



W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated: 15.06.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY**

**W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026**

Thangavel

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner  
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,  
No.119, Uthamar Gandhi Salai,  
Nunbambakkam,  
Chennai - 600 034.
2. The District Collector,  
Dindigul District,  
Dindigul.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Palani,  
Dindigul District.
4. The Tahsildar,  
Palani Taluk,  
Dindigul District.
5. The District Registrar (Administration),  
Palani,  
Dindigul District.



W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026

WEB COPY

6. The Joint Sub Registrar No.I,  
Palani,  
Dindigul District.

7. The Executive Officer,  
Arulmighu Azhaghu Nachiamman Temple,  
Dindigul District.  
(R7 is suo motu impleaded by an order dated 15.06.2026  
in W.P.(MD).No.16096 of 2026 by DBCJ) ...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this court to issue a Writ of Mandamus or order or direction in the nature of the writ directing the 6th respondent to revise the guideline valuation of the petitioners land in S.No.55/2A, Plot No.10 admeasuring 4.128 cdnts i.e. 4 cents 58 sq.ft. situated at Thattankulam Village Group, Palani Taluk, Dindigul District based on the proceedings of the 4th respondent in Na.Ka.No.4072/2024/C1 dated 30.07.2024 and fix valuation for the said land as private owned land and pass such further or other orders as this Honble court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of this case and thus render justice.

|                |                                                 |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner | : Mr.V.Kannan                                   |
| For R1 to R6   | : Mr.R.Parthiban<br>Government Standing Counsel |
| For R7         | : Mr.P.Aathimoola Pandian                       |



W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026

WEB COPY

## ORDER

The writ petition is filed for a mandamus to revise the guideline valuation of the petitioner's land in S.No.55/2A, Plot No.10 admeasuring 4.128 cents situated at Thattankulam Village Group based on the proceedings dated 30.07.2024.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner, being a teacher, validly purchased the property from one Meenal in respect of an approved layout bearing Plot No. 10 by a registered sale deed dated 03.10.1991. The said vendor, in turn, had purchased the property under a document dated 08.09.1989 registered as Document No. 1134 of 1989. Therefore, when the property has been dealt with by private individuals for several years, it is the petitioner's grievance that, on the request of the temple, the property has suddenly been categorized as temple property and assigned a zero guideline value.

3. The petitioner would therefore pray that the property be restored to its status as private property and that an appropriate guideline value be fixed in accordance with law.



W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. As far as the temple is concerned, it is the owner only of the other extent of land comprised in Survey No. 55/1 and not of Plot No. 10 purchased by the petitioner. In fact, after the purchase, the petitioner was granted patta by the revenue authorities. The petitioner has also constructed a house after obtaining the necessary approvals and is residing therein.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 7th respondent would submit that the entire extent comprised in Survey No. 55, admeasuring 1 acre and 62 cents, belongs to the temple and that the Settlement Tahsildar had passed orders under Section 8(2) in favour of the then poojaris as a service inam. Therefore, according to the 7th respondent, the temple alone is the owner of the property. Any alienation would not bind the temple, and the temple is justified in asserting its rights over the entire survey number, including all plots therein, among which is the plot claimed by the petitioner. It is further submitted that steps are being taken to initiate appropriate proceedings against all persons concerned.



W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026

WEB COPY

6. I have considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials on record.

7. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner had validly purchased the property and is also in possession of a patta, the fact remains that the temple disputes the petitioner's title. This is not a case where the petitioner has merely presented a document for registration; rather, the petitioner seeks reclassification of the property. When the title itself is in dispute, it is for the petitioner to approach the competent Civil Court to remove the cloud over his title. Thereafter, the petitioner may approach the authorities for appropriate relief. The District Registrar cannot decide questions of title.

8. In view of the above, leaving it open to the petitioner to approach the competent forum for appropriate relief, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

15.06.2026  
(1/2)

Neutral Citation: No  
rgm



W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026

WEB COPY

**D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.**

rgm

To

1. The Commissioner  
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,  
No.119, Uthamar Gandhi Salai,  
Nunbambakkam,  
Chennai - 600 034.
2. The District Collector,  
Dindigul District,  
Dindigul.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Palani,  
Dindigul District.
4. The Tahsildar,  
Palani Taluk,  
Dindigul District.
5. The District Registrar (Administration),  
Palani,  
Dindigul District.
6. The Joint Sub Registrar No.I,  
Palani,  
Dindigul District.
7. The Executive Officer,  
Arulmighu Azhaghu Nachiamman Temple,  
Dindigul District.

**W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026**

**15.06.2026**



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.16096 of 2026

(1/2)