



W.P.(MD)No.28803 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED :05.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P.(MD)No.28803 of 2025

and

WMP (MD) Nos.22397 & 22402 of 2025

P.Pichai

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Additional Magistrate,
Collectorate,
Madurai District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Madurai East Taluk,
Othakkadai,
Madurai.

3. The Tahsildar,
Madurai East Taluk,
Othakkadai,
Madurai District.

4. The Village Administrative Officer,
Arumbanoor 2nd Bit Revenue Village,
Madurai East Taluk,
Madurai District.

5. K.Manikandan

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India



W.P.(MD)No.28803 of 2025

praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus seeking to call for the records relating to the impugned proceedings of the 1st respondent / the District Revenue Officer / Additional Magistrate, Madurai District in Ni.Mu.No.38159/2016/G5 dated 29.12.2017 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents 1 to 4 to retain the revenue records including patta in respect of land in Sy.No.62/5 (admeasuring 20 cents), Arumbanoor II bit Revenue Village Madurai East Taluk, Madurai District in the name of the writ petitioner in patta No. 522.

For Petitioner :Mr.N.Dilipkumar

For Respondents :Mr.P.Thambidurai
Government Advocate for R1 to R4
R5 - No appearance

ORDER

An order dated 29.12.2017 of the District Revenue Officer is challenged, *inter alia*, on the ground that notice was not issued to the petitioner, and, therefore, the petitioner was deprived of a reasonable opportunity to contest the matter.

2. Notice sent to the fifth respondent was returned unserved with the endorsement "refused". Therefore, the matter is proceeded with in the absence of the said respondent.



W.P.(MD)No.28803 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The petitioner traces title to the land in Survey No.62/5, admeasuring about 20 cents from one Chinnapukam Picha Konar. By relying on sale deed dated 09.02.2026 (Document No.305 of 1926), learned counsel submits that the land was sold by the original owner to Akkini Veeranan Ambalam. Under an unregistered partition, it is stated that land was allotted to Malayandi Ambalam, who is one of the sons of Akkini Veeranan Ambalam. Thereafter, under sale deed dated 09.02.1985, it is stated that the petitioner purchased the land.

4. Learned counsel contends that the fifth respondent was aware of the petitioner's correct address, but had provided a wrong address to the office of the District Revenue Officer. Consequently, he contends that the petitioner was unable to place on record, the above-mentioned sale deeds as also the judgment and decree in O.S.No.199 of 2003 dismissing the said suit filed by the father of the fifth respondent. In the absence of material documents, learned counsel contends that the District Revenue Officer arrived at an erroneous conclusion.

5. Learned Government Advocate submits that it is recorded in the order that the petitioner and the pattadhar had participated in the final



6. The impugned order sets out the address of the petitioner as under:

Thiru.P.Pichai

S/o.P.Periasamy Ambalam

Y.Kodikulam (Post), Madurai East Taluk,

Madurai.

7. This address does not tally with the address in the cause title of the petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that it does not tally with the cause title in the suit also. In the affidavit in support of the writ petition, it is expressly stated in paragraph 12 thereof that the fifth respondent was aware of the correct address and that all proceedings and inquiries were conducted by the District Revenue Officer behind the back of the petitioner.

8. On perusal of the impugned order, the contentions of parties have not been set out therein. The discussion does not make any reference to the title documents relied on by the petitioner in these



W.P.(MD)No.28803 of 2025

proceedings. While the suit (O.S.No.199 of 2003) is referred to therein, the fact that such suit was dismissed has not been taken note of. All these facts and circumstances support the contention of the petitioner that the order was issued without hearing the petitioner. Therefore, this order cannot be sustained and is set aside. The matter is consequently remanded to the District Revenue Officer for reconsideration. After providing a reasonable opportunity to the petitioner and the fifth respondent, a fresh order shall be issued within four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. All contentions are kept open for the rival parties in the remanded proceedings.

9. Accordingly, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

05.11.2025

NCC :No
Internet :Yes
Index :No
PKN



W.P.(MD)No.28803 of 2025

To

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Additional Magistrate,
Collectorate,
Madurai District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Madurai East Taluk,
Othakkadai,
Madurai.

3. The Tahsildar,
Madurai East Taluk,
Othakkadai,
Madurai District.

4. The Village Administrative Officer,
Arumbanoor 2nd Bit Revenue Village,
Madurai East Taluk,
Madurai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.28803 of 2025

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.

PKN

W.P.(MD)No.28803 of 2025

05.11.2025