



W.P.(MD)No.1256 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 21.01.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDER

W.P.(MD)No.1256 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.990 and 993 of 2026

Meenakshi Koori @ Meenakshi

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The District Revenue Officer / Additional District Magistrate,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

2.The Tahsildar,
Thiruparankundram Taluk,
Madurai District.

3.The Village Administrative Officer,
Valayankulam Village,
Thiruparankundram Taluk,
Madurai District.

4.M.Velu

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the first respondent in Ni.Mu.No.E-1698105/2023/G5 dated 03.02.2025 and quash the same as illegal.



W.P.(MD)No.1256 of 2026

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Gowrishankar
For R1 to R3 : Mr.B.Ramanathan
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The Writ Petition has been filed seeking to quash the impugned order passed by the first respondent in Ni.Mu.No.E-1698105/2023/G5 dated 03.02.2025.

2. By consent, the Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. Since no adverse orders are going to be passed against the fourth respondent, notice to the fourth respondent is hereby dispensed with.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not a party to the Patta cancellation proceedings, and she was not heard before the impugned order was passed. The petitioner's name was removed



W.P.(MD)No.1256 of 2026

in respect of Punja land in S.No.43/5A1D2 on the sole ground that she was affected by the order. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside, and the Writ Petition may be allowed.

5. When questioned, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 to 3 fairly submits that the impugned order does not disclose that the petitioner was put on notice before the order was passed.

6. A reading of the impugned order shows that, on an application made by one M.Velu, S/o.Murugesan, who is the fourth respondent herein, the first respondent / District Revenue Officer, Madurai, directed the second respondent / Tahsildar to remove the name of the petitioner in respect of the Punja land in S.No.43/5A1D2, along with other names in respective survey numbers. Nowhere in the proceedings is there any mention that the petitioner was put on notice before passing such order.

7. For the sole reason that the petitioner was affected by the removal of her name in the Patta, yet was not put on notice, the impugned order violates the



W.P.(MD)No.1256 of 2026

principles of natural justice. Further, the impugned order does not reflect that the petitioner was given an opportunity to present her case before it was passed.

8. For the above reasons, the impugned order deserves to be set aside insofar as the petitioner is concerned. The first respondent shall issue notice to the petitioner, call for objections, and conclude the enquiry after considering the objections raised by the petitioner, and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law.

9. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
smn2

(K.SURENDER, J.)
21.01.2026

To:-

1.The District Revenue Officer / Additional District Magistrate,
Madurai District,
Madurai.



W.P.(MD)No.1256 of 2026

2.The Tahsildar,
Thiruparankundram Taluk,
Madurai District.

3.The Village Administrative Officer,
Valayankulam Village,
Thiruparankundram Taluk,
Madurai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.1256 of 2026

K.SURENDER, J.

smn2

W.P.(MD)No.1256 of 2026

21.01.2026