



W.P.(MD) No.4882 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENGH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 23.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.4882 of 2026

Anto Jeba Stelwin

... Petitioner

Vs

- 1.The Chief Controller,
Department of Explosive,
No.140, Rukmani Lakshmipathi Marshall Road Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.
- 2.The Joint Chief Controller,
South Circle, Department of Explosive,
No.140, Rukmani Lakshmipathi Marshall Road,
Egmore,
Chennai - 600 008.
- 3.The District Collector,
Tuticorin District.
- 4.The Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited,
Represented Through its Chief Regional Manager,
Petro Bhavan, 2nd Floor,
New No.82, T.T.K.Road,
Alwarpet, Chennai – 18.

5.Suresh

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing respondent Nos.1 to 3 to take appropriate action against the fourth respondent for not discharging



W.P.(MD) No.4882 of 2026

the guarantee of the petitioner given in favour of the fifth respondent and consequently direct respondent Nos.1 to 4 to cancel the Letter of Intent granted in favour of the fifth respondent dated 02.01.2026.

For Petitioner	: Mr.K.Navaneetharaja
For R-1 to R-3	: Mr.A.Oliraja, Government Advocate
For R-4	: Mr.R.J.Karthick

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking a direction to respondent Nos.1 to 3 to take appropriate action against the fourth respondent for not discharging the guarantee furnished by the petitioner in favour of the fifth respondent and, consequently, to direct respondent Nos.1 to 4 to cancel the Letter of Intent dated 02.01.2026 granted in favour of the fifth respondent.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that, for the purpose of issuance of dealership to the fifth respondent by the fourth respondent, the petitioner stood as guarantor and, on the strength of such guarantee, the dealership was granted. Subsequently, a misunderstanding arose between the petitioner and the fifth respondent.



W.P.(MD) No.4882 of 2026

Hence, the petitioner requested the respondents to discharge him from the guarantee.

3. Per contra, Mr.R.J.Karthick, learned counsel appearing for the fourth respondent, by referring to the E-mail dated 23.02.2026, submitted that the petitioner's undertaking affidavit as guarantor was not considered. The relevant portion of the E-mail reads as follows:

"Dear Team,

Please find the documents considered for Rs.6 Lakhs which was in the name of Father-in-law.

Applicant was submitted another affidavit from Anto Jeba, which was not considered as there was no supporting documents for establishing the funds.

HPCL has considered for finance which were in the name of the applicant and in his father-in-law and Bank Letter for issuing LOI."

4. By placing reliance on the above E-mail, the learned counsel for the fourth respondent submitted that the petitioner's undertaking affidavit as guarantor was not taken into consideration while issuing the Letter of Intent.



W.P.(MD) No.4882 of 2026

5. Recording the submission of the learned counsel for the fourth respondent, particularly with reference to the E-mail dated 23.02.2026, to the effect that the petitioner's affidavit as guarantor was not considered, this Court finds that the question of discharging the petitioner from the guarantee does not arise.

6. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. No costs.

23.02.2026

TSG

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

To

1.The Chief Controller,
Department of Explosive,
No.140, Rukmani Lakshmipathi Marshall Road Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.

2.The Joint Chief Controller,
South Circle, Department of Explosive,
No.140, Rukmani Lakshmipathi Marshall Road,
Egmore,
Chennai - 600 008.

3.The District Collector,
Tuticorin District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.4882 of 2026

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

TSG

W.P.(MD)No.4882 of 2026

23.02.2026