



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 18.11.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN

W.P (MD)No.4325 of 2014

and

M.P (MD) .No.1 of 2014

WEB COPY

Sri Vyasaraaja Mutt
(Sosale) having its main office at
Krishnamurthypuram,
Mysore,
Represented by its Administrator,
S.N.Prakash

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.Jairaj I.A.S.
Administrator,
Sri Vyasaraaja Mutt,
(Sosale) having its main office at
No.1, Benne Govindappa Chatra,
Basavangudi, Bangalore.

2.The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments
(Administration) Department,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai-34.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, forbearing the first respondent herein from interfering with the affairs and management of the affairs of the branch offices of Sri Vyasaraaja Mutt, Bangalore situated at Trichy, Kumbakonam, Madurai within Tamil Nadu.

For Petitioner	:	No Appearance
For R-1	:	Mr.S.Anand Chandrasekar, for M/s.Sarva Bhuman Associates,
For R-2	:	Mr.S.Shanmugavel, Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The Writ Petition has been filed in the nature of Mandamus seeking a direction against the first respondent who is a private individual from interfering with the branch offices of the



petitioner, Sri Vyasaraaja Mutt, Bangalore situated at Trichy, Kumbakonam, Madurai.

2. Heard Mr.S.Anand Chandrasekar for M/s.Sarva Bhuman Associates, learned counsel for the first respondent and Mr.S.Shanmugavel, learned Special Government Pleader who appears for the second respondent.

3. The Registry had put up note even when the Writ Petition had been filed seeking clarification on maintainability. Thereafter, notice had been directed to the respondents and the Writ Petition had been taken on file only in the year 2015. A counter had been filed by the first respondent again questioning the maintainability.

4. It had been stated in the counter that there was an order of Karnataka High Court dated 19.07.1996, wherein, a four member enquiry committee and later a six member enquiry committee and finally a five member committee headed by the Endowment Commissioner had been formed who conducted an enquiry and the Madathipathi was also heard and subsequent proceedings were also initiated. It was also claimed that the first respondent was appointed as an Administrator by Government Order dated 26.05.2012.

5. As on date, the relief sought in the Writ Petition does not survive and if at all the petitioner has any grievance, he has to approach the appropriate court which had appointed the first respondent as Administrator complaining of any of the actions. Filing a Writ Petition is not the answer.

6. This Writ Petition is therefore dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AE)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Nsr/Lm

Note : In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.



To

The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments
(Administration) Department,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai-34.

+1 CC to M/s.SARVABHAUMAN ASSOCIATES, Advocate (SR-35219[F] dated 19/11/2021)

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP (SR-35182[F] dated 19/11/2021)

W.P (MD) No. 4325 of 2014
18.11.2021

PK(CO)
SB(30.11.2021) 3P 4C