



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

WP No. 11263 of 2021

S.S.Rajendiran,
S/o.S.N.Saminathan,
No.74, E.B.Office Road, Salaipudhur,
Chennasamudiram Village,
Kodumudi Taluk, Erode District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

- 1.The District Collector,
Erode District.
- 2.The Tahsildar,
Kodumudi Taluk, Erode District.
- 3.The Village Administrative Officer,
Chennasamudiram Village,
Kodumudi village, Erode District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER:-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for an issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to conduct enquiry on petitioner's complaint dated 13.03.2021 and reminder dated 30.03.2021 and take appropriate action against the miscreants who have manipulated and corrected the FMB sketch record in respect of petitioner land in S.F.No. 679/25,26 of Chennasamudiram Village, Kodumudi Taluk, Erode District and restore its original measurements as 18.8.



WEB COPY

WP No. 11263 of 2021



For Petitioner(s): Mr.Gnanavel
For M/s.R.Prabakar

For Respondent(s): Mr.C.Gowthamaraj
Government Advocate

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking to direct the respondents to conduct enquiry on the petitioner's complaint dated 13.03.2021 and reminder dated 30.03.2021 and take appropriate action against the miscreants who have manipulated and corrected the FMB sketch record in respect of petitioner land in S.F.No. 679/25,26 of Chennasamudiram Village, Kodumudi Taluk, Erode District and restore its original measurements as 18.8.

2.Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner had purchased the subject land on 14.09.2018 which is 18.8 metres width. However, the FMB sketch reflects only 18 meter width. Therefore, the petitioner made a complaint on 13.03.2021 to the respondents. Since there was no response from the respondents, the petitioner has also sent a reminder dated 30.03.2021 in this regard. However, the respondents have not acted on the complaint of the petitioner. Hence, the present writ petition has been filed.



3.Learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents would submit that initially, the width of the subject land was reflected as 16.2 meters width in the FMB sketch. Based on the request of the petitioner, it was corrected as 18 metres width. In the sale deed, it has been wrongly mentioned as 18.8 metres. The correct width of the petitioner property is only 18 meters width.

4.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents.

5.Considering the submissions made by both the parties, it is evident that, according to the petitioner he purchased the subject property which consists of 18.8 meters width. However, according to the respondents, initially as per the revenue records the width of the subject property was only 16.2 meters width. Based on the request of the petitioner it was corrected as 18 meters and the sale deed has been executed wrongly as 18.8 meters width. Thus, this Court is of the view that, the issue before this Court involves disputed questions of fact, which cannot be decided in the present writ petition. These issues have to be decided before the Civil Court.

6.In view of the above, this writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

24-03-2026

rst



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

To

1. The District Collector,
Erode District.

2. The Tahsildar,
Kodumudi Taluk, Erode District.

3. The Village Administrative Officer,
Chennasamudiram Village,
Kodumudi Village, Erode District.



WEB COPY

WP No. 11263 of 2021



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.
rst

WP No. 11263 of 2021

24-03-2026