



W.P(MD)No. 30624 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 30.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P(MD)No.30624 of 2025

Mohan

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Sub-Collector,
Sub-Collector Office,
Musiri,
Trichy District.

2.The Thasildar,
Musiri Taluk Office,
Musiri,
Trichy District.

3.Manivannan

4.Sankar

... 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 pertaining to the impugned order of the 1st respondent vide his proceedings in Pa.Mu.A1/6286/2023 dated 09.09.2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the 1st respondent to issue patta in favour of the petitioner in respect of the Survey no.

1/5



W.P(MD)No. 30624 of 2025

123/2A1 for an extent of 0.19.00 Ares which is situated at M.Pudupatti
West Revenue Village, Musiri Taluk, Trichy District.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Arunraj

For R1 & R2 : Mr.B.Saravanan
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The petitioner assails an order dated 09.09.2025 of the Revenue Divisional Officer rejecting the request of the third respondent herein to cancel the patta and instead directing the three rival claimants to approach the jurisdictional civil court.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that patta Nos.1480 and 1926 were issued in the name of the petitioner in respect of survey Nos.123/2A2 and 123/2A3, respectively. He submits that the third survey number, being the survey No.123/2A1, was wrongly issued in the name of the fourth respondent and his family. Without appreciating these aspects, learned counsel contends that the impugned order was issued.



W.P(MD)No. 30624 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. Learned Additional Government Pleader accepts notice for respondents 1 and 2. He submits that the third parties concerned were heard in detail and all material documents were examined before issuing the impugned order. Therefore, he submits that no case is made out for interference.

4. On perusal of the order, it is noticeable that the petitioner, Manivannan's statement, the first respondent, Mohan's statement, the second respondent, Shankar's statement, and the report of the surveyor were taken into consideration. Thereafter, it was noticed that the parties concerned are tracing their title from Periyammal, who was the pattadar as per UDR records. After noticing that the death certificates of Periyammal were submitted and that such death certificates indicated different dates of death, the Revenue Divisional Officer directed the parties to approach the jurisdictional civil court. I find no infirmity in the order warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution.

5. Therefore, by leaving it open to the petitioner to either approach



W.P(MD)No. 30624 of 2025

the District Revenue Officer by way of revision or approach the jurisdictional civil court, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

NCS : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
apd

30.10.2025

To

1.The Sub-Collector,
Sub-Collector Office,
Musiri,
Trichy District.

2.The Thasildar,
Musiri Taluk Office,
Musiri,
Trichy District.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No. 30624 of 2025

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY.,J.

apd

ORDER MADE IN

W.P(MD)No. 30624 of 2025

30.10.2025