



W.P(MD)No.22617 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 20.08.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

Writ Petition(MD)No.22617 of 2025

Ramakrishnan

..Petitioner

Vs

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer
Pudukkottai,
Pudukkottai District.

2.The Tahsildar,
Taluk Office,
Thirumayam Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.

..Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent in No. 2025/0105/22/291254 dated 30.07.2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to transfer Patta in the name of the petitioner in respect of the property comprised in Survey No.11/10 to an extend of 334.44 Sq.Mt situated at Kottur village, Thirumayam Taluk, Pudukkottai District,by considering the petitioner's representation dated 26.05.2025 within the time frame that may be fixed by this court.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Balasubramanian
For Respondents : Mr.D.S.Nedunchezian
Govt. Advocate



W.P(MD)No.22617 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The writ petition has been filed challenging the order of the second respondent, whereby the petitioner's application seeking transfer of patta in respect of the property comprised in Survey No.11/10, situated at Kottur Village, Thirumayam Taluk, Pudukkottai District, was rejected.

2. Heard the arguments of Mr.E.Balasubramanian, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Mr.D.S.Nedunchezian, learned Government Advocate, for the respondents. By consent of both sides, this writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. According to the petitioner, he purchased the property from one Arumugam under a registered sale deed dated 26.05.2025 and, thereafter, submitted an application before the second respondent on the same day seeking transfer of patta. However, the said application was rejected by the second respondent without conducting any enquiry or affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. Aggrieved by the said rejection, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of the present writ petition.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner mainly assails the impugned order on the ground that it has been passed without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.



W.P(MD)No.22617 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. The learned Government Advocate, who takes notice for the respondents, submits that there is a serious title dispute in respect of the property for which the petitioner sought transfer of patta and, therefore, his application was rejected. The learned Government Advocate also fairly submits that the impugned order was passed without conducting an enquiry or affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

6. Since the impugned order has been passed without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, the same is liable to be set aside. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the second respondent is set aside. The matter is remitted to the file of the second respondent with a direction to consider the petitioner's application dated 26.05.2025 and pass a fresh order on its own merits, after affording reasonable opportunity to the petitioner as well as other interested parties, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

20.08.2025

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



W.P(MD)No.22617 of 2025

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Pudukkottai,
Pudukkottai District.
- 2.The Tahsildar,
Taluk Office,
Thirumayam Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.22617 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

skn

Writ Petition(MD)No.22617 of 2025

20.08.2025