

Leonard Vasanth S Vs The Tahsildar

Leonard Vasanth S Vs The Tahsildar

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1416643

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Feb-19-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice Abdul Quddhose

Appeal No. : WP/5583/2026

Appellant : Leonard Vasanth S

Respondent : The Tahsildar

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19-02-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE AND WMP NO.
6058 OF 2026

1. Leonard Vasanth S Petitioner(s) Vs

1. The Tahsildar

Tahsildar Office, Egmore, Nungambakkam Taluk, Chennai-600 The
Survey Department, Egmore, Respondent(s) PRAYER Calling for all the

connected records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent in Application No.2025/0153/02/063419 dated 08.12.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st Respondent to issue patta in Respect of RS. No.190 TS No.190/4, Block No. 16, Situated at Door No.2, 2nd Street, Sowrashta Nagar,Choolaimedu, Chennai-600 094 and to pas

For Petitioner(s): Mr.N.Edwin Jeyakumar For Respondent(s):
Mr.D.Ravichander,SGP

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed, challenging the impugned order dated 08.12.2025 passed by the first respondent, rejecting the petitioners application, seeking for issuance of patta in his name for the property morefully described in the prayer to this writ petition on the ground that a civil suit is pending.

2. Only through WhatsApp message, the impugned order dated

08.12.2025 was communicated to the petitioner. Except for stating that a civil suit is pending between the parties, no proper reason has been given by the first respondent for rejecting the petitioners application. No enquiry was also conducted by the first respondent.

3. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents

would also submit that since there was a specific performance suit, filed by the rival claimant against the petitioner, who is the landlord of the property, the application submitted by the petitioner seeking for issuance of patta was rejected. However, as seen from the impugned order, the same is not disclosed.

4. Furthermore, pendency of the specific performance suit, will not disentitle the title holder of the property to get a patta.

5. This Court is not expressing any opinion on the merits of the respective contentions.

6. Since the impugned order is a non speaking order and is an order

passed in violation of the principles of natural justice, this Court deems it fit to quash the same and remand the matter back to the first respondent for fresh consideration. The first respondent will have to hold a proper enquiry and only after considering the respective contentions of the rival claimants and only after considering the supporting documents, a final speaking order can be passed.

7. For the foregoing reasons, the impugned order dated 08.12.2025 passed

by the first respondent is hereby quashed and the matter is remanded back to the first respondent for fresh consideration of the petitioners application, seeking for issuance of patta for the property morefully described in the prayer to this writ petition. The first respondent shall pass final orders within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order after hearing the objections of the rival claimants, one Dr. R. Murali and any other third party whom the first respondent deems it fit to enquire.

8. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of. No Costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes Neutral Citation:Yes/No ab To 1.The Tahsildar Tahsildar Office, Egmore, Nungambakkam Taluk, The Survey Department, Egmore, Chennai-600 031 ABDUL QUDDHOSE J. ab AND WMP NO. 6058 OF 2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com