



W.P.(MD)No.17274 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 23.06.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR**

W.P.(MD)No.17274 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD)No.12799 of 2026

R.Anitha

... Petitioner

vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the District Collector,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Thiruchendur, Thoothukudi District.

4.The Tahsildar,
Taluk Office, Eral Taluk,
Thoothukudi District.

5.Guna Chitra

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned order in O.Mu.A4/9869/ 2025 dated 21.11.2025 passed by the 3rd Respondent and quash the same as illegal



W.P.(MD)No.17274 of 2026

and consequently to direct the 3rd and 4th Respondents to conduct a fresh enquiry after affording opportunity to all parties concerned and pass a reasonable order in accordance with law, within the stipulated time fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner :Mr.S.Muthu Malai Raja
For R1 to R4 :Mr.M.Mahaboob Athiff
Government Advocate

ORDER

The petitioner challenges the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by the third respondent.

2. By the impugned order, the petitioner's representation seeking a direction to the fourth respondent to delete the name of the fifth respondent from the legal heir certificate issued in respect of the petitioner's deceased son, who was the husband of the fifth respondent, came to be rejected.

3. The petitioner contends that, after the demise of her son, the fifth respondent, who is her daughter-in-law, contracted a second marriage and, therefore, is no longer entitled to be shown as a legal heir in the legal heir certificate.



W.P.(MD)No.17274 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The fourth respondent, after conducting an enquiry, came to the conclusion that the petitioner had not produced any cogent material to substantiate the allegation that the fifth respondent had contracted a second marriage after the demise of the petitioner's son. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner submitted a representation before the third respondent seeking appropriate directions to the fourth respondent. The said representation came to be rejected by the impugned order.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate appearing for respondents 1 to 4.

6. The petitioner has not produced any cogent evidence to establish that the fifth respondent has contracted a second marriage. The fifth respondent disputes the said allegation. Thus, the controversy involves disputed questions of fact, which cannot be adjudicated in exercise of the writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as not maintainable, reserving liberty to the petitioner to approach the jurisdictional Civil Court for appropriate relief in accordance with law.



W.P.(MD)No.17274 of 2026

8. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected

miscellaneous petition is closed.

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

23.06.2026

cmr



W.P.(MD)No.17274 of 2026

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The District Collector,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.
- 2.The District Revenue Officer,
Thoothukudi District, Thoothukudi.
- 3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Thiruchendur, Thoothukudi District.
- 4.The Tahsildar,
Taluk Office, Eral Taluk,
Thoothukudi District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.17274 of 2026

HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J.

cmr

W.P.(MD)No.17274 of 2026

23.06.2026