



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19-08-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

WP No. 25439 of 2026

and

W.M.P.No.27886 of 2026

S.Yasar Arafath

..Petitioner

Vs

1. The Inspector of Police,
C-1 Flower Bazar Police Station,
Law and Order, Chennai – 600 001.
2. The District Officer,
Fire & Rescue Services,
Madras High Court campus,
Esplanade, Chennai - 600104.
3. The District Collector,
Chennai District,
Singaravelar Maaligai,
Chennai – 600 001.
4. The Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.
5. The Joint Chief Controller of Explosives
Petroleum and Explosives Safety Organisation
(PESO), South Circle, A & D Wing,
Block 1 to 8, 2nd Floor, Sastri Bhavan,
No.26, Haddows Road, Nungambakkam,
Chennai – 600 006.
6. The Chief Controller of Explosives,
Petroleum and Explosives Safety Organisation
(PESO) CGO Complex, 5th A Block,
Seminary Hills, Nagpur – 440 006,
Maharashtra.



7. A.Rafiq Raja

..Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 5 and 6 herein to cancel the Explosive Licence No.E/SC/TN/24/962 (E20357) granted to the 7th respondent to carry on fire crackers business at Ground Floor, No.51/26, Bunder Street, Parys Corner, Chennai - 600001.

For Petitioner: Mr.K.Rajasekaran

For Respondents: Mr.Durai Gunasekaran
Government Advocate for R1 & R4

Mr.J.V.Sakthi Balakrishnan for R2 & R3

Mr.Naveenkumar Murthi for R7

ORDER

The prayer in the writ petition is for a mandamus directing the fifth and sixth respondents to cancel the explosive licence granted to the seventh respondent to carry on the firecrackers business at Ground Floor, No.51/26, Bunder Street, Parys Corner, Chennai – 600 001.

2. Upon perusing the material records of the case and hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, the grievance of the petitioner is that the seventh respondent is carrying on the business of stationery as well as storing firecrackers on the ground floor of the same building in which the petitioner carries on his business on the third floor. The entrance itself is very congested; if anything happens, it will be difficult to evacuate others and the explosive



licence to store the crackers seems to have been given without considering the mandatory rules and regulations. The petitioner, therefore, has given a representation and the same was also forwarded to the appropriate authority on 13.05.2026 to take appropriate action. In spite thereof, no action has been taken and hence the writ petition.

3. When the matter came up for hearing, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the seventh respondent would submit that the seventh respondent is a landlord and the petitioner is a tenant under him. The said fact has not been disclosed in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition. Already, rent control proceedings in RLTOP No.7768 of 2024 is filed by the petitioner and the same is also pending and the said fact is also not disclosed in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition. Thereafter, claiming to be the agreement holder in respect of the very same property, the petitioner has filed C.S.No.82 of 2025 on the file of this Court for specific performance, requiring the seventh respondent to sell the very same property to the petitioner and the said fact is also suppressed in the affidavit. This apart, the petitioner has also filed CRP No.6064 of 2025 with reference to the rent control proceedings, and the same is also suppressed.

4. In reply thereof, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the veracity of the said averments has to be verified by him and he was not



informed about the aforesaid proceedings.

WEB COPY

5. I have considered the rival submissions and the prayer to adjourn the matter.

6. When there are conflicts between the parties with reference to tenancy and also with reference to an agreement of sale, etc., the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition as if the entire thing is filed considering safety cannot be countenanced. When specific proof has been filed by the learned counsel for the seventh respondent by way of a extracts from the e-Courts website, the same cannot be doubted. It can be seen that in the proceedings, the name of the petitioner is categorically shown and as such, further time as prayed for by the learned counsel for the petitioner is not given.

7. Accordingly, finding no merit, the writ petition stands *dismissed*. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is also closed. No costs.

19-08-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

NSL



To

1. The Inspector of Police,
C-1 Flower Bazar Police Station,
Law and Order, Chennai – 600 001.

2. The District Officer,
Fire & Rescue Services,
Madras High Court campus,
Esplanade, Chennai - 600104.

3. The District Collector,
Chennai District,
Singaravelar Maaligai,
Chennai – 600 001.

4. The Commissioner of Police,
Vepery, Chennai – 600 007.

5. The Joint Chief Controller of Explosives
Petroleum and Explosives Safety Organisation (PESO), South Circle, A & D
Wing,
Block 1 to 8, 2nd Floor, Sastri Bhavan,
No.26, Haddows Road, Nungambakkam, Chennai – 600 006.

6. The Chief Controller of Explosives,
Petroleum and Explosives Safety Organisation (PESO) CGO Complex, 5th A
Block,
Seminary Hills, Nagpur – 440 006, Maharashtra.



WEB COPY

WP No. 25439 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

NSL

WP No. 25439 of 2026

19-08-2026