



W.P.(MD)No.24481 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED :24.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDER

W.P.(MD)No.24481 of 2025

and

WMP (MD) Nos.19215 and 19217 of 2025

Mani

... Petitioner(s)

Vs.

1. The Thasildhar,
Tirumangalam Taluk,
Madurai District.

2. The Zonal Deputy Thasildhar,
Tirumangalam Taluk,
Madurai District.

3. Virumayee Alias Pooranam

4. Nagammal

5. Manjana Petchi

6. Samuthiram

7. Pandiammal

... Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the 2nd respondent dated 26.5.2025 in proceedings T.R.No. 2025/0103/24/392368TR quash the same, as the same is arbitrary, ultravires, contrary to the principles of natural justice, Audi Alteram Partem, in colorable exercise of power and consequentially direct the 2nd respondent to revert back the patta in petitioners name.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.G.Shankar Ganesh



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.24481 of 2025

For Respondents :Mr.S.Kameswaran
Government Advocate for R1 & R2
M/s.V.Nagendran for R3 to R6
Unserved and Returned for R7

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned proceedings of the second respondent dated 26.05.2025 and consequentially, to direct the second respondent to revert back the patta in the petitioner's name.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials available on record.

3. The case of the petitioner is that originally the patta stood in the petitioner's name and based on an application submitted by the private respondents, their names were also included along with the petitioner's name. Aggrieved by the same, the present writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned proceedings dated 26.05.2025.

4. The main ground urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner was not put on notice before the impugned order was passed.



W.P.(MD)No.24481 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. Learned Government Advocate appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 and 2 fairly concedes that there is no specific averment in the impugned proceedings to indicate that notice was served on the petitioner.

6. Since the petitioner had not been put on notice before the impugned proceeding was passed, the impugned order is set aside and the matter is remanded to the second respondent for fresh consideration. The second respondent shall issue notice to all concerned parties and after affording an opportunity of hearing to the parties, pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law.

7. With the above observation and directions, this writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

(K.SURENDER, J)
24.02.2026

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



W.P.(MD)No.24481 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Thasildhar,
Tirumangalam Taluk,
Madurai District.

2. The Zonal Deputy Thasildhar,
Tirumangalam Taluk,
Madurai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.24481 of 2025

K.SURENDER, J.

PKN

W.P.(MD)No.24481 of 2025

24.02.2026