



W.A(MD)No. 249 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 04.03.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR**
AND
THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN**

W.A(MD)No. 249 of 2026
and
C.M.P.(MD) No.2720 of 2026

1. N.Selvaraj

2. N.Subramani

... Appellants

Vs

1. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Dindigul Division,
Dindigul.

2. The Tahsildar,
Nilakottai Taluk,
Nilakottai,
Dindigul District.

3. L.Anusuya

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent, against the order made in W.P.(MD).No.30991 of 2023 dated 11.12.2025.

For Appellants : Mr. R.R.Kannan



W.A(MD)No. 249 of 2026

For R1 & R2

: Mr.A.Kannan
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.**)

Challenge is made against the order of the learned Single Judge dismissing the writ petition on the ground that the petition is not maintainable.

2. The writ petition has been originally filed by the writ petitioners challenging the order of the Tahsildar, dated 18.11.2023, wherein the Tahsildar has issued patta in favour of the private respondent removing the names of the writ petitioners. The learned Single Judge found that since the alternative remedy is available under Section 12 of the Patta Passbook Act, 1983, the writ petition is not maintainable. At that stage, the learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioners sought liberty of the Court to file a statutory appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer under Section 12 of the Patta Passbook Act, 1983. The writ Court has already granted four weeks time from the date of receipt of that order to file statutory appeal. On the request of the petitioner, the period of



W.A(MD)No. 249 of 2026

limitation got extended for filing the appeal. Now, once again this writ appeal is filed before this Court.

3. It is the main grievance of the appellants that even after filing of the statutory appeal, the second respondent has mutated the patta in name of the third respondent. Therefore, his contention is that mutation has to be cancelled, as there is a collusion between the second and third respondents.

4. Heard both sides and perused the records.

5. At the outset, as the statutory appeal has already been preferred after obtaining leave from this Court and extending the period of limitation, the appellants have to canvass their case in the statutory appeal instead of filing this writ appeal and further, once again the same order cannot be challenged in the writ appeal. Be that as it may, if any mutation is made by the second respondent during the pendency of the appeal, the same will be subjected to the outcome of the result of the appeal. Hence, we do not find any merit in this appeal.



W.A(MD)No. 249 of 2026

6. With these observations, this writ appeal is dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

NCS : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
apd

[N.S.K., J.] & [M.J.R., J.]
04.03.2026

To

1. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Dindigul Division,
Dindigul.

2. The Tahsildar,
Nilakottai Taluk,
Nilakottai,
Dindigul District.



WEB COPY



W.A(MD)No. 249 of 2026

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND
M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.

apd

ORDER MADE IN

W.A(MD)No. 249 of 2026

04.03.2026