



W.A.(MD) No.1189 of 2025

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 12.06.2025

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA
and
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

W.A.(MD) No.1189 of 2025

V.Velayautham

... Appellant

-VS-

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Pudukottai and District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Pudukottai and District.

... Respondents

Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent to set aside the impugned order passed in WP(MD)No.19933 of 2020 dated 01.07.2022 on the file of this Court.

For Appellants : Mr.K.Balasundaram, Senior Counsel
for KBS Law Office

For Respondents : Mr.B.Ramanathan
Additional Government Pleader



W.A.(MD) No.1189 of 2025

WEB COPY

J U D G M E N T

[Judgment of the Court was made by A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.]

This writ appeal is directed against the order of the learned Single Judge, dated 01.07.2022, passed in WP(MD) No.19933 of 2020.

2. The appellant / writ petitioner has suffered an adverse order at the hands of the Sub Collector, Pudukottai, on 23.02.2004. He had filed a revision before the District Revenue Officer, Pudukottai, challenging the order against him after a lapse of 15 years. The authority finding that the revision was filed after a long period, had dismissed the same. Questioning the same, the appellant had preferred W.P(MD)No. 19933 of 2020. The learned Single Judge holding that the approach of the 1st respondent cannot be faulted and also holding that any entry made in the revenue record is not decisive of one's title, had dismissed the writ petition. The learned Single Judge also held that it is always open to the appellant to move the jurisdictional Civil Court and claim appropriate



W.A.(MD) No.1189 of 2025

WEB COPY

relief. Challenging the same, this writ appeal is filed by the writ petitioner.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant would submit that the appellant is aged about 74 years and he was taking treatment for the heart ailment and thereby he was unable to file the revision within time. Further, the impugned order in the writ petition was also not served on him.

4. Per contra, the learned Additional Government Pleader who takes notice for the respondents 1 and 2 would submit that the appellant is a party to the proceedings and therefore he cannot claim that he was not aware of the order. Further, the revision was filed after 15 years and based on the impugned order in the writ petition, the other party is in possession of the subject property.



W.A.(MD) No.1189 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. In reply, learned counsel for the appellant would submit that the appellant is in possession of the subject property.

6. If it is so, it is always open to the appellant to move the Jurisdictional Civil Court and claim appropriate relief. We do not find any infirmity in the order passed by the learned Judge. It is made clear that the Civil Court shall proceed with the matter without being influenced by the orders passed by the revenue authorities as well as this Court.

7. Accordingly, this Writ Appeal is dismissed. No costs.

[A.D.J.C., J.] [R.P., J.]
12.06.2025

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No



W.A.(MD) No.1189 of 2025

WEB COPY bala

To

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Pudukottai and District.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Pudukottai and District.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD) No.1189 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.
AND
R.POORNIMA, J.

bala

JUDGMENT MADE IN
W.A(MD)No.1189 of 2025
DATED : 12.06.2025