



Rev.Aplc(MD)No.164 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 14.10.2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN**

**Rev.Aplc(MD)No.164 of 2024
and
C.M.P.(MD)No.18159 of 2024**

1.The Commissioner of Land Reforms,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai – 5.

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

3.The Tahsildar,
Tirumayam Taluk,
Pudukottai District.

... Applicants

-Vs-

1. S.Pitchammal

2. R.Govindasamy

... Respondents

PRAYER: Review Application under Order XLVII Rule 1 and 2 r/w.under
Section 114 of CPC against the judgment dated 10.06.2024 made in W.A.(MD)
No.987 of 2024.

For Applicants : Mr.J.Ravindran



Rev.Aplc(MD)No.164 of 2024

Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.Shaji Bino
Special Government Pleader

For Respondents : Mr.C.Arul Vadivel Sekar,
Senior Counsel

ORDER

*(Order of the Court was made by **R.SURESH KUMAR, J.**)*

This review application has been filed against the judgment passed by us in W.A.(MD)No.987 of 2024, dated 10.06.2024.

2.By the said judgment, we have given the following observations and directions:

“13.The Land Commissioner also has only directed the Revenue Divisional Officer to pass an order instead of sending the report to the Land Commissioner. Therefore, the Land Commissioner need not have any apprehension based on which this Appeal need not have been filed.

14.Therefore, the observation whatever has been made by the learned Judge in the order impugned would not alter the situation, therefore, the Revenue Divisional Officer can pass final orders pursuant to the de novo enquiry already been completed and such an order, he can pass at the



earliest.

15. With these discussion, observation and conclusion, we deem it that this Writ Appeal can be disposed of. Accordingly, it is disposed of. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.”

The aforesaid judgment is sought to be reviewed herein.

3. In support of the review application, Mr.J.Ravindran, learned Additional Advocate General, assisted by Mr.Shaji Bino, learned Special Government Pleader, would submit that even though the Land Commissioner, by his letter dated 08.01.2024, has directed the Revenue Divisional Officer, who is the authorized officer to pass orders on the holdings of the land owner on enquiry and available records, since at paragraph Nos.13 and 14 of the judgment which is sought to be reviewed, it is stated that as directed by the Land Commissioner, orders have to be passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer pursuant to the *de novo* enquiry already completed, the Revenue Divisional Officer might pass orders in favour of the land holders.



Rev.Aplc(MD)No.164 of 2024

4.Heard Mr.J.Ravindran, learned Additional Advocate General, assisted by Mr.Shaji Bino, learned Special Government Pleader for the applicants and Mr.C.Arul Vadivel Sekar, learned Senior Counsel for the respondents.

5.In our considered view, no such interpretation needs to be given to our judgment, especially, at paragraph Nos.13, 14 and 15 of the judgment, which is sought to be reviewed herein.

6.Therefore, we are of the view that the present review application is totally unwarranted as the same has been filed only based on an apprehension without there being any basis.

7.In that view of the matter, the review application is liable to be dismissed and accordingly, it is dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

(R.S.K., J.) (G.A.M., J.)
14.10.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Speaking Order : Yes / No

sli



WEB COPY



Rev.Aplc(MD)No.164 of 2024

**R.SURESH KUMAR, J.
AND
G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.**

sli

**Rev.Aplc(MD)No.164 of 2024
and
C.M.P.(MD)No.18159 of 2024**

14.10.2025