



W.P.(MD) No.19012 of 2025

WEB COPY

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

**DATED : 14.07.2025**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR**

**W.P.(MD)No.19012 of 2025**

R.S.Vimalarani

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The District Collector,  
Tirunelveli District,  
Tirunelveli.
- 2.The District Revenue Officer,  
Tirunelveli, Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Sub Collector,  
Cheranmahadevi, Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Tahsildar,  
Radhapuram Taluk,  
Radhapuram,  
Tirunelveli District.
- 5.Shubh Realty
- 6.Madurai Integrated Textile Park Limited,  
Industrial Complex,  
Thathampatti,  
Vadipatti,  
Madurai District.

7.Lakshmi

... Respondents



W.P.(MD) No.19012 of 2025

WEB COPY

Prayer :- Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the impugned order dated 01.08.2024 as passed by the 3rd respondent under reference Pa.Mu.C.Pa.No/5(12051-2018)/2024/Aa3 and set aside the same as illegal and erroneous and consequently direct the 3rd respondent to cancel the subdivision made as 897/2A1, 897/2A and 897/2A3 as from 897/2A as situated at Udhayathoor Village, Radhapuram Taluk, Tirunelveli District forthwith.

For Petitioner : Mr.Palanivelayutham  
For R1 to R4 : Mr.A.Baskaran  
Additional Government Pleader

### **ORDER**

The writ petition is filed challenging the order passed by the third respondent dismissing the application submitted by the petitioner seeking cancellation of sub division.

2. Against the impugned order passed by the third respondent, the petitioner has got a remedy of revision before the second respondent. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition, when



W.P.(MD) No.19012 of 2025

WEB COPY

petitioner effectively participated in the enquiry before the third respondent and there is no violation of natural justice.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the remedy of revision is barred by limitation. Therefore the petitioner may be permitted to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court.

4. Merely because the petitioner slept over his right and failed to file revision in time, this Court cannot entertain the writ petition. It is for the petitioner to file revision with necessary application for condonation of delay.

5. With the above observation, this writ petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to file a revision before the second respondent.

No costs.

**14.07.2025**

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

pnn



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.19012 of 2025

**S. SOUNTHAR, J.**

pnn

To

- 1.The District Collector,  
Tirunelveli District,  
Tirunelveli.
- 2.The District Revenue Officer,  
Tirunelveli, Tirunelveli District.
- 3.The Sub Collector,  
Cheranmahadevi, Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Tahsildar,  
Radhapuram Taluk,  
Radhapuram,  
Tirunelveli District.

**W.P.(MD) No.19012 of 2025**

**Dated: 14.07.2025**