



W.P.(MD)No.5484 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 27.02.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDER

W.P.(MD)No.5484 of 2026

V.Kanniha

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Collectorate Office,
Madurai.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Melur,
Madurai.

3.N.Manikandan

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, challenging the impugned order passed by the second respondent is Ni.Mu.No.4736/2025/A4 dated 10.09.2025 as illegal and quash the same and retain the petitioner's patta which stands for more than 40 years in respect of Madurai East Taluk, Melamada Bit 1 Village, Natham Patta S.No.24/10 to an extent of 2000 sq.ft.

For Petitioner

: Mr.N.S.Karthikeyan



W.P.(MD)No.5484 of 2026

For R1 and R2

: Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam
Government Advocate

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to quash the proceedings of the second respondent dated 10.09.2025 and to retain the petitioner's patta, which stands for more than 40 years in respect of the property comprised in S.No.24/10, measuring an extent of 2000 sq.ft., situated at Madurai East Taluk, Melamadai Bit 1 Village.

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 third respondent, notice to the third respondent is hereby dispensed with.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that without making any field visit and verifying the revenue records and also without calling upon the petitioner for enquiry, the impugned order came to be passed. The petitioner came to know about the impugned order only after obtaining information under the Right to Information Act.



W.P.(MD)No.5484 of 2026

WEB COPY

5. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 submits that the impugned order does not indicate that the petitioner was put on notice prior to its issuance.

6. A perusal of the impugned order dated 10.09.2025 shows that the petitioner was not put on notice before the same was passed. In the said circumstances, the impugned order is set aside and the matter is remitted back to the second respondent for fresh consideration. The second respondent shall pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, the third respondent, and any other persons who may be affected by such decision, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands allowed. No costs.

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
smn2

(K.SURENDER, J.)
27.02.2026



W.P.(MD)No.5484 of 2026

To:-

WEB COPY

- 1.The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Collectorate Office,
Madurai.

- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Melur,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.5484 of 2026

K.SURENDER, J.

smn2

W.P.(MD)No.5484 of 2026

27.02.2026