



WEB COPY

W.P. No.50172 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED : 06.01.2026**

CORAM :

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM  
and  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN**

**W.P. No.50172 of 2025  
and  
W.M.P. Nos.56124 and 56126 of 2025**

1.R.Palani @ Palanivel  
S/o.Rajalingam Pillai,  
Residing at No.10,  
Kummananchavadi Byepass,  
Nombal Puliampattu,  
Poonamallee, Chennai- 600 077.

2.P.Shankar  
S/o.Ponniahpillai,  
Residing at No.10,  
Kummananchavadi Byepass,  
Nombal Puliampattu, Poonamallee,  
Chennai- 600 077.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.The Secretary  
Revenue Department Tamil Nadu,  
Secretariat Office St. George Fort,  
Chennai.

2.The District Collector,  
Thiruvallur Collector, Thiruvallur.

3.The District Revenue Officer,  
Thiruvallur Collector Office,  
Thiruvallur.



W.P. No.50172 of 2025

4.The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Thiruvallur Collector Office,  
Thiruvallur.

5.The Thasildar  
Poonammallee Taluk Thasildar Office,  
Poonamallee, Chennai.

Respondent(s)

**Prayer:** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to dispose the representation of the petitioners' dated 25.07.2025 and till such time not to evict the petitioners.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr.J.Senthamilarasu

For Respondent(s) : Mr.T.Arun Kumar  
Additional Government Pleader

### **ORDER**

(Order of the Court was made by *S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.*)

Writ of Mandamus has been instituted to direct the respondents to dispose of the representation submitted by the petitioners dated 25.07.2025 and till the disposal of representation not to evict the petitioners from the subject property described in the writ proceedings.

2. Learned counsel for petitioners would mainly content that the subject property has been classified as "Anadeenam" and petitioners are armed with an order passed by the settlement officer. Therefore, he is



W.P. No.50172 of 2025

entitled for grant of patta. The representation submitted by the petitioners was not considered. Thus, the present writ petition came to be instituted.

The petitioners have narrated the facts to show that they derived title from various persons and therefore their representation is to be considered.

3. Learned Additional Government Pleader would object that the issues raised by the petitioners in their representation is no more *res integra* and the property has been classified admittedly as “anadeenam” and in respect of the properties classified as “anadeenam”, this Court has elaborately considered the scope of the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari Act), 1948, and the relevant Government Orders subsequently passed. In the case of ***Commissioner of Land Administration vs. R.Muniyandi*** reported in **2025 MHC 2624**, the relevant paragraphs are extracted hereunder:

*“2. During the introduction of ryotwari settlement, the subject land in S.F.No.33/4, for an extent of 18.10 acres had been classified as “Sarkar Wet-Anadheenam” by the Assistant Settlement Officer and published in the A-Register. As there was no appeal against the above classification or the non-grant of patta within the appeal time that ended on 20.08.1987 with respect to the claims under Section 11(a) of the Act, (vide the rule amendment notification published in G.O.Ms.No.714, Commercial Taxes and Registration Department dated 29.06.1987), the classification as “Government-Wet-*



W.P. No.50172 of 2025

WEB COPY

*Anadheenam” attained its finality as per Section 64(C)(1) of the Act. Thereafter, no challenge can be made before any Court as per Section 64(C)(2) of the Act. In the Updating Registry scheme conducted after 1984, the said land had been retained in the same classification.*

.....

*4. The Assistant Settlement Officer (North), in the Endorsement Letter No.E1/6663/2011 dated 12.06.2011, informed the above mentioned applicant that no action can be taken to alter the registries made during the operation of settlement, as the Settlement Authorities do not have powers to condone the delay in entertaining the belated petitions submitted after 20.08.1987, as per the rule amendment published in G.O.Ms.No.714, dated 29.06.1987.*

.....

*30. Pertinently, the first application itself had been filed seeking ryotwari patta after a lapse of 49 years from the date of notification issued by the Government on 03.01.1951. Regarding the Rule amendment published in G.O.Ms.No.714 dated 29.06.1987, the Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.96 of 2015 dated 09.02.2016, as reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in S.L.P.(C).No.134554 of 2016 dated 13.05.2016, no application is entertainable beyond the period of limitation as contemplated in the amended Rule published in G.O.Ms.No.714 dated 29.06.1987.*

*31. Amended Rule had been published in the year 1987. Applying the amended rule, Assistant Settlement Officer informed the claimants before him, vide his letter dated 12.06.2011 that petition seeking Ryotwari Patta is not maintainable. However, the learned Single Judge of this Court quashed the letter of the*



W.P. No.50172 of 2025

WEB COPY

*Assistant Settlement Officer and directed him to pass orders by affording opportunity of hearing to the claimants. However, the Assistant Settlement Officer, being the Original Authority who classified the subject lands as Government Wet Anadheenam in the year 1967, has no jurisdiction to entertain a petition since he is not an Appellate Authority. The Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.96 of 2015 dated 09.02.2016 affirmed the amended rule notified in G.O.Ms.No.714 dated 29.06.1997. Therefore, the findings of the Writ Court in this regard appear to be incorrect.*

*32. Writ Court formed an opinion that the Commissioner of Land Administration cannot invoke the suo-motu revision power under Section 7(c) of the Act by referring two judgments i.e., W.P.No.1464 of 2013 dated 22.02.2013 and W.P.No.3267 of 2023 and 35303 of 2007 dated 05.07.2022.*

.....

*34. But, in the present case, Assistant Settlement Officer (North) had passed his second order on 19.09.2011, (while his first order was in existence and not cancelled by the Appellate/Revision Authority) under Section 11(a) of the Act, wherein an appeal lies before the Settlement Officer as per the rules framed under Section 11 of the Act. Thus, the suomotu revision powers of the Commissioner of Land Administration under Section 7(c) of the Act is not barred in respect of the present case on hand. Thus, the finding of the Writ Court that the Commissioner of Land Administration is not empowered to exercise his suo-motu revision power in the present case appears to be erroneous.”*

4. The above judgment of the Division Bench of this Court has been



W.P. No.50172 of 2025

confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in S.L.P. Civil No.4444 of 2025 dated 02.12.2025. In view of the above judgment, the direction as such sought for in the writ petition to consider the representation cannot be granted. A mere direction to dispose of the representation would do no service to the cause of justice and in the present case, the litigant would be back again by filing further writ petition which will lead only to multiplicity. Thus, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition. The present Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

(S.M.S., J.) (C.K., J.)  
06.01.2026

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

To:  
1.The Secretary  
Revenue Department Tamil Nadu,  
Secretariat Office St.George Fort,  
Chennai.

2.The District Collector,  
Thiruvallur Collector, Thiruvallur.

3.The District Revenue Officer,

6/8



W.P. No.50172 of 2025

Thiruvallur Collector Office,  
Thiruvallur.

4.The Revenue Divisional Officer  
Thiruvallur Collector Office,  
Thiruvallur.

5.The Thasildar  
Poonammallee Taluk Thasildar Office,  
Poonamallee, Chennai.

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

mka



WEB COPY



W.P. No.50172 of 2025

**W.P. No.50172 of 2025**

**06.01.2026**