



W.P.(MD) No.33268 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 02.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDER

W.P.(MD) No.33268 of 2025

S.Alagu

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.B.Senthil

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order in Oo.Mu.No.G2/3657596/2025 dated 04.09.2025 and quash the same and direct the first respondent to entertain the review petition filed by the petitioner and conclude the same within time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Dinesh

For R1 : Mr.D.S.Nedunchezian
Government Advocate

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the



W.P.(MD) No.33268 of 2025

impugned order in Oo.Mu.No.G2/3657596/2025 dated 04.09.2025, quash the same and consequently direct the first respondent to entertain the review petition filed by the petitioner and dispose of the same within the time stipulated by this Court.

2. By the impugned order dated 04.09.2025, the first respondent has rejected the review petition filed by the petitioner against the order of the Revenue Divisional Officer dated 20.02.2025 on the ground that the petitioner had filed the review petition with a delay of 4 months and 15 days.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the first respondent has passed the impugned order rejecting the petitioner's review petition without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and only on the ground of a delay of 4 months and 15 days. He would further submit that the petitioner is aged about 75 years and on account of illness and age-related problems, he could not prefer the review petition within the stipulated time. He would also submit that if the first respondent has granted an opportunity of hearing, the petitioner would have explained the reasons for the delay before the first respondent.



W.P.(MD) No.33268 of 2025

4. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the first respondent would fairly concede that the impugned order does not disclose that the petitioner was put on notice prior to its passing.

5. Considering the fact that the impugned order has been passed without affording any opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and being satisfied with the reasons stated by the petitioner for not filing the review petition within the stipulated time, i.e. that he is aged about 75 years and suffered from illness and age-related problems, the impugned order is set aside and a direction is given to the first respondent to entertain the review petition filed by the petitioner, consider the same and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law.

6. With the above observations, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

[K.SURENDER, J.]
02.02.2026

JEN
Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
To
The District Revenue Officer,
Madurai District, Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.33268 of 2025

K.SURENDER, J.

JEN

W.P.(MD) No.33268 of 2025

02.02.2026