BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :17.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P.(MD)No.32766 of 2025
and
WMP (MD) Nos.25837 & 25838 of 2025

A. Muhammad Ali Jinnah ... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Revenue Officer
Office of the District Revenue Office
Thiruchirapalli District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Srirangam
Thiruchirappalli District.

3. The Tahsildar
Mannaparai
Thiruchirapalli District. ... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent herein in the proceedings in Na.Ka.Aa 5/30688/2022 dated 11.12.2024 and quash the same as illegal by allowing this petition and further directing the respondents to issue the patta with respect to petition mentioned property within in a time stipulated by this Honble Court.

For Petitioner :Mr.J.Barathan
for Ms.Shabana M F

For Respondents :Mr.B.Saravanan
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

An order dated 11.12.2024 of the District Revenue Officer is assailed in this writ petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner purchased lands in Survey No.19/5 of the extent of 12 cents and lands in Survey No.19/6 of the extent of 9 cents from one Radha under sale deed bearing Document No.6338 of 2021 and subsequent rectification deed bearing Document No.7674 of 2021 and consent document bearing Document No.3008 of 2022.

3. Learned counsel submits that the District Revenue Officer erroneously concluded that the land is sarkar poramboke without duly appreciating land tenures. By referring to the definition of 'Government Land' under Section 3 of the Tamil Nadu Survey and Boundaries Act 1923, he submits that the said expression has been used to apply to any

land that does not fall within the definition of 'State' under the said statute. In other words, his contention is that the said expression applies to lands in respect of which land revenue was collected directly by the Government as opposed to being collected through intermediaries. In support of this contention, learned counsel also referred to and relied upon G.O.(Ms) No.221, Revenue and Disaster Management Department, Survey and Settlement Wing, SS-II Section, dated 04.05.2023. By drawing reference to the discussion under classification of land as Government vs. Ryotwari in the said circular, he points out that the Commissioner of Land Administration has recorded that the term 'Government' does not indicate ownership but only the tenure wherein the Government directly collected land revenue from the cultivator as opposed to land tenure systems involving intermediaries such as Inamdar. He also draws reference to the registration of land as Government Dry and Government Wetland in that context.

4. In this context, by referring to the impugned order, learned counsel submits that the District Revenue Officer erroneously relied on the 1927 'A' register classification of GD to conclude that the land should be registered as 'Sarkar Poramboke'. According to learned counsel, this is

based on a complete misconception of the evolution of land tenures.

5. Learned Additional Government Pleader accepts notice on behalf of all the respondents. He submits that the impugned order was issued after noticing that the lands were classified as 'Government Dry' lands in the 1927 'A' register.

6. On perusal of the impugned order, it is noticeable that starting from the SLR, the land is classified as 'Ryotwari Punja land', albeit it is shown as 'Tharisu' in the remarks column. The encumbrance certificate relating to the property shows the flow of title from the original owner G.S.Nandan all the way through to the petitioner. In the operative paragraphs of the order, it is noticeable that the District Revenue Officer was largely influenced by the classification of land as 'Government Dry' in the 1927 'A' register. By construing the said classification as a reference to the land being owned by the government, the impugned order was issued. While drawing such conclusions, the District Revenue Officer has not taken note of the evolution of land tenure, as described in G.O.(Ms) No.221, dated 04.05.2023. Therefore, the matter requires reconsideration.

7. For that purpose, the impugned order is required to be set aside. Therefore, by setting aside the impugned order, the matter is remanded for reconsideration by the District Revenue Officer. After providing a reasonable opportunity to the petitioner, a speaking order shall be issued within thre months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Before issuing such order, the District Revenue Officer shall take note of the basis for classification of lands as 'Government Dry and Government Wetlands' in revenue records, such as the 1927 'A' register.

8. This writ petition is disposed of on these terms. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

17.11.2025

NCC :No
Internet :Yes
Index :No
PKN

To
1. The District Revenue Officer
Office of the District Revenue Office
Thiruchirapalli District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Srirangam
Thiruchirappalli District.

3. The Tahsildar
Mannaparai
Thiruchirapalli District.

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.

PKN

W.P.(MD)No.32766 of 2025

17.11.2025