



WEB COPY

WP No. 1807 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29-01-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

WP No. 1807 of 2026

1. M.Eagappan
2. E.Naresh Kumar
3. E.Hemalatha

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Tahsildar
Avadi (12) Taluk, Thiruvallur District
2. The Sub Registrar
Poonamallee, Chennai.

..Respondent(s)

Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking for issuance of a writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for the records dated 6/12/2025 in order Application No. 2025/ 0154/ 01/ 0097 and to quash the same as illegal and arbitrary and direct the respondents to consider and pass orders on the representation of the petitioner dated 28/10/2025.

For Petitioner(s): Ms.S.Santhi

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



ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 06.12.2025 passed by the first respondents rejecting the petitioners' application for transfer of patta in their names for the property morefully described in the affidavit filed in support of this writ petition.

2. The petitioners have challenged the impugned order on the ground that the impugned order is a non-speaking order. They categorically contend that erroneously, the first respondent has rejected their application for transfer of patta.

3. Mr.D.Ravichander, learned Special Government Pleader, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

4. As seen from the impugned order, the first respondent has not passed a speaking order. Excepting for stating that parent and link documents were not submitted in the name of the current patta holder, Ezhumalai, there is no discussion by the first respondent explaining how such a finding was reached.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions would submit that the petitioners have got all supporting documents to substantiate their application seeking for transfer of patta in their names. He would further submit that the petitioners are willing to provide all supporting documents to the first respondent if the matter is remanded back to the first respondent for fresh



consideration. The said statement of the learned counsel for the petitioners is hereby recorded by this Court.

WEB COPY

6. Since the impugned order is a non-speaking order, necessarily, the impugned order has to be quashed and 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. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of in the following manner:-

(a) The impugned order dated 06.12.2025 passed by the first respondent is hereby quashed by this Court and the matter is remanded back to the first respondent for fresh consideration on merits and in accordance with law.

(b) The first respondent is directed to pass a speaking order after giving due consideration to the supporting documents filed by the petitioners, and after hearing the objections from the neighbouring land owners, and any other party whom the first respondent deems fit to enquire, within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

No Costs. W.M.P.No.1892 of 2026 is ordered, subject to payment of separate court fee. W.M.P.No.1893 of 2026 is ordered.

29-01-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

RKM



WEB COPY

WP No. 1807 of 2



ABDUL QUDDHOSE, J.

RKM

To

1. The Tahsildar
Avadi (12) Taluk, Thiruvallur District
2. The Sub Registrar
Poonamallee, Chennai

WP No. 1807 of 2026

29-01-2026