



W.A.(MD)No.816 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **24.06.2026**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

W.A.(MD)No.816 of 2024

1.V.Amsam
2.V.Parthipan

...Appellants

Vs.

1.The Collector,
Collectorate,
Tuticorin District.

2.The Special Tahsildar,
Land Acquisition (Adi-Dravidar Welfare),
Ettayapuram Road,
Kovilpatti,
Tuticorin-District.

...Respondents

PRAYER:- Writ Appeal – filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, to set aside the order passed by this Court in W.P.(MD)No.27880 of 2023 dated 13.02.2024.

For Appellant : Mr.C.Emalias
For Respondents : Mr.M.S.Parthiban
Counsel for the State



W.A.(MD)No.816 of 2024

WEB COPY

JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by **N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.**)

Challenging the order of the learned Single Judge dismissing the writ petition, this appeal has been filed.

2.The writ petitioners' lands were acquired under the Tamil Nadu Land Acquisition for Harijan Welfare Schemes (1978, Act 31 of 1978) and award was passed on 15.02.1998. The petitioners filed a writ petition stating while determining the compensation, a typographical error had occurred. According to them, the data land value was wrongly taken as Rs.300/- instead of Rs.3,000/-. It is further contended that under Document No.19 of 1997, the sale consideration was Rs.1,80,000/-, whereas the same was erroneously recorded as Rs.18,000/- in the award proceedings. On the said premise, the writ petition was filed seeking appropriate relief. The learned Single Judge, taking note of the fact that the award had been passed as early as in the year 1998, held that if the petitioners were aggrieved by the quantum of compensation awarded, the



W.A.(MD)No.816 of 2024

WEB COPY

appropriate remedy available to them was to invoke the appellate remedy provided under Section 9 of the Act. Accordingly, the writ petition was dismissed.

3.Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed on record.

4.The learned counsel for the appellants would submit that the discrepancy is purely a typographical error. According to him, the original sale deed in Document No.19 of 1997 clearly reflects the sale consideration as Rs.1,80,000/-, but the same has been wrongly noted as Rs.18,000/-. Therefore, it is contended that the error being clerical in nature shall be corrected in exercise of the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

5.We are unable to accept the said submission. The compensation has been determined after taking into account the data sale deed and other relevant factors. Whether the value reflected in the data sale deed represents the true market value of the land is a question of fact requiring appreciation of evidence. In the absence of any challenge to the award in the manner known to law, the petitioners cannot seek



W.A.(MD)No.816 of 2024

WEB COPY

enhancement or re-quantification of compensation by filing a writ petition on the plea that the error is merely typographical.

6. Therefore, without availing the statutory remedy and without producing evidence before the appellate authority, the writ petition itself is not maintainable. The learned Single Judge has rightly dismissed the writ petition and we find no infirmity in the order passed by the learned Single Judge.

7. Accordingly, the writ appeal stands dismissed. It is, however, open to the appellants to work out their remedies in the manner known to law. It is made clear that if any appeal is filed, it is for the appellant authority to consider the fact that the writ petitioner was bona fide in pursuing the remedy before this Court, while reckoning the period of limitation and thereafter decide the appeal on its own merits and in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs.

[N.S.K., J.] & [M.J.R., J.]
24.06.2026

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
ta



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)No.816 of 2024

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

ta

W.A.(MD)No.816 of 2024

24.06.2026