



W.P.(MD)No.33256 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED :20.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P.(MD)No.33256 of 2025

and

WMP (MD) Nos.26242 & 26245 of 2025

K.Shobana

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

3. The Tahsildar,
Mudhukulathur,
Ramanathapuram District.

4. N.Ramamoorthy

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorari to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the 2nd Respondent vide his proceedings in Pa.Mu.(A4)/6202/2022 dated 31.08.2023 and quash the same as illegal.



W.P.(MD)No.33256 of 2025

For Petitioner : Ms.R.Affrin Fathima
M/s.Ajmal Associates
For Respondents :Mr.P.Thambidurai
Government Advocate for R1 to R3

ORDER

An order dated 31.08.2023 of the Revenue Divisional Officer is challenged in this writ petition on the ground that the petitioner is a person interested in the relevant property, but the petitioner was not heard.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's grandfather, Arumugam, allotted the property in Survey No.328/2A, 328/3A and 328/6A in favour of the petitioner's father K.Pugalendhi and his brother K.Gunasekaran. According to the petitioner, K.A.Karuppannan, has no nexus to the property. It is also stated that since notice was issued only to Karuppannan, the petitioner was unaware about the order until the year 2025. This is submitted by way of explanation for challenging the order belatedly.



W.P.(MD)No.33256 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. Learned Government Advocate accepts notice for respondents 1 to 3. He submits that the revenue records were restored in the names of the UDR pattadhar, Raja Nadar and Natarajan Nadar and the Tahsildar was directed to examine documents and legal heir certificates and effect subdivision and issue patta on that basis. Therefore, he submits that the petitioner has not been prejudiced by the order.

4. The appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer was filed by N.Ramamurthy, the fourth respondent herein. The appeal was directed at the patta issued in favour of Karuppannan under Patta No.2510. Therefore, notice was issued to the pattadhar and the pattadhar and the appellant were heard. I see no infirmity in the process followed by the Revenue Divisional Officer warranting interference under Article 226.

5. Nonetheless, in view of the fact that the petitioner asserts that she is entitled to the property pursuant to an oral partition effected by her grandfather, I dispose of this writ petition by leaving it open to the petitioner to challenge the order by way of revision before the District Revenue Officer. If such revision petition is filed within 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, the District Revenue Officer is



W.P.(MD)No.33256 of 2025

WEB COPY

directed to receive and dispose of the same on merits without going into the question of limitation. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

20.11.2025

NCC :No
Internet :Yes
Index :No
PKN



W.P.(MD)No.33256 of 2025

To

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

3. The Tahsildar,
Mudhukulathur,
Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.33256 of 2025

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.

PKN

W.P.(MD)No.33256 of 2025

20.11.2025