



W.P(MD)No. 31338 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. 31338 of 2025
and
W.M.P.(MD) No.24531 & 24532 of 2025

Velusamy

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Collector,
O/o.District Collector
Thenkasi District.
2. The District Revenue Officer,
District Revenue Office,
Thenkasi District.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Revenue Divisional Office,
Sankaran Kovil Taluk,
Thenkasi District.
4. The Tasildar,
Thiruvenkadam Taluk Office,
Thenkasi District.
5. The Block Development Officer,
Block Development Office,
Kuruvikulam Union,
Thenkasi District.



W.P(MD)No. 31338 of 2025

6. The Panchayath Secretary,
Office of the Alagapuri Panchayath,
Alagapuri,
Thiruvengadam Taluk,
Thenkasi District.

7. Karuppasamy

... 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 passed by the second respondent vide proceedings in Ni.Mu.COLR/10101/2024-I1 dated 23.09.2025 and quash the same as illegal and consequently, direct the respondent Nos.2 to 4 to issue a patta to the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Ponraj

For Respondents : Mr.B.Saravanan
Additional Government Pleader for R1 to R4
Mr.M.Siddharthan
Additional Government Pleader for R5 & R6

ORDER

The petitioner assails an order dated 23.09.2025 rejecting the request to cancel the patta issued in the name of the seventh respondent in respect of survey No.169/26.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's



W.P(MD)No. 31338 of 2025

father purchased the property in old survey No.97 under a sale deed dated 12.09.1975. He further submits that the seventh respondent purchased the land in survey No.100/1 under a sale deed dated 24.09.1984. Therefore, he submits that the grant of patta to the seventh respondent in respect of survey No.169/26, which corresponds to old survey No.97 was unlawful.

3. Mr.B.Saravanan, learned Additional Government Pleader accepts notice for respondents 1 to 4. Mr.M.Siddharthan, learned Additional Government Pleader accepts notice for respondents 5 and 6. Mr.B.Saravanan, learned Additional Government Pleader refers to the impugned order at page Nos.28 and 29 of the typeset of papers to contend that the order sets out cogent reasons for rejecting the petitioner's request.

4. On perusal of the impugned order, it is noticeable that the revenue records during the pre-UDR period were examined. It was recorded that the old survey No.97 was classified in pre-UDR 'A' Register as 'Sarkar Poramboke'. During the Natham Resettlement



W.P(MD)No. 31338 of 2025

Scheme, the survey number was changed to survey No.169/26 and was classified as 'Sarkar Kalimanai'. Thereafter, in the year 2005, pursuant to the proceedings of the Tahsildar, Sankaran Kovil, it was subdivided as survey Nos.169/26 and 169/34, reclassified as 'Ryot.Manai' and pattas were issued under patta Nos.994 and 995, respectively, to Karuppusamy and Velusamy. After recording that the petitioner did not raise any objections during the subdivision and grant of patta in the year 2005, the District Revenue Officer also referred to the provision for an appeal before the Assistant Settlement Officer with regard to orders passed by the Tahsildar under the Natham Resettlement Scheme. In these circumstances, the request of the petitioner was rejected.

5. The petitioner has failed to produce any revenue records indicating that the petitioner's father was the pattadar pursuant to the purchase under the sale deed dated 12.09.1975. On the contrary, the revenue records reflect that the land was classified as 'Sarkar Poramboku' and 'Sarkar Kalimanai' until the subdivision in 2005. The petition before the District Revenue Officer was submitted by the petitioner on 18.10.2024, which is about 19 years after the subdivision and grant of



W.P(MD)No. 31338 of 2025

patta to the seventh respondent. Considering all these facts and circumstances, I find no infirmity in the impugned order warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution.

6. Therefore, this Writ Petition is dismissed without any order as to costs. This order will not stand in the way of the petitioner approaching the jurisdictional civil court in relation to any title dispute. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

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

05.11.2025

To

1. The District Collector,
O/o.District Collector
Thenkasi District.

2. The District Revenue Officer,
District Revenue Office,
Thenkasi District.

3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Revenue Divisional Office,
Sankaran Kovil Taluk,
Thenkasi District.

5/7



W.P(MD)No. 31338 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. The Tasildar,
Thiruvengkadam Taluk Office,
Thenkasi District.

5. The Block Development Officer,
Block Development Office,
Kuruvikulam Union,
Thenkasi District.

6. The Panchayath Secretary,
Office of the Alagapuri Panchayath,
Alagapuri,
Thiruvengadam Taluk,
Thenkasi District.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No. 31338 of 2025

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY.,J.

apd

ORDER MADE IN

W.P(MD)No. 31338 of 2025

05.11.2025