



W.A.(MD)No.2913 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **15.10.2025**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH**
AND
THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN**

W.A.(MD)No.2913 of 2025

and

C.M.P.(MD)No.16479 and 16481 of 2025

Vijayakumar

...Appellant

/Vs./

1.The District Revenue Officer cum
Additional District Registrar,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Paramakudi, Kamuthi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

3.The Tahsildar,
Kamuthi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

4.The Village Administrative Officer,
Pasumpon Village, Thavasikurichi Group,
Kamuthi Taluk, Ramanathapuram District.

... Respondents

PRAYER:- Writ Appeal - filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, to set aside the order made in W.P.(MD)No.16953 of 2025 dated 24.09.2025 on the file of this Court and allow the writ appeal.



W.A.(MD)No.2913 of 2025

For Appellant : Mr.A.Saravanan
For R1 to R4 : Mr.M.Sarangan
Additional Government Pleader

JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by **C.KUMARAPPAN, J.**)

The present writ appeal has been filed as against the order of the learned Single Judge, dated 24.09.2025, by and which the learned Single Judge directed the writ petitioner to approach the jurisdictional civil Court.

2.The learned counsel for the writ petitioner/appellant would submit that in the revenue records, the classification of Tharisu and Anatheenam was rounded of and in that place, the writ petitioner's father's, vendor name qua Muthuramalinga Thevar is mentioned. Therefore, it is the specific contention of the writ petitioner that the order of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 28.08.2023, impugned in the writ petition, is liable to be interfered with as also the order of the learned Single Judge.

3.Per contra, the learned Additional Government Pleader would contend that the land in Survey No.60/2 was recorded as “Sarkar



W.A.(MD)No.2913 of 2025

poromboke” and “Tharisu” in the SLR and UDR records. Even in the pre-UDR records, the said survey number was recorded as “Tharisu”.

Therefore, the contention of the writ petitioner that the property in question belongs to him is contrary to the revenue records. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the writ appeal.

4.The learned Single Judge after adverting to the arguments on either side has rightly come to the conclusion that there is a disputed facts involved in the present lis and therefore, relegated the parties to approach the jurisdictional civil Court.

5.It is a settled principle of law that whenever there is any disputed facts, it cannot be adjudicated by the writ Court. Having considered such legal position, the learned Single Judge, while disposing the writ petition, have given liberty to the writ petitioner to approach the jurisdictional civil Court. We absolutely, do not find any infirmity in the order of the learned single Judge and we are fully concurring with that views.



W.A.(MD)No.2913 of 2025

6.In the result, this writ appeal stands dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

[A.S.M.J.] & [C.K.J.]
15.10.2025

Index :Yes/No
Internet :Yes
ta

To

- 1.The District Revenue Officer cum
Additional District Registrar,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Paramakudi, Kamuthi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Kamuthi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 4.The Village Administrative Officer,
Pasumpon Village, Thavasikurichi Group,
Kamuthi Taluk, Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)No.2913 of 2025

DR.ANITA SUMANTH, J.
AND
C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

ta

W.A.(MD)No.2913 of 2025

15.10.2025