



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

**WP No. 34439 of 2022
AND WMP NO. 8634 OF 2024
& 33893 OF 2022**

S.Ganapathy
S/o. Suburayar,
Old No. 4/ 24, New No. 142,
Veerampattinanam Street,
Ariyankuppam, Puducherry - 605 007.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The tahildar,
DRDM, (Revenue) North, Puducherry.

2.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Arainguppam Police Station,
Puducherry.

3.Ilamparithy,
No. 08, Deivanayakkar Street,
Mudaliarpeth, Puducherry.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records on the file of the respondents in impugned order No. 4119/TOP/PGR/E/2022 dated 21.10.2022 issued by the 1st respondents and quash the same.



For Petitioner(s): No appearance

For Respondent(s): Ms.V.Usha, AGP for R1 & 2
Mr.E.V.Chandru, for R3

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed against the impugned order dated 21.10.2022 passed by the 1st respondent.

2. Today, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the private respondent would submit that the adjacent subject property, to an larger extent, was purchased by the petitioner. Thereafter, the petitioner started to disturb the peaceful possession of the 3rd respondent and hence, the 3rd respondent had erected a compound wall. In spite of the same, the petitioner continued to disturb the possession of 3rd respondent. Due to this dispute, a complaint and counter complaint was given by both the parties before the 2nd respondent. Subsequently, those complaints were referred to the 1st respondent. Under these circumstances, the 1st respondent had passed an order to sub-divide the subject property, so as to resolve the dispute between the parties.



4. Further, he would contend that the impugned order was rightly passed by the 1st respondent and no interference is required. He would also submit that even if the petitioner is aggrieved over the impugned order, the only recourse available to him is to approach an appropriate Civil Court. Thus, he prays for dismissal of this petition.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the 3rd respondent and also perused the entire materials available on record.

6. In the case on hand, there is a title dispute over the subject land between the petitioner and the 3rd respondent. In this regard, a complaint and counter complaint were filed by both the parties before the respondents. Subsequently, the 1st respondent had passed an order to sub-divide the subject property, so as to resolve the dispute between the parties.

7. As rightly contended by the 3rd respondent, the issue involved in this case is with regard to the title dispute over the subject land. In such case, if the petitioner is aggrieved over the impugned order, the only recourse available to him is to approach an appropriate Civil Court. That may be the reason for non-appearance of the petitioner.



8. In view of the above, this Court is inclined to dismiss this petition.

Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. No cost.

Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

27-04-2026

nsa

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1. The tahildar,
DRDM, (Revenue) North, Puducherry.

2. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Arainguppam Police Station,
Puducherry.



WEB COPY

WP No. 34439 of 2022



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY J.
nsa

WP No. 34439 of 2022

27-04-2026