



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION)

MONDAY, THE 25th DAY OF APRIL 2022

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

O.A.No.710 of 2021

and

A.No.4083 of 2021

in

C.S.No.336 of 2021

1. A.Subash, aged about 34 years

Son of Arulmani,

No.16/96, Church Street,

Kadatchapuram (P.O) 628 702

Thoothukudi District.

2. Chinnaraja Vinoth Kumar, aged about 45 years

Son of Y.Sargunaraj

Kavalkadu,

Idaiyarkadu Post 628 682,

Thoothukudi District.

(Suing for themselves and in representative capacity on behalf of members of CSI TND).

... Plaintiffs

-Versus-

1. The Moderator

The Church of South India,

CSI Centre, # 5, Whites Road,

Royapettah, Chennai 600 014.

2. The Bishop

The CSI Thoothukudi - Nazareth Diocese,

Caldwell School Campus,

100, Beach Road,

Thoothukudi 628 001.



3. Rev.V.M.S.Tamil Selvan
Son of Victor
C.S.I.St.Paul's Parsonage,
Kalugumalai 628 552,
Thoothukudi District.

4. Rev.M.P.Immanuel Vonstuck
Son of Paul Pandian
No.5/100-V, 3rd Street,
Shanthi Nagar, Spic Nagar,
Thoothukudi 628 005,
Thoothukudi District.

5. D.NeegarPrince Giftson
Son of Durairaj,
No.26/49/1, Makizhchipuram,
Anna Nagar 12th Street,
Thoothukudi 628 008,
Thoothukudi District.

6. D.Mohanraj Arumainayagam
Son of Diraviam,
No.160-D/36, 5th Street,
Kurinchi Nagar,
Thoothukudi 628 002,
Thoothukudi District.

(*) 7. Dr.Caroline Jeba Shanthini,
Wife of Edwin David,
6/126, Arokiyapuram,
Keelaramasamipuram (po),
Veppankaadu,
Thoothukudi 628 210

(*) (7th Defendant impleaded as per order
dated 01.12.2021 in Application No.4391 of 2021)

(*) 8. B.SugumarDuraisingh,
S/o.Balasundaram,
No.97G/2, Teachers' Colony East,
Second Street, Thoothukudi 628 008.



(*) (8th Defendant impleaded as
per order dated 01.12.2021
in A.No.4392 of 2021)

... Defendants

O.A.No.710 of 2021

and

A.No.4083 of 2021

1. A.Subash, aged about 34 years
Son of Arulmani,
No.16/96, Church Street,
Kadatchapuram (P.O) 628 702
Thoothukudi District.

2. Chinnaraja Vinoth Kumar, aged about 45 years
Son of Y.Sargunaraj
Kavalkadu,
Idaiyarkadu Post 628 682,
Thoothukudi District.
(Suing for themselves and in representative
capacity on behalf of members of CSI TND).

...Applicants/Plaintiffs

-Versus-

1. The Moderator
The Church of South India,
CSI Centre, # 5, Whites Road,
Royapettah, Chennai 600 014.

2. The Bishop
The CSI Thoothukudi - Nazareth Diocese,
Caldwell School Campus,
100, Beach Road,
Thoothukudi 628 001.

3. Rev.V.M.S.Tamil Selvan
Son of Victor
C.S.I.St Paul's Parsonage,
Kalugumalai 628 552,



Thoothukudi District.

4. Rev.M.P.Immanuel Vonstuck
Son of Paul Pandian
No.5/100-V, 3rd Street,
Shanthi Nagar, Spic Nagar,
Thoothukudi 628 005,
Thoothukudi District.

5. D.NeegarPrince Giftson
Son of Durairaj,
No.26/49/1, Makizhchipuram,
Anna Nagar 12th Street,
Thoothukudi 628 008,
Thoothukudi District.

6. D.Mohanraj Arumainayagam
Son of Diraviam,
No.160-D/36, 5th Street,
Kurinchi Nagar,
Thoothukudi 628 002,
Thoothukudi District.

...Respondents/Defendants

O.A.No.710 of 2021

Original Application praying that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to grant an order of interim injunction restraining the 3rd to 6th Defendants claiming or acting as office bearers of the diocese or exercise any powers of the office bearers of the CSI Thoothukudi-Nazareth diocese pending disposal of the above Civil Suit.

A.No.4083 of 2021

Application praying that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to continue the Administrative Committee constituted on 24.08.2021 pending disposal of the above Civil Suit.



These Applications having been heard on 07.03.2022 in the presence of Mr.Karthick Seshadiri for M/s.K.Subbu Ranga Bharathi, Advocates for the Applicants in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and A.No.4083 of 2021 and Mr.V.Prakash, Senior Counsel for Mr.Adrian D.Rozario, Advocates for the 1st Respondent in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and A.No.4083 of 2021 and Mr.V.Lakshmi Narayanan, for Mr.J.Kingsly Solomon, Advocates for the 2nd respondent in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and A.No.4083 of 2021 and Mr.A.R.Karunakaran, Advocate for the Respondents 3,4 & 6 in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and A.No.4083 of 2021 and Mr.S.Prabakaran, Senior Counsel for Mr.R.Ashokan, Advocates for the 5th Respondent in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and A.No.4083 of 2021 and Mr.M.K.Kabir, Senior Counsel for M/s.M.Akila, Advocates for the Defendants 7 & 8 in C.S.No.336 of 2021 and upon reading the Judges Summons and the Affidavit of A.Subash and S.Chinnaraja Vinothkumar filed in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and A.No.4083 of 2021, and the Counter Affidavit of Rt.Rev.Dr.S.E.C.Devasahayam filed in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and A.No.4083 of 2021 and the Common Counter Affidavit of Neegar Prince Giftson filed in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and the Common Counter Affidavit and Common Additional Counter Affidavit of D.Mohanraj Arumainayagam filed in O.A.No.710 of 2021 and A.No.4083 of 2021 and the Reply Affidavit of Neegar Prince Giftson filed in



and having stood over for consideration till this date and coming on this day before this court for orders in the presence of the said advocates for the parties hereto, and **it is ordered as follows:-**

That 1. Rev.V.M.S.Tamil Selvan, 2. Rev.M.P.Immanuel Vonstuck 3. D.Neegar Prince Giftson and 4. D.Mohanraj Arumainayagam, the Respondents 3 to 6/Defendants 3 to 6 in O.A.No.710 of 2021 be and are hereby restrained by an order of interim injunction until further orders of this Court or till the disposal of the above suit from claiming or acting as office bearers of the diocese or exercise any powers of the office bearers of the CSI Thoothukudi-Nazareth diocese.

2. That the 1st and 2nd Respondents/Defendants herein be and are hereby directed to continue the Administrative Committee Constituted on 24.08.2021 until further orders of this Court or till the disposal of the above suit.

WITNESS THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MUNISHWAR NATH BHANDARI CHIEF JUSTICE, HIGH COURT AT MADRAS AFORESAID, THIS THE 25th DAY OF APRIL 2022.

Sd./-

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR (O.S-II)

//Certified to be true copy//

Dated at Madras this the day of 2022.

COURT OFFICER(O.S.)

From 25th Day of September 2008 the Registry is issuing certified copies of the Orders/Judgments/Decrees in this format.



7

KY

25.04.2022

O.A.No. 710 of 2021
and
A.No.4083 of 2021
in
C.S.No.336 of 2021

ORDER

DATED :25.04.2022

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE
P.VELMURUGAN

FOR APPROVAL: 25.04.2022

APPROVED ON: 25.04.2022



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

(ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION)

MONDAY, THE 25th DAY OF APRIL 2022

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.VELMURUGAN

O.A.No.710 of 2021

and

A.No.4083 of 2021

in

C.S.No.336 of 2021

1. A.Subash, aged about 34 years

Son of Arulmani,

No.16/96, Church Street,

Kadatchapuram (P.O) 628 702

Thoothukudi District.

2. Chinnaraja Vinoth Kumar, aged about 45 years

Son of Y.Sargunraj

Kavalkadu,

Idaiyarkadu Post 628 682,

Thoothukudi District.

(Suing for themselves and in representative capacity on behalf of members of CSI TND).

... Plaintiffs

-Versus-

1. The Moderator

The Church of South India,

CSI Centre, # 5, Whites Road,

Royapettah, Chennai 600 014.

2. The Bishop

The CSI Thoothukudi - Nazareth Diocese,

Caldwell School Campus,

100, Beach Road,

Thoothukudi 628 001.



3. Rev.V.M.S.Tamil Selvan
Son of Victor
C.S.I.St.Paul's Parsonage,
Kalugumalai 628 552,
Thoothukudi District.

4. Rev.M.P.Immanuel Vonstuck
Son of Paul Pandian
No.5/100-V, 3rd Street,
Shanthi Nagar, Spic Nagar,
Thoothukudi 628 005,
Thoothukudi District.

5. D.NeegarPrince Giftson
Son of Durairaj,
No.26/49/1, Makizhchipuram,
Anna Nagar 12th Street,
Thoothukudi 628 008,
Thoothukudi District.

6. D.Mohanraj Arumainayagam
Son of Diraviam,
No.160-D/36, 5th Street,
Kurinchi Nagar,
Thoothukudi 628 002,
Thoothukudi District.

(*) 7. Dr.Caroline Jeba Shanthini,
Wife of Edwin David,
6/126, Arokiyapuram,
Keelaramasamipuram (po),
Veppankaadu,
Thoothukudi 628 210

(*) (7th Defendant impleaded as per order
dated 01.12.2021 in Application No.4391 of 2021)

(*) 8. B.SugumarDuraisingh,
S/o.Balasundaram,
No.97G/2, Teachers' Colony East,
Second Street, Thoothukudi 628 008.



(*) (8th Defendant impleaded as
per order dated 01.12.2021
in A.No.4392 of 2021)

... Defendants

O.A.No.710 of 2021

and

A.No.4083 of 2021

1. A.Subash, aged about 34 years
Son of Arulmani,
No.16/96, Church Street,
Kadatchapuram (P.O) 628 702
Thoothukudi District.

2. Chinnaraja Vinoth Kumar, aged about 45 years
Son of Y.Sargunaraj
Kavalkadu,
Idaiyarkadu Post 628 682,
Thoothukudi District.
(Suing for themselves and in representative
capacity on behalf of members of CSI TND).

...Applicants/Plaintiffs

-Versus-

1. The Moderator
The Church of South India,
CSI Centre, # 5, Whites Road,
Royapettah, Chennai 600 014.

2. The Bishop
The CSI Thoothukudi - Nazareth Diocese,
Caldwell School Campus,
100, Beach Road,
Thoothukudi 628 001.

3. Rev.V.M.S.Tamil Selvan
Son of Victor
C.S.I.St Paul's Parsonage,
Kalugumalai 628 552,



Thoothukudi District.

4. Rev.M.P.Immanuel Vonstuck
Son of Paul Pandian
No.5/100-V, 3rd Street,
Shanthi Nagar, Spic Nagar,
Thoothukudi 628 005,
Thoothukudi District.

5. D.NeegarPrince Giftson
Son of Durairaj,
No.26/49/1, Makizhchipuram,
Anna Nagar 12th Street,
Thoothukudi 628 008,
Thoothukudi District.

6. D.Mohanraj Arumainayagam
Son of Diraviam,
No.160-D/36, 5th Street,
Kurinchi Nagar,
Thoothukudi 628 002,
Thoothukudi District.

...Respondents/Defendants

O.A.No.710 of 2021

Original Application praying that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to grant an order of interim injunction restraining the 3rd to 6th Defendants claiming or acting as office bearers of the diocese or exercise any powers of the office bearers of the CSI Thoothukudi-Nazareth diocese pending disposal of the above Civil Suit.

A.No.4083 of 2021

Application praying that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to direct

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

the 1st and 2nd respondents to continue the Administrative Committee



constituted on 24.08.2021 pending disposal of the above Civil Suit.

WEB COPY

These Applications coming on this day before this Court for hearing the Court made the following orders:-

Reserved on : 07.03.2022

Delivered on : 25 .04.2022

The applicants in both the applications are the plaintiff and the respondents are the defendants in the above suit. The first applicant is an Executive of Diocesan Council of Thoothukudi-Nazareth Diocese (in short 'TND'), second applicant is the member of Diocesan Council and also contested for the post of Synod Member in the purported election of the CSI TND conducted on 20.10.2021, who has interest in the affairs of the CSI TND.

2 The applicants/plaintiffs have filed the application in O.A.No.710 of 2021 seeking an order of interim injunction restraining the defendants 3 to 6 claiming or acting as office bearers of the diocese or exercise any powers of the office bearers of the CSI TND and the application in A.No.4083 of 2021 seeking to direct the first and second respondents/defendants 1 & 2 to continue the Administrative Committee constituted on 24.08.2021, pending disposal of the above suit.



3 For the sake of the convenience, the parties are referred to as per their rank in the above suit.

4 The plaintiffs filed the above suit for the reliefs of declaration and mandatory injunction with regard to 4th phase election of TND held on 20.10.2021 and the subsequent notice dated 28.10.2021. The first defendant is Moderator, second defendant is Bishop, defendants 3 to 6 are claimed to have been elected as office bearers of the TND on the strength of the purported election held on 20.10.2021 and defendants 7 & 8 are also aggrieved parties with regard to the election held on 20.10.2021.

5 Mr.Karthick Sheshadhiri, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the plaintiffs would submit that according to the constitution of TND, elections to elect the office bearers of Diocese are required to be conducted once in 3 years as amended in 2016 and the election for the executive of the TND is conducted through 4 phases of election and the previous election was held in 2018. As the tenure was to end in October 2021, election has to be conducted for the period of 2021 to 2024. The Executive Committee has to take steps for electing new council 6 months prior to the expiry of tenure and hence it was decided to convene election to the new council and the 1st phase of the election was held on 16.08.2021. In this phase, eligible voters



from the congregation casted their vote and elected the Pastorate Committee members and Diocesan Council members. In the meanwhile, on 24.08.2021, an administrative committee was constituted by the first defendant in violation of the CSI constitution Chapter VIII Rule 12 D, in consultation with the 2nd defendant to assist him till the election is over.

5.1 The learned Senior Counsel would further submit that on 28.08.2021, 2nd phase was convened, in which the elected pastorate committee members and the diocesan council members during 1st phase, elected the Secretary, Treasurer and Church Council members of the pastorate. On 18.09.2021, 3rd phase was convened and elected diocesan council members and the elected Secretary, Treasurer and the Church Council Members of all the pastorate elected 4 diocesan executive members in the category of 2 lay common, 1 lay woman and lay under 35 and a Church Council Secretary and 1st to 3rd phase of election was conducted in a fair and transparent manner. The last phase of the diocese election was convened on 20.10.2021. Generally, in this phase, the elected diocesan council members will elect the office bearers such as Vice Chairman, Lay Secretary, Clergy Secretary and the Treasurer. The Lay Diocesan Council members will elect five Executive members from themselves, the

Clergymen will elect 3 Clergy Executive members and 6 Clergy Synod



representative and the Lay diocesan Council members will elect 5 lay Synod representatives, 3 lady Synod representatives and 3 under 35 lay Synod representatives. On 20.10.2021, as per the agenda, the Diocesan Council meeting of TND commenced at 9.30 a.m. and the second defendant, the Administrative Secretary and the Administrative Treasurer commenced the election process at 10.30 a.m. Subsequently, the second defendant, in accordance with the constitution appointed the following persons:

- (1) Two Recording Secretaries namely, M.Edward and Rev.M.S.Jebastin Michelraj and arranged to record the proceeding of the election process.
- (2) Three observers namely, Rev.Raja Stalin from Madurai Ramnad Diocese, Rev.Muthusamy Chirstudoss from Kanyakumari Diocese and Lordwin from Tirunelveli Diocese appointed by the CSI Synod were present to supervise the election and they also form a part of the Administrative Committee appointed by CSI Synod.

5.2 The learned Senior Counsel would further submit that the agenda was not followed and the election process was not in accordance with the Constitution of TND. As per the Constitution, the 2nd defendant, Secretary and Treasurer are the election officers and any instruction during the election can be rendered only by the Bishop. However, it was not so in the present case. During the 4th phase of election, several unpleasant



happenings occurred which instilled fear in the minds of the members present to cast their vote. The observers have overlooked the Bishop and taken over the proceedings in their hand, which is absolutely against the election norms. The CSI Synod observers acted hand in glove with the defendants 3 to 6 and their supporters and were constantly acting under the instruction from one party. The recording secretary appointed by 2nd defendant was called upon by the observers and it was informed that they have to act in accordance with the instruction given by the observers. When the 2nd defendant explained the observers that they have been appointed by the Synod (Administrative Committee) only to supervise the election and not to render any instruction which the observers ignored. The 2nd defendant and the Administrative Officers were openly threatened that they will give false report to the CSI Synod and cancel the elections or declare that the other side won the election.

5.3 The learned Senior Counsel would continue to submit

that as per the agenda, the election of Treasurers is held only after the election for other posts are filled. However this was not followed due to chaos created by some persons and the observers. The election of treasurer was held as per affirmative voting of Rev.Moses Jebaraj selected by search

committee, normally once the election is over, the Diocesan employees



always will count the ballot papers under the supervision of the second respondent and the observers, but the observers asked them to keep them out. The observers themselves began counting the ballot papers and asked everyone to leave the place including recording Secretary, Bishop, Administrative Executive etc., and allowed three tellers from each side and some additional persons who has took part in the elections during the counting which is against the election norms. It was informed in Vice-Chairman election, the third defendant got 189 votes and Rev. Andrew Victor Ganana Oli got 181 votes. The total votes polled in the election is only 369, however the aggregate of votes casted was 370. The election for Lay Secretary and Clergy Secretary was also held in an unfair manner, the votes issued and the votes casted were disproportionated. The request for recounting the votes has been rejected by the observers. During the counting of votes for the post of Treasurer, the members of the one party and the CSI Synod observers demanded that only one side of the members to count the affirmative votes and asked the other side to keep it aside and chased the first plaintiff out of the place with the help of some persons. The CSI Synod observer, Rev. Raja Stalin also attempted to stop the video graphing of the counting of ballot papers. While informing the results of the election they did not disclose the number of votes and more than 100 ballot



name of 6th defendant as the Treasurer which the Search Committee refused and came up with 4th name Rev.Jasper Arputharaj but a group of 6 people threatened the 2nd defendant and forced him to announce the name of 6th defendant as Treasurer, who has no educational qualification prescribed as per CSI constitution. The process of electing the 6th defendant as a candidate who was not recommended by search committee is invalid. During Women Synod Executive election counting, Dr.Caroline, Dr.Kamali Jeyaseelan, Mrs.Thendral Benjamin lodged a complaint to the CSI Synod observer's that the counting was done in unfair manner, disproportionate and about 30 votes were missing. However, the observer turned deaf ears and the same happened in the lay executive members counting, 10 votes were missing.

5.4 The learned Senior Counsel would further submit that the plaintiffs gave complaint to the 2nd defendant on 20.10.2021 and 21.01.2021, based on which, administrative committee and diocesan tribunal held and the second defendant cancelled the elections and published it in all the leading daily newspapers and the second defendant also announced for re-election to be held on 01.11.2021 and 03.11.2021, but, till date no re-election conducted, instead the defendants 3 to 6 have assumed office on the basis of the election, which was cancelled by the 2nd defendant by his notice dated 22.10.2021. Therefore, the learned Senior

Counsel finally argued that if the defendants 3 to 6 are allowed to act as



office bearers of the TND, there is much probability of exploitation of Diocese resources and misappropriation of funds. Hence it is just and necessary to restrain the defendants 3 to 6 from claiming and acting as office bearers of the CSI TND and from exercising power under the capacity of office bearers of the CSI TND.

6 Mr.V.Prakash, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the first defendant would oppose the suit as well as the applications mainly on the three grounds (1) the plaintiffs cannot institute the present suit under the capacity of representatives of the members of the TND, (2) The suit is hit by non compliance of Order I, Rule, since no leave has been obtained by the plaintiffs and the plaintiffs cannot sue the first defendant alone under the capacity of Moderator of CSI and lastly (3) the plaintiffs should have addressed their disputes regarding the election to the Diocesan Election Commission as per the CSI Constitution.

6.1 Drawing the attention of this Court on the above three points, the learned Senior Counsel argued that the TND has around 2 lakhs members and its Diocesan Council has 370 members, out of which, the plaintiffs have alone come forward by way of the present suit, claiming representative of the members, which seems without any basis and they



cannot sue under the capacity of the representative of the members of TND.

To support the above contention, the learned Senior Counsel relied on the decision of this Court reported in **1999 II MLJ 277 (Moderator, CSI, and others vs. J.S.Kingsley and others)**. Further, the CSI is an unincorporated body and the first defendant as Moderator alone cannot be sued it has to be against all the members with leave of the Court under Order I, Rule 8 and without getting such permission, the suit cannot be maintained. In support of his contentions, the learned Senior Counsel placed reliance on the decision of this Court in **1999 I MLJ 392 (Rev.Noble Gambeeran and others vs. Peter P.Ponnan)**

6.2 The learned Senior Counsel would further contend that if there is any dispute with regard to election, that has to be addressed to the Diocesan Election Commission and therefore, the remedy available to the plaintiff's is before the Diocesan Election Commission and the plaintiffs have no *prima facie* case and the balance of convenience is with the defendants only. Like wise, the election disputes have to be addressed to the Diocesan Election Commission and the Bishop cannot interfere with the same.



argue that the second defendant Bishop accepted the decision of the Moderator/Officers of the Synod and in proof cancelled the elections rescheduled on 03.11.2021. Furthermore, the defendants 3 to 6 the officers of the TND are functioning from 21.10.2021 and the Administrative Committee appointed by the Synod for the said Diocese ceased to be in existence from 20.10.2021 and therefore, the impugned proceedings suffer from no infirmity as being in accordance with the Constitution and there is no cause of action for the plaintiff's to institute the present suit, which is liable to be dismissed.

7 Mr.V.Lakshmi Narayanan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the second defendant would submit that the second defendant Bishop is the Head of the Institution. The first three phases of the election were conducted in a fair and transparent manner, the issue raised only in the fourth phase of the election held on 20.10.2021. Despite the specific order of the Madurai Bench of this Court permitting 3000 teachers to participate in the election and the Bishop also permitted the same, 1st defendant did not permit the Teacher constituency to participate in the election, had they permitted the teachers to vote in the election, it would have made a drastic difference in the declaration of results.



20.10.2021 the second defendant received complaints from several quarters and the video recordings also proved the malpractices by few members of the Diocese. The second defendant also sent a report to the first defendant elaborating the irregularities during the election and counting and the recording secretaries also lodged their report to the first defendant about the unlawful and unjust acts occurred during election, but the first defendant did not respond for the both the reports. The tribunal viewed and scrutinised the video recordings and came to a conclusion that the elections were vitiated by unfair conduct and the Tribunal unanimously resolved to cancel the election held on 20.10.2021 and hence on 20.10.2021 published the order cancelling the election held on 20.10.2021 and the same has not been challenged by any party till dated. Subsequently, on 22.10.2021, the General Secretary of the CSI Synod sent a letter on the instruction of the first defendant stating that in case of allegations regarding the election, the same has to be addressed to the Diocesan Election Commission as per CSI Constitution. The Synod acted as an appellate authority over the Bishop and the first respondent wrote to the Bishop stating that he has no right to interfere or cancel the election held on 20.10.2021 and also the newly elected officers of the Diocese and such officers alone shall be responsible for the administration and that if the Bishop fails to stand by the letter, action would be initiated against him.



WEB COPY 7.2

The suo motu actions of the defendants 3 to 6, without the declaration of results and in the teeth of the Bishop's order based on the administrative committee decision as well as that of the election tribunal's decision is unjust and unequitable. The video recordings speak volumes on the malpractice and electoral fraud in the election. The first defendant has no power to interfere with the internal affairs of the diocese. The second defendant was compelled to call of the election that was to be convened on 03.11.2021 under the threat and pressure and also fear to life. The learned Senior Counsel argued pointing out the irregularities and procedural lapses in the electoral process and contended that undoubtedly, the election held on 20.10.2021 was held in a prejudicial and unfair manner.

8 Mr.S.Prabakaran, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the 5th defendant would submit that the election held on 20.10.2021 was held in accordance with the rules under the TND Constitution. The allegations of the plaintiffs and the second defendant are baseless and are contrary to the facts. In fact, since the 6th defendants has got majority of the votes, the Bishop announced his name as Treasurer and also blessed the elected office bearers and in fact had also had prayer with them. The second defendant also present till the election process was over and announced the results.



The Administrative Committee was constituted by the Synod only to assist the second defendant in the administration and management of the Diocese and to conduct the election to the Diocese and to convene the Diocesan Council. Therefore once the Diocesan Council is formed/convened, the Administrative Committee ceased to exist and therefore, the so called decision said to have taken by the Administrative Committee is without any authority and the same is *ultra vires* of its power.

8.1 The learned Senior Counsel would further submit that the fifth defendant has been elected to the post of Lay-Secretary and has assumed charge and discharging his duties. The second defendant Bishop is supporting the plaintiffs group and he is interest in getting the election of the defendants 3 to 6 set aside. The second defendant Bishop is taking different stand at different point of time and he is not neutral and he has taken sides. Therefore, the allegations made by the plaintiff's and the second defendant are baseless and the election convened 20.10.2021 need not be declared as void, since it was held in accordance with the Constitution and the defendants 3 to 6 have also assumed charge and discharging their duties.

9 Mr.A.R.Karunakaran, learned counsel appearing for the defendants 3, 4 and 6 has made a submission reiterating the submissions made by Mr.Prabakaran, Senior Counsel, for the fifth defendant. The



defendants 3 to 6 have been elected as office bearers and they have assumed charge and they have performing their duties towards the welfare of the Diocese. Therefore, the lawful elections cannot be overturned on the malicious litigation. Hence the applications and the very suit itself are liable to be rejected, as the allegations made by the plaintiff's and the second defendant are baseless.

10 Mr.M.K.Kabir, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the newly impleaded defendants 7 and 8 is also disputing the fourth phase of election held on 20.10.2021. The 7th defendant is a Teacher and the 8th defendant is the retired Headmaster of TDTA Primary School, Palayamkottai and he was Diocesan Council Member during the period 1991-95 & 1995-99 and also member of the Executive Committee between 1999-2003. The TND Constitution chapter 4 rule 2 E 1,2,3, clearly specifies the right of the Teachers to vote in the elections to the Diocesan Council and the Madurai Bench of this Court also held that the Teachers should be included as voters and they should be allowed to vote in the elections. However, the Teachers were prevented from contesting deprived their right to vote in the fourth phase of the elections. More than 15% of the total electoral college enshrined in the CSI TND constitution deprived of their rights and hence the entire election for the fourth phase held on 20.10.2021 is liable to be set



11 Heard the respective Senior Counsel and the Counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

12 Admittedly, elections to elect the office bearers of TND are required to be conducted once in 3 years as per the amendment in the constitution of the TND in the year 2016 and the election for the executive of the TND is conducted through 4 phases. It is seen that up to three phases, there was no dispute and the entire dispute arises only around the fourth phase of the elections to the TND held on 20.10.2021. The plaintiffs have made certain allegations against the first defendant and the defendants 3 to 6 with regard to the fourth phase of elections. The second defendant Bishop has also disputed the manner in which the fourth phase of the election was held. The newly impleaded defendants 7 and 8 contended that the Teachers were not allowed to contest and vote in the elections, despite the order of the Court.

13 A careful perusal of the documents filed by the second defendant Bishop would clearly show that there were malpractice in the disputed election. The second defendant Bishop has enclosed the letters of complaint received from various persons. He also filed the report of the Recording Secretaries and the Minutes of the Diocesan Election Tribunal held on 21.10.2021, wherein it was decided to cancel the election took place on



14 From the materials placed on records and the submissions made by the respective counsel, it is clear that there was some dispute in the manner of the conduct of the fourth phase of the election held on 20.10.2021. It is seen that the second defendants Bishop addressed the grievance received from various persons with regard to the fourth phase election to the first defendant and the Recording Secretaries also submitted the report elaborating the malpractice in the disputed election. But, it is seen that no action was taken by the first defendant on the representation of both the second defendant and the Recording Secretaries. It is stated that As per Chapter IX of the Constitution of CSI, the Synod is the highest representative body of the CSI, its supreme governing and legislative body and the visible symbol of its unity and the Bishops are the Heads of the respective Diocese.

15 After receiving complaints from various parties and after perusing the video graphs, as the Minutes of the Diocesan Election Tribunal, the election took place on 20.10.2021 was cancelled and re-election was also announced. It is stated that the Synod, overruling the second defendant Bishop, had held the Election conducted on 20.10.2021 as valid and the first defendant allowed the defendants 3 to 6 to assume charges, even though there were many complaints with regard to the election and without taking action on the same. Whether really any malpractices have taken place



during the 4th phase of election and whether the decision of the second defendant Bishop was right or not are all matter for trial, which can be decided only after trial and not at this stage.

16 There is no quarrel with the decisions referred to by the learned counsel for the first defendant, but, the same are not made applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case on hand. Admittedly there were many complaints with regard to the fourth phase of the election held on 20.10.2021, pursuant to which, the same was declared as cancelled. But, subsequently the same was declare as valid and the newly elected office bearers have also assumed charge. Therefore the applicants/plaintiffs have got *prima facie* case. The balance of convenience is in favour of the applicants. If the injunction is not granted, the members of the Diocese would suffer irreparable injuries and if injunction is granted, the defendants would not be prejudiced. What are all the defence taken by the defendants are matter for trial.

17 Therefore, on a perusal of the documents filed and considering the submissions of the respective counsel, this Court is of the view that the applicants made out prima face case for grant of reliefs sought for in these applications. There shall be an order of interim injunction as prayed for in the application in O.A.No.710 of 2021. Further, since the election held on



the defendants 1, 3 to 6, the first and second defendants are directed to continue the Administrative Committee constituted on 24.08.2021 until further orders or till the disposal of the above suit.

18 With the above reliefs, both the applications are allowed.

Sd./- P.V.J.,
25.04.2022

//Certified to be true copy//

Dated at Madras this the day of 2022.

COURT OFFICER(O.S.)

From 25th Day of September 2008 the Registry is issuing certified copies of the Orders/Judgments/Decrees in this format.