BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **21.11.2025**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P(MD)No.13339 of 2024

Immanuvel ... Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Revenue Officer cum
Additional District Executive Magistrate,
Ramanthapuram District, Ramanathapuram.

2. The Sub-Collector,
Paramakudi, Ramanthapuram District.

3. The Thasildar,
Kadaladi Taluk, Ramanathapuram District.

4. Theivendiraman

5. Muthuraj

6. Bher Mohamed

7. Rahamadhullah

8. Rahmed Nisha ... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating with the impugned order of the 1st respondent in his proceedings in NiMu.(Pi10)/46733/2020 dated 10.05.2024 and quash the same as illegal and consequently directing the 1st respondent to restore the patta in the name of the Mookandi Kudumban for the property in S.Nos.24/1 and 24/2 in Thanichiyam Revenue Village, Kadaladi Taluk, Ramanathapuram District.

For Petitioner	:	M/s.S.Saravana Kumar
For Respondents	:	Mr.B.Saravanan Additional Government Pleader for R1 to R5 Mr.S.Ramesh for R6 & R7 R8-given up

ORDER

An order dated 10.05.2024 of the District Revenue Officer relegating the parties to the civil court is challenged in this writ petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is giving up the 8th respondent.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner invited my attention to the impugned order and points out that it records that the name of the petitioner's father, Mookandi Kudumban, was reflected in the 1958 Settlement Register. He also points out that the pattadhar's name was registered as Rahmed Nisha in the UDR record relating to S.No.24/2. Therefore, he contends that it is evident that it is an UDR error which should have been rectified by the District Revenue Officer.

3. Learned counsel for respondents 6 and 7 has filed an additional typed set of papers, which includes proceedings dated 07.08.1986 of the Revenue

Inspector. Therefore, he contends that the name of Rahmed Nisha was entered pursuant to the said proceedings and that the said proceedings have not been challenged.

4. The proceedings dated 07.08.1986 were issued by the Revenue Inspector after the entry into force of the Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1983 (the Patta Passbook Act). The Patta Passbook Act entered into force on or about 30.01.1986. Under the Patta Passbook Act, the jurisdiction to issue pattas or make mutations in respect thereof has been vested in the Tahsildar and not the Revenue Inspector. In addition, the proceedings of the Revenue Inspector do not contain any indication as to the basis on which the patta was transferred in the name of Rahmed Nisha. From the order of the District Revenue Officer, it is clear that the pattadhar was Mookandi Kudumban as per the 1958 Settlement Register. In those circumstances, the District Revenue Officer should have examined as to whether there was any link document between Mookandi Kudumban and Rahmed Nisha. Since the District Revenue Officer has not exercised the jurisdiction vested in him, the matter warrants reconsideration.

5. For reasons set out above, the impugned order dated 10.05.2024 is set aside and the matter is remanded to the District Revenue Officer for reconsideration. After providing a reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and

the current pattadhar, a fresh speaking order shall be issued within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

21.11.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
RJR

To

1. The District Revenue Officer cum
Additional District Executive Magistrate,
Ramanthapuram District, Ramanathapuram.

2. The Sub-Collector,
Paramakudi, Ramanthapuram District.

3. The Thasildar,
Kadaladi Taluk, Ramanathapuram District.

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.

RJR

W.P(MD)No.13339 of 2024

21.11.2025