



WEB COPY

WP No. 10488 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

WP No. 10488 of 2026

AND

WMP NO. 11351 OF 2026

1. Jayavendan
S/o Velmurugan, Pillayar Kovil Street
Rauthankuppan village Vanur Taluk.
Villupuram District

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Vanur Taluk, Villupuram District.

2. The Revenue Tahsildar
Vanur Taluk, Villupuram District.

3. Sathish Kumar,
S/o. Muthaalu No. 117 Mariamman
Kovil Street, Rauthankuppan village
Vanur Taluk. Villupuram District.

4. Kumar
S/o. Muthaalu No. 117 Mariamman
Kovil Street, Rauthankuppan village
Vanur Taluk. Villupuram District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To call for the records of the 1st respondent herein vide his proceeding bearing PA.MU.(A 3) No. 1717/2024 dated 23.01.2026 and quash the same

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.Venkatasubban for
M/S.SARVABHAUMAN
ASSOCIATES



For Respondent(s): Mr.D.Ravichander,SGP For R1
and R2

ND/W - R3 to R4 -Pvt

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed, challenging the impugned order dated 23.01.2026 passed by the first respondent, rejecting the petitioner's application, seeking for transfer of patta in his name for the property measuring twelve cents out of a total extent of 2.69 acres.

2. The petitioner categorically contends that he is the absolute owner and is in possession of the said property. The petitioner's father had earlier sold a larger extent of the property measuring 2.57 acres to the respondents 3 and 4. The petitioner claims that, thereafter, the balance extent of twelve cents, which was retained by the petitioner's father, was settled in favour of the petitioner by way of a settlement deed dated 27.09.2010. The petitioner claims that by virtue of the settlement deed, he become the owner of the said twelve cents.

3. The petitioner had applied for transfer of patta for the said twelve cents of land. However, the same was rejected by the first respondent under the impugned order dated 23.01.2026, directing the petitioner to approach the civil court.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that, earlier, the private respondents, namely the respondents 3 and 4, had filed a civil suit in O.S. No.119 of 2010 on the file of the District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Vanur, seeking declaration of title over the entire extent of 2.69 acres, which includes the twelve cents claimed by the petitioner. The said suit was dismissed on 20.09.2017 by the trial court, which was also confirmed by the appellate court. Therefore, the learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that by total non application of mind to the aforesaid undisputed facts, the first respondent has rejected the petitioner's application, seeking for transfer of patta in his name through the impugned order dated 23.01.2026.

5. As seen from the impugned order, the contentions of the petitioner as raised in this writ petition have not been considered by the first respondent. Except for stating that the petitioner will have to approach the civil court, the contentions of the petitioner, which includes the following:

a) The dismissal of the civil suit filed by the respondents 3 and 4, seeking for declaration of title in respect of the entire extent 2.69 acres;

b) The execution of the settlement deed in favour of the petitioner, by the petitioner's father for an extent of 12 cents have not been considered by the first respondent in the impugned order.



6. Since the impugned order is a non-speaking order with regard to the petitioner's contentions as raised in this writ petition and the impugned order has not considered the supporting documents produced by the petitioner, necessarily, the impugned order dated 23.01.2026 passed by the first respondent is liable to be quashed and the matter remanded back to the first respondent for fresh consideration on merits and in accordance with law, after hearing all the necessary parties including the respondents 3 and 4.

7. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 23.01.2026 passed by the first respondent is hereby quashed and the matter is remanded back to the first respondent for fresh consideration on merits and in accordance with law within a time frame to be fixed by this Court.

8. The petitioner shall submit a detailed written explanation to the first respondent, stating as to how the petitioner is entitled for transfer of patta in his favour for the property measuring 12 cents along with supporting documents, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On receipt of the said written explanation from the petitioner within the stipulated time, the first respondent, after hearing the objections of the respondents 3 and 4 and any other third party, whom the first respondent deems it fit to enquire, shall pass final orders on merits and in accordance with law on the petitioner's



application, seeking for transfer of patta in his name for the subject property, after giving due consideration of the petitioner's contentions as well as the supporting documents produced by him, within a period of twelve weeks thereafter.

9. In case, the first respondent decides to reject the petitioner's application once again, the first respondent will have to pass a speaking order with regard to the petitioner's contentions as well as the supporting documents produced by the petitioner.

10. With the aforesaid directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No Costs. Consequently, connected writ miscellaneous petition is closed.

26-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
ab

To

1. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Vanur Taluk, Villupuram District.

2. The Revenue Tahsildar
Vanur Taluk, Villupuram District.



WEB COPY

WP No. 10488 of 2026



ABDUL QUDDHOSE J.

ab

**WP No. 10488 of 2026
AND WMP NO. 11351
OF 2026**

26-03-2026