

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 28-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

WEB COPY

WP(MD) NO. 1527 of 2026 and

WMP(MD)No.1196 of 2026

Alagarsamy

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The District Collector
Trichy District, Trichy.

2. The District Revenue Officer
Trichy District, Trichy.

3. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Srirangam, Trichy District.

4. The Thasildar
Manaparai Taluk
Trichy District.

5. The Thasildar
Marungapuri Taluk
Trichy District.

6. Mookayi

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M.Rathi Yamuna

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Shanmugavel,
Additional Government Pleader For R1 To R5
No appearance for R6

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the entire record pertaining to the impugned proceedings / order in Na.Ka.A5/54310/2024, dated 15.12.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent and to quash the same as illegal and to direct the 2nd



respondent to conduct fresh enquiry by perusing the documents submitted by the petitioner.

ORDER

WEB COPY

The present Writ Petition has been filed for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to quash the impugned proceedings / order in Na.Ka.A5/54310/2024, dated 15.12.2025 passed by the 2nd respondent and to direct the 2nd respondent to conduct fresh enquiry by perusing the documents submitted by the petitioner.

2.The brief facts as stated by the petitioner is that originally, Alagar Gounder is the owner of the property who is having two sons namely, Palaniyandi and Aarigounder. The 6th respondent is tracing title through Aarigounder. The petitioner is tracing title through Palaniyandi. The said Alagar Gounder's father's name is Aarigounder and the said Aarigounder's father's name is also Alagar Gounder. Due to the similarity in the names, there is a confusion in granting patta.


3.The next contention of the petitioner is that the Sy.No.413/1 was purchased by the petitioner's father through sale deed dated 23.05.1934 in Doc.No.908/1934. The petitioner has submitted the said document and the respondents failed to consider the same. The Survey No.413/1 stands in the name of the great grandfather Aarigounder. Taking the similarity in the name, the 6th respondent is claiming right over the property.



4.The further contention of the petitioner is that there are two clans and two properties in Survey Nos.413/1 and 161/4. There was an oral partition and Survey No.161/4 was allotted to the 6th respondent clan and Survey No.413/1 was allotted to the petitioner's clan. Now, the 6th respondent has inherited through the oral partition and is claiming another share in the present property. This argument was not considered by the official respondents.

5.Therefore, for the above reasons, the impugned order is set aside and the matter is remitted back to the official respondents. The petitioner shall submit all the relevant documents and the official respondents shall issue notice to the petitioner as well as to the 6th respondent. Thereafter, the respondents shall conduct fresh enquiry and pass orders in accordance to law. If the petitioner is not satisfied with the order, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the competent Civil Court. The said exercise shall be completed within a period of five months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6.With the above observations, this Writ Petition is allowed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.



28-04-2026

WEB COPY
To

1. The District Collector
Trichy District, Trichy.
2. The District Revenue Officer
Trichy District, Trichy.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Srirangam, Trichy District.
4. The Thasildar
Manaparai Taluk
Trichy District.
5. The Thasildar
Marungapuri Taluk
Trichy District.