



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 26.09.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.B. BALAJI

WMP(MD).No.14460 of 2025

in WP(MD).No.6654 of 2025

1.R.Karuppasamy
2.Ragupathy
3.Sornam
4.Sivabal

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.N.Nallachamy

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Palani Taluk, Dindugal District.

3.The Tahsildar,
Ottanchathiram Taluk,
Dindugal District.

Respondent(s)

Prayer: Civil Miscellaneous Petition filed to recall the order dated
12.03.2025 in W.P(MD).No.6654 of 2025.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Suriya Narayanan



ORDER

The Writ Miscellaneous Petition has been filed to recall the order dated 12.03.2025 in W.P(MD).No.6654 of 2025.

2.Despite service of notice on the 1st respondent/writ petitioner, there is no appearance on his behalf. I have heard Mr.R.Suriya Narayanan, learned counsel for the petitioner.

3.The writ petition was filed by the 1st respondent herein seeking for issuance of a writ of mandamus to direct the 1st respondent/RDO in the writ petition to consider the petitioner's representation dated 09.01.2025 to cancel the patta in respect of S.Nos.415/2A, 415/2B, 2C and 2D to an extent of 9 acres and 78 cents at Ottanchathiram Village, Dindigul District.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the present petitioners were not made parties to the said writ petition. The writ petition was disposed of, directing the 1st respondent/RDO in the writ petition to hear the interested parties and pass orders on merits. However, it is now brought to my notice by the present petitioners, numbering 4, who are third parties to the writ petition that an earlier attempt was made by the writ



WEB COPY

petitioner, seeking cancellation of the patta issued to the petitioner and the RDO has also rejected the said request and directed the writ petitioner to approach the competent Civil Court. The learned counsel for the petitioners would further state that if at all the writ petitioner was aggrieved by the said order, he ought to have preferred an appeal before the DRO concerned. However, without doing so and especially, after having filed a civil suit and suffered a decree of dismissal and pending appeal in A.S.No.27 of 2024 before the Sub-Court, Ottanchathiram, the petitioner has given a representation to the RDO and Tahsildar and in order to dispose of the said representation, the writ petition came to be filed. The 1st respondent/writ petitioner has suppressed these material facts which are now brought to the Court's notice by way of the writ miscellaneous petition.

5. In view of the above and the fact that the 1st respondent/writ petitioner's request of cancellation of the petitioner's patta was already rejected by the RDO, I am inclined to recall the order dated 12.03.2025 in W.P(MD)No.6654 of 2025. It shall be open to the 1st respondent/writ petitioner to either approach the DRO, if permissible, in accordance with law or workout his remedy in pending A.S.No.27 of 2024 before the Sub-Court, Ottanchathiram.



6.In fine, the Writ Miscellaneous Petition is ordered. The order dated 12.03.2025 in W.P(MD)No.6654 of 2025 is recalled. No costs.

26.09.2025

ata

To

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Palani Taluk, Dindugal District.

2.The Tahsildar,
Ottanchathiram Taluk,
Dindugal District.

WMP(MD).No.14460 of 2025
in WP(MD).No.6654 of 2025