



W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 02.07.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

**W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026
and
W.M.P.(MD) No.13749 of 2026**

Saravanadevi

... Petitioner

/vs./

1.The Regional Transport Officer
Regional Transport Office
Pudukkottai Town and District.

2.The Motor Vehicle Inspector
Illuppur Part Office
Illuppur Post
Pudukkottai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent to issue fitness certificate and certificate of renewal for vehicle bearing registration No.TN 34 AH 5573 within a stipulated time fixed by this Court by considering the Petitioner's representation dated 07.04.2026.



W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Arul Jenifer for
M/S.KBS Law Office

For Respondents : Mr.S.Venkatesh
counsel for the State of Tamil Nadu

ORDER

Mr.S.Venkatesh, learned counsel for the State of Tamil Nadu, takes notice for the respondents.

2.By consent, this writ petition is disposed of at the time of admission after hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondents.

3.The petitioner is before this Court for a Mandamus to direct the second respondent to issue a fitness certificate as well as the certificate of renewal for the vehicle bearing Reg.No.TN 34 AH 5573, by considering the petitioner's representation, dated 07.04.2026.

4.It appears that the petitioner has taken a loan from Equitas Bank and the vehicle has been hypothecated to the said bank.



W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

WEB COPY

5.The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner's brother-in-law, namely, Mayilvel and one Muniyandi have been claiming rival rights over the vehicle, although the vehicle stands in the name of the petitioner.

6.The learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn attention to a communication issued by first respondent, dated 26.05.2026, bearing Ref.Na.Ka.No.4182/A2/2026, wherein, both Mayilvel and Muniyandi have claimed right over the vehicle.

7.It appears that Muniyandi claims that the petitioner has taken loan from him and therefore, the petitioner has pledged the RC book. On the other hand, the petitioner's brother-in-law, Mayilvel, claims that the RC book is available with him and that the loan with Equitas Bank is being serviced by him.

8.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner's husband, namely, Paneer Selvam and his brother, Mayilvel are carrying on business as V.K.Construction and there are certain disputes between them and



W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

WEB COPY

therefore, the said Muniyandi had been instigated to state as if he is in possession of the RC book of the vehicle.

9.The learned counsel for the petitioner would draw attention to Section 56 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and Rule 62 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 in this regard.

10.It is submitted that to renew the fitness certificate, the Vehicle Inspector of the authorized testing stations has to merely carry out the specified test as in the table to Rule 62 of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 and that the private dispute if at all between the petitioner's husband, namely, Panneer Selvam and the petitioner's brother-in-law, namely, Mayilvel, are at the instance of the said Muniyandi, the renewal of the fitness certificate cannot be denied.

11.It is submitted that the petitioner is servicing the loan with Equitas Bank and is unable to put the vehicle to use in the absence of the fitness certificate.



W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

WEB COPY

12.Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondent and taking note of the facts narrated as above, I am of the view that the renewal of the fitness certificate, which expired on 31.10.2025, in respect of which an application was filed by the petitioner before the second respondent on 20.03.2026, cannot be kept in suspended state of animation, merely because there is a *inter se* dispute between the petitioner's husband, Panneer Selvam and his brother, namely, Mayilvel and Muniyandi.

13.The Rules do not contemplate any scope for stalling the renewal merely because the original of the RC book is not produced, where it is claimed that it is lost. It is quite possible that the RC book may be either with the said Mayilvel or Muniyandi. It is for them to settle their private disputes in the manner known to law. They cannot put spoke into the request for renewal under the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and the Central Motor Vehicles Rules 1989.



W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

WEB COPY

14. Under these circumstances, I direct the second respondent to renew the fitness certificate of the petitioner without prejudice to the rights of the said Mayilvel and Muniyandi to work out the remedy in the manner known to law. It is also open for the petitioner to proceed with the complaint given for the loss of the original RC book. Needless to state, the petitioner will pay the requisite late fee, if any, on account of the delayed filing of the application for renewal of the fitness certificate.

15. The Writ Petition stands disposed of, with the above directions. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

mm

02.07.2026

To

1. The Regional Transport Officer
Regional Transport Office
Pudukkottai Town and District.

2. The Motor Vehicle Inspector

6/8



W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

WEB COPY

Illuppur Part Office
Illuppur Post
Pudukkottai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

C.SARAVANAN, J.

mm

W.P.(MD) No.18579 of 2026

02.07.2026