



W.P(MD)NO.21538 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 07.08.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

W.P(MD)No.21538 of 2025

and

W.M.P(MD)No.16609 of 2025

P.Arumugam @ Mahalakshmi

... Petitioner

.Vs.

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Melur, Madurai District.

3.The Tahsildar,
Melur Taluk,
Madurai District.

4.Asanatha Antony

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the second respondent in her proceedings in Na.Ka.No.5292/2024/ Aa1, dated 21.7.2025 and set aside the same as illegal and arbitrary.

For Petitioner

: Mr.R.Sevugaraja

For Respondents
1 and 2

: Mr.M.Gangatharan
Govt. Advocate



W.P(MD)NO.21538 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

The Writ Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the second respondent cancelling the patta issued in the name of Petitioner and restoration of the same in the name of Petitioner's husband Pandi Narayanan, son of Narayanan.

2.Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed before this Court.

3.It is not in dispute that the property situate in S.No. 113/1A1, Old S.No.113/1A1, T.S.No.10, Melur Town, Madurai District originally belongs to the Petitioner's husband Pandi Narayanan, he having purchased the same under sale deed, dated 13.01.2006. The said Pandi Narayanan is no more and after his death, revenue records mutated in favour of Petitioner. Aggrieved by the same, the third respondent herein filed an application before the first respondent seeking cancellation of patta issued in the name of Petitioner and issuance of patta in the name of her daughter Anjali Janaki, based on the 'Will' executed by Pandi Narayanan. The said application was allowed by the first respondent and patta in the name of Petitioner was cancelled and the same was restored in the name of Pandi Narayanan.



W.P(MD)NO.21538 of 2025

Aggrieved by the said order, the Petitioner has come before this Court with the present Writ Petition for the relief stated supra.

4.The learned counsel for the Petitioner vehemently submitted that the Will relied on by the third respondent is very much under challenge in a civil suit filed by the Petitioner in O.S.No.177 of 2024, on the file of District Munsif Court, Melur and hence, the first respondent ought not to have passed the impugned order. The learned counsel for the Petitioner further submits that the third respondent, who is claiming herself as second wife of Pandi Narayanan, has no locus-standi to maintain the application before the Revenue Authorities under the Will relied on by her, which is in favour of her daughter Anjali Janaki.

5.A perusal of the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition and the typed-set of papers would indicate that the subject property was purchased by Pandi Narayanan by registered sale deed on 13.1.2006.The third respondent herein claims that the above said Pandi Narayanan executed a Will in favour of her only daughter Anjali Janaki bequeathing the subject property in her favour and suppressing the same, after the death of Pandi Narayanan, the Petitioner got mutated the revenue records in his name. The Will relied on by the third respondent is



W.P(MD)NO.21538 of 2025

WEB COPY

very much under challenge in the civil suit filed by the Petitioner in O.S.No.177 of 2024. The validity of the Will relied on by the Petitioner has to be decided by the civil Court in the pending civil litigation. Even in the absence of Will, the above said Anjali Janaki, in her capacity as daughter of Pandi Narayanan, is entitled to get exclusive patta in her name.

6. In such circumstances, I do not find any error in the order passed by the first respondent cancelling the exclusive patta issued in the name of Petitioner and restoring the same in the name of Pandi Narayanan, pending disposal of civil litigation. In the impugned order, the first respondent has observed that after the disposal of the civil litigation, the parties are at liberty to approach the revenue authorities seeking mutation of revenue records. Therefore, the right of the petitioner was very well protected by the impugned order.

7. Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed, with liberty to the Parties to move the revenue authorities seeking mutation of revenue records based on the Civil Court's findings. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.



W.P(MD)NO.21538 of 2025

07.08.2025

WEB COPY
NCS : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

vsn

To

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Melur, Madurai District.

3.The Tahsildar,
Melur Taluk,
Madurai District.

S.SOUNTHAR.,J.

vsn

ORDER MADE IN

W.P(MD)No.21538 of 2025
and
W.M.P(MD)No.16609 of 2025

5/6



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)NO.21538 of 2025

07.08.2025