WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Reserved on : 09.02.2026

Pronounced on : 13.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDER

W.P.(MD)No.18622 of 2022
and
WMP (MD) Nos.13549 and 13550 of 2022

A.Palsamy ... Petitioner(s)

Vs.

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District, Madurai.

2. The Tahsildar,
Usilampatti Taluk, Madurai District.

3. The Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Jenagai Mariamman Temple,
Sholavandhan/the Fit Person,
Arulmigu Sri Karungapillai Perumal Thirukovil,
Madurai. ... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records pertaining to the impugned order of the 1st respondent vide his proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 192/J/2020 dated 07.01.2022 cancelling the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

patta stood in the petitioner's name in respect of his landed property an extent of 0.52.5 Ares, in Survey No. 18/5, Kovilankulam Village, Usilampatti Taluk, Madurai District and quash the same as illegal and for other reliefs.

For Petitioner :M/s.J.Lawrance

For Respondents :Mr.D.S.Nedunchezhian
Government Advocate for R1 and R2
Mr.S.Manohar for R3

O R D E R

Challenging the patta cancellation proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 192/J/2020 dated 07.01.2022 passed by the first respondent, the present writ petition has been filed.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the impugned order, whereby the first respondent, the District Revenue Officer, cancelled the Patta No. 1578 standing in the name of the petitioner and granted patta in favour of the third respondent temple. Further the Tahsildar was direected to carryout necessary mutation in the 'A' Register, Chitta, Adangal and the computer patta system.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

3. The facts of the case are that the third respondent temple submitted a representation to the District Revenue Officer stating that, in respect of the subject land in Survey No.18/5, Kovilankulam Village, Usilampatti Taluk, Madurai District, patta had been granted in favour of Arulmigu Sri Karukappillai Perumal Temple after a detailed enquiry under the Minor Inam Abolition and Conversion in to Ryotwari Settlement operations. However, during the land records Updating Registry Scheme (UDR), entries were made in favour of the petitioner. Further, Patta No.1578 was also issued to the petitioner.

4. Based on the said representation, notices were issued to the petitioner and other concerned parties. An enquiry was conducted in which the petitioner participated. Upon consideration of the materials placed on record, the District Revenue Officer found that the order of the Inam Abolition Settlement Tahsildar dated 31.12.1969 relating to the disputed land required to be given effect to and that the subsequent UDR entries had been made erroneously. It was observed that the revenue records must align with the inam abolition settlement orders and that registration of private individuals in respect of temple-owned Inam land

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

could not be sustained.

5. Accordingly, the erroneous entries in Patta No.1578 relating to Survey No.18/5 were cancelled and patta was ordered to be restored in the name of the third respondent temple. The Tahsildar was directed to carry out the necessary corrections in the revenue records. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Government Advocate appearing on behalf of respondents 1 and 2 and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the third respondent/Temple.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had purchased the subject property through four sale deeds executed during the year 1969 and also during the year 1981 and 1989. The UDR entries were effected based on the petitioner's sale deeds. It was contended that the District Revenue Officer has no jurisdiction to decide questions of title as though exercising the powers of a civil court. If the third respondent temple had any grievance, it ought to have approached the competent civil court to set aside the patta granted in favour of the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

petitioner. Thus, the impugned order is erroneous and deserves to be set aside.

8. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the third respondent temple submitted that the patta was granted in favour of the Temple during the Minor Inam Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari Settlement operations. Wrong entries were made in the UDR which was corrected by way of the impugned order in favour of the temple as such the impugned order needs no interference. In this regard, learned counsel for the third respondent relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No.4850 of 2021, dated 06.09.2021.

9. As seen from the above case details, patta had been granted in favour of the temple as early as in the year 1969 pursuant to the Minor Inam Settlement proceedings. Based on the said statutory settlement, entries had to be effected in the revenue records. Further patta was ordered to be granted in favour of the Kovilangulam Village Arulmigu Sri Karukappillai Perumal Temple based on the statutory settlement.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

During the UDR scheme conducted between 1981 and 1989, entries were made in favour of the petitioner on the basis of sale deeds in his favour. Any sale deeds executed, subsequent to the grant of patta in favour of the temple will not have any bearing on the temple's patta or defeat the statutory entitlement of the temple on account of the UDR entries.

10. The patta granted in favour of the temple has not been challenged before any civil court nor set aside by any competent authority. The patta continues to stand in the name of the temple. The UDR entries subsequently made would not confer any right upon the petitioner, nor can such entries be construed as recognition of title. Further the entry of the name of the petitioner during the UDR Scheme which is an administrative updating exercise, cannot override the entire statutory settlement records in favour of the temple.

11. Having found that the UDR entries were contrary to the patta granted in favour of the third respondent temple in respect of the subject property, the impugned order came to be passed. Therefore, I do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order. However, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the competent civil court and work out his

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

remedies, if so advised. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

(K.SURENDER, J)
13.02.2026

NCC :Yes/No
Internet :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
PKN

To
1. The District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District, Madurai.

2. The Tahsildar,
Usilampatti Taluk, Madurai District.

3. The Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Jenagai Mariamman Temple,
Sholavandhan/the Fit Person,
Arulmigu Sri Karungapillai Perumal Thirukovil,
Madurai.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

K.SURENDER, J.

PKN

W.P.(MD)No.18622 of 2022

13.02.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis