vishwas Footwear Company Ltd., Vs. The District Collector, Kancheepuram)**, the revenue authority cannot go into the same.

4. We are of the view that the approach adopted by the learned single Judge cannot be faulted. It is also to be seen that the writ petitioner / first respondent herein had purchased the disputed property way back in the year 1996 and that the sale deed was registered in the year 1997. Patta was also mutated in favour of the writ petitioner nearly thirty years ago. It is for this reason, the learned single Judge called upon the appellant herein to move the jurisdictional civil Court to establish his rights. The order impugned in the writ appeal cannot be faulted. This writ appeal stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

(G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.) & (K.RAJASEKAR, J.)
3rd June 2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes/ No
PMU



WEB COPY



4

W.A.(MD)NO.1333 OF 2025

G.R.SWAMINATHAN,J.

AND

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

PMU

To:

1. The District Collector,
O/o.the District Collector,
Madurai.
2. The District Revenue Officer,
O/o.the District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
3. The Tahsildar,
Madurai North Taluk,
Madurai District.

W.A.(MD)No.1333 of 2025

03.06.2025



WEB COPY



5

W.A.(MD)NO.1333 OF 2025