



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 29.01.2026

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN
AND
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN**

**W.P(MD)No.24078 of 2025
and
W.M.P(MD)Nos.18880 and 20406 of 2025**

Karuppaiah

... Petitioner

.Vs.

- 1.The District Revenue Officer,
Office of the District Revenue Officer,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 2.The Sub-Collector,
Office of the Sub Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Kamuthi Taluk Office,
Ramanathapuram District.

4.Balamurugan

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records pertaining to the impugned



proceedings issued by the first respondent vide Ni.Mu.Pi. 11/14700/2025, dated 24.6.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents 1 to 3 to issue updated computerised patta in the name of the Petitioner in respect of Survey field properties comprised in S.No.114/18 corresponding to New S.Nos.261/38, 261/39, 261/37, 261/18, Old S.No.115/19 corresponding to new S.Nos.261/19 and S.No.127/31 corresponding to new S.Nos.261/48, 261/50, 261/47, 261/49 situated at Kakkudi Group, Kamuthi Taluk, Ramanathapuram within the time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Jameel Arasu

For Respondents : Mr.P.Thilak Kumar
1 to 3 Govt. Pleader

For Respondent-4 : Mr.K.Neelamegam

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN**)

The Writ Petitioner Karuppaiah, being aggrieved by the proceedings of the District Revenue Officer, dated 24.06.2025, is before this Court seeking issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified



Mandamus calling for the records pertaining to the impugned proceedings and to quash the same.

2.In this Writ Petition, it is contented that the fore-fathers of the Petitioner were holding patta in respect of vast extent of land classified as 'Natham' in the said village which comprised of S.No.114/18 corresponding to New S.Nos.261/38, 261/39, 261/37, 261/18, Old S.No.115/19 corresponding to new S.Nos. 261/19 and S.No.127/31 corresponding to new S.Nos.261/48, 261/50, 261/47, 261/49 situated at Kakkudi Group, Kamuthi Taluk, Ramanathapuram District. While so, erroneously free house site patta was given as if free patta to him and his family members and that has been cancelled by the Revenue Divisional Officer vide proceedings, dated 25.03.2025. Challenging the same, revision petition was filed before the District Revenue Officer, which has been dismissed by the District Revenue Officer vide proceedings, dated 24.6.2025 stating that since civil dispute is pending in respect of the said property, it is for the parties to work out their remedy before the Civil Court.

3.According to the Writ Petitioner, the revision petition ought not to have been disposed of relegating the parties to work out their remedy before the Civil Court, since the issue is in



respect of validity and legality in the manner in which patta issued to the Petitioner and his family members been cancelled.

According to the learned counsel for the Writ Petitioner, the suit referred to in the impugned order is for bare injunction and therefore, there is no impediment for the District Revenue Officer to consider the revision filed before him. The learned counsel further submitted that the patta issued to him and his family members are all his own ancestral properties and stood in the name of his family members and that it reflects in the SLR records maintained by the Revenue Authorities. In spite of issuing a single patta in his name, mechanically separate pattas were issued in his name and in the name of his family members which has given a misleading impression as if seven pattas were given to one family under Free Housing Patta Scheme. The Revenue Authorities have committed serious mistake while issuing these assignment pattas in the name of three individuals in one family in respect of their family property.

4.This Court had given its anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the Writ Petitioner.

5.The SLR Register relied on by the Writ Petitioner was examined. We find that the fore-fathers of the Petitioner's family



WEB COURT

Karuppaiah and Malaichamy are found only in respect of S.No. 114/18 and S.No.115/19, total extent of 00.350 + 00.050 ares of land. Though the learned counsel for the Petitioner contends that even the land falling under S.No.127/31 measuring 01.170 ares also was in possession of his fore-fathers, there is no material element to substantiate the same and the said S.No.127/31 measuring 01.170 ares is classified as 'Natham' and no other properties are found in the SLR Register relied on by the Writ Petitioner. That apart, the Petitioner Karuppaiah is son of Malaichamy. The proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer clearly indicates that by proceedings in RTR/24/2007, dated 10.7.2007 patta in the name of his fore-fathers has been transferred to Karuppaiah, son of Malaichamy in respect of S.No.261/26 measuring 0.00.71 sq.mts and S.No.261/19 measuring 00.050 sq.mts and in both the survey numbers, the said Karuppaiah, the Petitioner herein has put up a tiled house and enjoying the same. In the said circumstances, the contention of the learned counsel for the Petitioner that free patta in respect of S.Nos.261/18, 261/37, 261/38, 261/29, 261/47 and 261/49 given to the Petitioner and his family members is an erroneous process of the Revenue Authorities which has been reversed pursuant to the intervention of this Court.



WEB COPY

6. Therefore, We find that there is no illegality in the order passed by the District Revenue Officer which is impugned in this Writ Petition relegating the Petitioner to work out the remedy before the Civil Court, if he has any valid right in respect of survey numbers, for which, he was erroneously issued patta and later cancelled. We make it clear that the Petitioner cannot have any right to occupy or put up any construction except in the land for which he was issued patta by transfer under the proceedings in RTR/24/2007, dated 10.7.2007

7. With these observations, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

[G.J.,J.] [K.K.R.K.,J.]
29.01.2026

NCS : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

vsn

To

1. The District Revenue Officer,
Office of the District Revenue Officer,
Ramanathapuram District.

6/8



2.The Sub-Collector,
Office of the Sub Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.

3.The Tahsildar,
Kamuthi Taluk Office,
Ramanathapuram District.

DR.G.JAYACHANDRAN, J.
and
K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN, J.

vsn

ORDER MADE IN

W.P(MD)No.24078 of 2025
and
W.M.P(MD)Nos.18880 and 20406 of 2025



WEB COPY



29.01.2026