



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 12.11.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P.(MD)No.31912 of 2025

Rajeshwari

...Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Collector,
Pudukottai,
Pudukottai District.

2. The District Revenue Officer,
Pudukottai.

3. The Tahsildar,
Kulathoor Taluk,
Pudukottai District.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the 2nd respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 01.04.2025 and rectify the UDR register mutating the patta in her name with respect to the property in Sy.No.288/1A, Vellanur Village, Kulathoor Taluk and Pudukottai District within the time stipulated by this court.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Balakrishnan

For Respondents : Mr.B.Saravanan
Additional Government Pleader



ORDER

WEB COPY

By relying on unregistered sale deed dated 09.02.2018, the petitioner had submitted a representation dated 01.04.2025 to rectify an alleged UDR error by mutating the patta in the name of the petitioner. This writ petition relates thereto.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner purchased the property in S.No.288/1A from one Govindharasu. Since the patta stands in the name of one Kanagaraj, who has no connection with the property, she states that a representation for rectification of the UDR register was submitted.

3. Learned Additional Government Pleader accepts notice for all the respondents. On the basis of written instructions from the Tasildar, he submits that the pattadhar is Kanagaraj and that the said Kanagaraj has not conveyed the property to any person as per records.

4. In the affidavit in support of the writ petition, the petitioner has admitted that she purchased the property from one Govindharasu under an unregistered sale deed. Under the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, no immovable property of the value exceeding Rs.100/- may be transferred except by way of registered instrument. Assuming that the petitioner has paid valuable



consideration towards the purported purchase, the remedy for the petitioner would be to seek recovery of such amount from the vendor. Apart from this aspect, it is also noticeable that there is nothing in the affidavit to support the assertion that there was a UDR error.

5. For the above reasons, the relief claimed by the petitioner cannot be granted. Therefore, this writ petition is dismissed without any order as to costs by leaving it open to the petitioner to initiate action for recovery against the said Govindharasu.

12.11.2025

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

To

1. The District Collector,
Pudukottai,
Pudukottai District.
2. The District Revenue Officer,
Pudukottai.
3. The Tahsildar,
Kulathoor Taluk,
Pudukottai District.



WEB COPY



SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.

RJR

W.P.(MD)No.31912 of 2025

12.11.2025