



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 16.10.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P.(MD)No.22368 of 2023

and

W.M.P(MD)No.18645 of 2023

Jayashankar

...Petitioner

Vs

1. The Chief Secretary to Government,
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai.
2. The District Collector ,
O/o. the District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The District Revenue Officer,
O/o. the District Revenue Officer,
Ramanathapuram District.
4. The Special Tahsildar,
O/o. the Special Tahsildar,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Ramanathapuram District.
5. The Special Officer,
O/o. the Special Officer,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Ramanathapuram District.

...Respondents



PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records pertaining to the order passed by the respondent No.4 in Na.Ka. No.2529/86 dated 30.10.1990 and quash the same as illegal in the light of the order passed by the respondent No.5 in Na.Ka. No.2/32636/2022 dated 00.07.2022.

For Petitioner : Mr.SMA.Jinnah
For Respondents : Mr.M.Muthumanikkam
Government Advocate

ORDER

An order dated 30.10.1990 is challenged in this writ petition.

2.Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the lands of the petitioner were acquired under the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Land for Harijan Welfare Schemes Act(Act 31 of 1978). In spite of the lapse of several decades, it is stated that the lands have not been put to use. Therefore, by challenging the impugned order, the petitioner seeks reconveyance.

3.Learned Government Advocate opposes the petition by referring to the award and pointing out that the revenue records have been mutated in favour of the Government. He also points out that the compensation amount has been



deposited. In support of the contention that reconveyance is not permissible, learned Special Government Pleader relies upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in W.A(MD)No.1663 of 2010, *The Government of Tamil Nadu and others Vs. Panayamma and others*, judgment dated 24.04.2015, wherein it was held that there is no provision for reconveyance under Act 31 of 1978.

4.The record discloses that the acquisition proceedings were duly concluded and an award was issued. The RTI reply also reflects that the compensation amount was deposited. The Division Bench of this court concluded that Act 31 of 1978 does not provide for reconveyance. In these circumstances, there is no infirmity in the order. Therefore, this writ petition is disposed of by leaving it open to the petitioner to claim compensation in accordance with law. No costs. Consequently, connected writ miscellaneous petition is also closed.

16.10.2025

3/4

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
RJR



To

1. The Chief Secretary to Government,
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai.
2. The District Collector ,
O/o. the District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The District Revenue Officer,
O/o. the District Revenue Officer,
Ramanathapuram District.
4. The Special Tahsildar,
O/o. the Special Tahsildar,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Ramanathapuram District.
5. The Special Officer,
O/o. the Special Officer,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.

RJR

W.P.(MD)No.22368 of 2023

16.10.2025

3/4