



W.P.(MD)No.18768 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 23.07.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

W.P.(MD).No.18768 of 2025
and
W.M.P(MD).No.14403 of 2025

R.Rajasekar

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Tahsildar,
Vedasandur Taluk,
Dindigul District.

... Respondent

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 to the impugned order passed by the respondent vide SMS dated 16-05-2025 rejecting my online Application No. 2025/0103/13/375257 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent to Mutate the Joint Patta by including the petitioner's name in the Joint Patta based upon the petitioner's application dated 30-04-2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Azhagesh

For Respondents : Mrs.K.Malathi
Additional Government Pleader



W.P.(MD)No.18768 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

The writ petition is filed challenging the order passed by the respondent rejecting the patta transfer application filed by the petitioner by SMS.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the impugned order was passed by the respondent without conducting any enquiry and affording a reasonable opportunity to the petitioner. Therefore, the same is vitiated by violation of principles of natural justice.

3. The respondent herein filed an affidavit dated 22.07.2025 admitting that the application of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that he failed to produce the supporting documents and SMS was sent to the petitioner on 17.05.2025, rejecting the application.

4. It is also stated in the affidavit filed by the respondent that after filing of the writ petition, a speaking order was passed on 13.07.2025. Therefore, from the averments found in the affidavit filed by the



W.P.(MD)No.18768 of 2025

WEB COPY

respondent, it is clear that the detailed speaking order was passed by the respondent only after impugned SMS that too after filing of the writ petition. Even though it is stated in the counter affidavit that Village Administrative Officer (VAO) called the petitioner to produce the supporting documents but the petitioner failed to do so, the respondent has not produced any documents to show that notice was issued to the petitioner called upon him to produce the supporting documents.

5. In such circumstances, the impugned order passed by the respondent is vitiated by violation of principles of natural justice. Accordingly, the same is set aside and the matter is remitted to the file of the respondent with a direction to consider the same afresh in the light of the supporting documents to be submitted by the petitioner. The petitioner is directed to submit all the supporting documents before the respondent within a period of two (2) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The application of the petitioner shall be considered in the light of the supporting documents to be submitted by the petitioner and final order shall be passed within a further period of eight (8) weeks.



W.P.(MD)No.18768 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. With these directions, the writ petition is allowed. No costs.

Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

23.07.2025

NCC :yes/No
Index :yes/No
Internet:yes/No
rgm



W.P.(MD)No.18768 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

The Tahsildar,
Vedasandur Taluk,
Dindigul District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.18768 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

rgm

W.P.(MD).No.18768 of 2025
and
W.M.P(MD).No.14403 of 2025

23.07.2025