



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.02.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Review Appln. Nos.78 & 79 of 2023

Rev.Appln.No.78 of 2023 :

M/s.Panchura Estate Ltd.,
Rep. by its Managing Director,
B.K.Mehta,
Coonoor – 643 101,
The Nilgiris.

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Forest Officer,
Gudalur Division, Gudalur,
The Nilgiris.

2.The Assistant Settlement Officer,
Dharapuram.

...Respondents

PRAYER: This Review Application has been filed under Section 114 read with Order XLVII Rule 1 read with of the Code of Civil Procedure, praying to review the judgment dated 28.05.2015 in S.T.A.No.1 of 2008 on the file of this Court, recall the same and thereby set aside the judgment passed in C.M.A.No.16 of 1999 on the file of District Court and Jenmam Estates Abolition Tribunal of the Nilgiris District, Udthagamandalam.



Rev.Appln.No.79 of 2023 :

M/s.Panchura Estate Ltd.,
Rep. by its Managing Director,
B.K.Mehta,
Coonoor – 643 101,
The Nilgiris.

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Collector of Nilgiris,
Udhagamandalam.

2.The Assistant Settlement Officer,
Dharapuram.

...Respondents

PRAYER: This Review Application has been filed under Section 114 read with Order XLVII Rule 1 read with of the Code of Civil Procedure, praying to review the judgment dated 28.05.2015 in S.T.A.No.2 of 2008 on the file of this Court, recall the same and thereby set aside the judgment passed in C.M.A.No.9 of 1999 on the file of District Court and Jenmam Estates Abolition Tribunal of the Nilgiris District, Udhagamandalam.

For Petitioner : Ms.Ba.Nalini
For Mr.K.V.Babu

For Respondents : Mr.T.Arun Kumar,
Addl. Govt. Pleader



WEB COPY



COMMON ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by C.KUMARAPPAN, J.)

The present Review Applications have been filed against the judgment of this Court dated 28.05.2015, which had arisen under the Gudalur Janmam Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1969 (Tamil Nadu Act 24 of 1969).

2. The main contention put forth by the review petitioner is that this Court has not considered the perversity of the finding rendered by the Tribunal. It is also the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that this Court did not go into the proof in respect of the trees planted by the petitioner.

3. The very submission of the petitioner comes within the factual scenario, which cannot be gone into under the review jurisdiction. Mistakes or error apparent on the face of the record may be invoked and such error is something more than mere error, and it must be one which is manifest on the face of the record. In the case on hand, this Court cannot find any manifest error on the face of the record. Therefore, the grounds raised by the petitioner cannot be adjudicated under the review jurisdiction.



Review Appln. No.78 & 79 of 2

4. In the result, the review applications stand **dismissed**. No

costs.

(S.M.S., J.) (C.K., J.)
19.02.2026

dsa
Internet :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
Neutral Citation :Yes/No



Review Appln. No.78 & 79 of 2

To:

- 1.The Collector of Nilgiris,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Udhagamandalam.
- 2.The District Forest Officer,
Gudalur Division, Gudalur,
The Nilgiris.
- 3.The Assistant Settlement Officer,
Dharapuram.



WEB COPY



Review Appln. No.78 & 79 of 2

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

dsa

Review Appln. Nos.78 & 79 of 2023

19.02.2026

Page No.:6/6