



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED :28.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P(MD)No.34594 of 2025

and

W.M.P(MD)Nos.27363 & 27366 of 2025

M.Lakshmipathirajan

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai Collectorate,
Madurai - 625 020.

2. The District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

3. The Tahsildar,
Madurai South Taluk,
Madurai Collectorate,
Madurai - 625 020.

4. M.Mallika @ Sharma

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the impugned order passed by the second respondent / District Revenue Officer in Ni.Mu.No.46556/2014(G-5) dated 16.09.2015 and quash the same.



For Petitioner : Mr.N.Murugesan

For Respondents : Mr.M.Muthumanikkam
Government Advocate
for R1 to R3

ORDER

The petitioner challenges an order dated 16.09.2015 of the District Revenue Officer. The belated challenge is justified on the ground that the order was not communicated to the petitioner earlier and that the petitioner had obtained a copy of the order when W.P.(MD)No. 9392 of 2017 was heard on 03.11.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he did not have a reasonable opportunity to contest the matter before the District Revenue Officer. Therefore, he contends that principles of natural justice were contravened. In addition, he submits that the property in S.No.111/3 was not the subject of partition deed dated 14.05.1998 and that this establishes that the 4th respondent was not asserting title or rights in relation to the said property.

3. Learned Government Advocate accepts notice for respondents 1 to 3.

4. On examining order dated 16.09.2015, I find that it records that equal opportunity was given and that the inquiry was held on 20.02.2015, 06.03.2015 01.04.2015 and 26.08.2015. It is also seen that both the petitioner herein and the 4th respondent participated in such proceedings. The District Revenue Officer



WEB COPY

examined the revenue records pertaining to the pre-UDR period and noticed that the revenue records stood in the names of Mani, Sabari Ambalam, Rajammal, Rukmani and minor Santhanalakshmi. The District Revenue Officer also noticed that the UDR records were in the names of the petitioner and K.Mahalingam. After taking note of the sale deeds dated 29.06.1975 (document No.2879 of 1975) and 29.05.1975 (document No.2243 of 1975), the District Revenue Officer concluded that Mahalingam had purchased the total extent of 43 cents in S.No.111/3 from K.Mani pursuant to a partition between the pre-UDR pattadhars. On that basis, the District Revenue Officer concluded that the name of Mahalingam should be entered in the patta. It was also recorded that the petitioner herein appeared at hearings on 01.04.2015 and 15.07.2015, but did not submit any documents. In these circumstances, I find no infirmity in the order impugned herein. This writ petition is dismissed without any order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

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

28.11.2025



WEB COPY



SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY.,J.

RJR

To

1. The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai Collectorate,
Madurai - 625 020.

2. The District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

3. The Tahsildar,
Madurai South Taluk,
Madurai
Collectorate,
Madurai - 625 020.

W.P(MD)No. 34594 of 2025

28.11.2025