



Cont P(MD) No.1396 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 11.08.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CONT.P(MD)No.1396 of 2026

in

WP CRL(MD) No.368 of 2026

Time Pass Recreation Club,
Rep. by its Secretary
Mr.Gnanaprakash,
S/o. Dhavamani
D.No.3/44B3, 44B4, 44B5, 44B6,
Gandhiji Road, Paramakudi
Ramanathapuram.

... Petitioner

-Vs-

- 1.Ms.Karthikaa S.P.(Director),
The Commissioner
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chepauk, Chennai
2. Mr.Simranjeet Singh
The District Collector
Ramanathapuram District,
District Collector Office
Ramanathapuram District.
3. Mr.G.Chandeesh
The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Superintendent of Police,



Cont P(MD) No.1396 of 2026

The District Collectorate Complex,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Contemnors / Respondents

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Contempt Petition is filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, to punish the contemnors/1 to 3 respondents herein for their willful deliberate and disobedience of the order passed by this Court in WP Crl(MD).No.368 of 2026 dated 19.02.2026.

For Petitioner : Mr.Niranjan S. Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.B.Saravanan, AAG

Assisted by Mr.S.Siva Thilakar

Special Government Pleader

(For R1 & R2)

Mr.I.Murugesan

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

(For R3)

ORDER

This petition has been filed to punish the Contemnors/ respondents for wilful disobedience of the order of this Court passed in WPCRL (MD) No.368 of 2026 dated 19.02.2026.



Cont P(MD) No.1396 of 2026

WEB COPY

2. The writ petition has been filed challenging the orders dated 15.09.2025 and 25.09.2025 and consequently seeking a direction to the first respondent to issue a licence for an FL-2 Bar to the petitioner's club. By the impugned orders, the respondents declined to grant a licence to the petitioner's club, stating that a school, Panchayat Office and hospital are situated in the said locality. Aggrieved by the same, the writ petition was filed by the petitioner.

3. While considering the writ petition, this Court noticed that, in respect of another Recreation Club, namely, Sevuga Recreation Club, license had been granted. Therefore, this Court set aside the order and directed the respondents to reconsider the petitioner's application and pass appropriate orders on merits. Pursuant to the said order, the respondents reconsidered the application and again declined to grant the licence stating that the location was not in permissible location. Hence, the present contempt petition has been filed.

4. The specific plea of the petitioner is that the Sevuga Recreation Club is still functioning in the said locality. Hence, it is questioned as to



Cont P(MD) No.1396 of 2026

how the Sevuga Recreation Club was permitted to function in the said area. In order to explain the same this Court directed the 3rd respondent to be present before this Court and explain how the Sevuga Recreation Club had been granted a licence when a school, Panchayat Office and hospital are functioning in the nearby area. The 3rd respondent was present before this Court.

5. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the contemnor submitted that only a school was available in the vicinity of the FL-2 licence premises and that there is no prohibition against granting an FL-2 licence merely because a school is situated nearby. It is only for TASMAL there is prohibition for granting license if nearby school is situated. Such a contention cannot be accepted, since the logic behind barring license to any liquor shop if it is situated near school is that the students should not be affected. Even FL-2 license is only a liquor shop.

6. The next submission of the respondents/contemnor is that there is school, panchayat office and hospital, hence the petitioner was not granted license. This Court is of the considered opinion that the same reason



Cont P(MD) No.1396 of 2026

would be applicable to Sevuga Recreation Club also. When this Court specifically questioned how the Sevuga Recreation Club was granted license, there is no answer from the respondents. This Court is of the considered opinion that same reason is applicable to both the petitioner and the Sevuga Recreation Club. When the respondent had granted to the Sevuga Recreation Club, then the petitioner is also entitled to the license. But now the respondents submitted that apart from the reason that there are school, panchayat office and hospital, two murders happened, hence the same was one more reason for not granting any license to the petitioner. In such circumstances, this Court directed to consider for cancelling the license granted to the said Sevuga Recreation Club. Today the respondents submitted that the license granted to Sevuga Recreation Club was cancelled in the order dated 10.08.2026 passed in P&E2(1)/6587/2023. In such circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner also may not be entitled to license.

7. The petitioner is making an allegation that the said Sevuga Recreation Club belongs to DMK party, hence license was granted to Sevuga Recreation Club. And the petitioner belongs to the other party,



Cont P(MD) No.1396 of 2026

hence license was declined. It is pertinent to record the sad state of affairs in the State of Tamil Nadu. Whenever license is granted to a person, he would be affiliated with the ruling party and any person affiliated to the other party would be declined license. To be specific, if DMK is ruling, license would be granted to the party persons of DMK. And the person affiliated to ADMK and other parties would be denied license. Likewise, if ADMK is ruling, license would be granted to the party persons of ADMK. And the person affiliated to DMK and other parties would be denied license. Interference of Politics in all walks of life is affecting the common public in their date-to-date affairs. This Court only can record the same, but no relief could be granted.

8. In the writ petition this Court had directed the respondents to consider the petitioner's application and pass orders in the light of the license granted to Sevuga Recreation Club. But now it is submitted that the license granted to the said Sevuga Recreation Club was cancelled vide order 10.08.2026. Also, the petitioner's application was also rejected. Hence this Court is of the considered view that there is no contempt as alleged in the petition. Therefore, the contempt petition is closed. The



Cont P(MD) No.1396 of 2026

petitioner is at liberty to challenge the order declining the licence. If the Sevuga Recreation Club obtains any order in its favour from any Court, the respondents shall reconsider the petitioner's application in the light of the said order of Sevuga Recreation Club.

9. The contempt petition is closed. No costs.

11.08.2026

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No
msrm

To

1. Ms. Karthikaa S.P. (Director),
The Commissioner
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Chepauk, Chennai
2. Mr. Simranjeet Singh
The District Collector
Ramanathapuram District,
District Collector Office
Ramanathapuram District.
3. Mr. G. Chandeesh
The Superintendent of Police,
O/o. The Superintendent of Police,
The District Collectorate Complex,
Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



Cont P(MD) No.1396 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J.

msrm

CONT.P(MD)No.1396 of 2026

in

WP CRL(MD) No.368 of 2026

11.08.2026