



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 27-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

WP(MD) NO. 10399 of 2024

J.Perumal

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The District Revenue Officer
Theni District, Theni.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Periyakulam, Theni District.

3. The Tahsildar
Aundipatti Taluk
Theni District.

4. Sri Parameswari Spinning Mills Limited
Rep by its Director
G.Ravi,
Having Office at
Sri Parameswari Spinning Mills Private Limited,
Great Cotton Road,
Panthalkudi,
Virudhunagar District.

Respondent(s)

*(Amended, vide order of this Court, dated 27.04.2026, made in
WMP(MD)No.7873 of 2026 in WP(MD) NO. 10399 of 2024)*

For Petitioner(s): Mr.P.Arun Jayatram

For Respondent(s): Mr.SRA.Ramachandran,
Additional Government Pleader For R1 To R3
Mr.A.Sivaji for R4

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 records of the 1st respondent in his proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 51876/2022/D2 dated 25.03.2024 and quash the same as



devoid of merits and consequently, to direct the 1st respondent to issue patta in the name of the petitioner's father for the land comprised in Survey No. 1512 situated at Shanmuga Sundarapuram Village, Andipatti Taluk, Theni District.

ORDER

WEB COPY

The present Writ Petition has been filed for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to quash the proceedings in Na.Ka.No.51876/2022/D2 dated 25.03.2024 and consequently, to direct the 1st respondent to issue patta in the name of the petitioner's father for the land comprised in Survey No.1512 situated at Shanmuga Sundarapuram Village, Andipatti Taluk, Theni District.

2.The petitioner is claiming right over the property in Survey No.1512 through the assignment patta issued in DKT proceedings No.242/75 dated 25.03.1966 to an extent of 3.64 acres in Survey No.1512 was assigned to the petitioner's father namely, Jakkulu Mathari. The Survey No.1512 was subdivided into 1512/2 to an extent of 3.64 acres and patta was issued in the name of the petitioner's father in patta No.1413. The petitioner's father died on 01/11/1985. The petitioner's father had two wives. The 1st wife namely Muthammal and son Chennan had died. The 2nd wife Varadammal was having three sons, namely Periya Perumal, Gnana Perumal and Perumal (petitioner). The said Gnana Perumal died on 04.10.2008.

3.The petitioner submitted that during UDR, patta was granted to the petitioner's elder



brother Periya Perumal. By using the same, the petitioner's elder brother sold the entire property in favour of the 4th respondent in the year 2005. Though the assignment was

WEB COPY

granted in favour of the petitioner's father, it was enjoyed by the family members. The official respondents have changed the patta in the name of the 1st brother and the petitioner considers the same as UDR mistake. Hence, he prayed to rectify the mistake.

4.The contention of the petitioner was considered by the RDO wherein he has stated that it is not a UDR mistake. Since there is a sale by the petitioner's brother, he has to approach the competent Civil Court. Aggrieved over the same, the petitioner preferred a revision petition before the DRO who is the 1st respondent herein. The DRO has stated that the assignment land was sold by the petitioner's brother which is a violation of conditions. Further, the petitioner's brother has not obtained appropriate permission from the Government. Panjamar land can be sold to Panjamar only and the 4th respondent is not a Panjamar. Therefore, the sale itself is wrong.

5.On perusing the conditions prescribed in the DKT patta, it is seen that there is no specific condition that it has to be sold to the Panjamar only. However, this Court is not inclined to go into the merits of the Panjamar or non Panjamar issue. The said issue is left open and the Commissioner of Land Administration may take a call on it. Now, the writ petition is filed between the petitioner and the 4th respondent. When the petitioner's brother has already sold the entire property to the 4th respondent, the



appropriate remedy for the petitioner is to approach the competent Civil Court.

6. Therefore, this Court is interfering with the District Revenue Officer's order, but this Court is agreeing with the order passed by the Revenue Division Officer. Thus, the impugned order passed by DRO is quashed and the order passed by the Revenue Division Officer, dated 01.11.2022, is restored. The parties are at liberty to approach the competent Civil Court.

7. With the above observations, this Writ Petition is allowed. There shall be no order as to costs.

27-04-2026

Tmg

To

1. The District Revenue Officer
Theni District, Theni.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Periyakulam, Theni District.

3. The Tahsildar
Aundipatti Taluk
Theni District.

4. The Commissioner of Land Administration,
Ezhilagam, 2nd Floor,
Chepauk, Chennai - 5.