



W.P.(MD)No.7210 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 17.02.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDER

W.P.(MD)No.7210 of 2025

and

W.M.P.(MD).Nos.5449 and 5450 of 2025

and 2343 of 2026

Sudalaimuthu

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Thasildar,
Kadaladi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

3.Gurupatham

4.Rajapandi

5.Duraipandi

6.Pitchai

7.Shanmugam

8.Sriram



W.P.(MD)No.7210 of 2025

9.Ponnaiya

10.Ramar

11.Ramakrishnan

12.Ponlakshmi

13.Esakki @ Esakkiammal

... Respondents

*(R10 to R13 are impleaded by this Court
vide order dated 17.02.2026 passed in W.M.P.(MD).No.15958 of 2025)*

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records pertaining to the order dated 21.12.2023 passed by the second respondent vide D.R 2023/27/21/000473SD and quash the same.

For Petitioner	: Mr.K.R.Laxman for G.Vishnuram
For Respondents	: Mr.P.Subbaraj(for R1 and R2) Special Government Pleader Mr.V.Selva Kumar (for R4 to R13)

ORDER

The Writ Petition has been filed seeking to quash the impugned order dated 21.12.2023 passed by the second respondent vide D.R 2023/27/21/000473SD.



W.P.(MD)No.7210 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that no notice was issued to the petitioner prior to the passing of the impugned order, which resulted in the transfer of Patta in favour of the respondents 3 to 9. The petitioner's fundamental right to be heard before the passing of any order adversely affecting their interests has been violated. It is well settled that when an administrative action, such as the transfer of Patta, is undertaken, the persons likely to be affected must be issued notice and afforded a reasonable opportunity to present their case. In the present case, the petitioner was not put on notice prior to the transfer of Patta. Consequently, they were deprived of the opportunity to make their representations or to challenge the basis of the said transfer, thereby causing serious prejudice to their rights and interests. In such circumstances, the impugned order is liable to be set aside, and the Writ Petition deserves to be allowed.

3. When questioned, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, on instructions, fairly submitted that the petitioner was not put on notice prior to the passing of the impugned order.



W.P.(MD)No.7210 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. A perusal of the impugned order does not indicate that the petitioner was afforded an opportunity to present his case before it was passed. Inasmuch as the transfer of Patta was effected without issuing notice to the petitioner, who is an affected party, the impugned order is in violation of the principles of natural justice.

5. For the above reason, the impugned order deserves to be set aside. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands allowed and the impugned order dated 21.12.2023 passed by the second respondent vide D.R 2023/27/21/000473SD is set aside. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
vsg

(K.SURENDER, J.)
17.02.2026
3/3



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.7210 of 2025

To:-

- 1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 2.The Thasildar,
Kadaladi Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.7210 of 2025

K.SURENDER, J.

vsg

W.P.(MD)No.7210 of 2025

17.02.2026

3/3