



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON: 07.11.2022

PRONOUNCED ON: 22.11.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE **S.SRIMATHY**

W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

P.Sreedharan (Died)
Viswambaran Nair

... Petitioner

vs.

- 1.The Commissioner,
H.R. and C.E. (Administration)
Department,
Chennai.
- 2.The Joint Commissioner,
H.R. and C.E. (Administration)
Department,
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Esakkiamman Temple,
Muppandal,
Kanyakumari District.

4.N.Parameswaran Pillai

... Respondents



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

(Petitioner is substituted for the deceased petitioner, vide Court order, dated 25.07.2019, in W.M.P.(MD)No.15829 of 2016)

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent in Se.Mu.Na.Ka.7587/2014/Aa2, dated 08.08.2014 to quash the same.

For Petitioner	: Mr.J.Anandhavalli
For R1 and 2	: Mr.P.Subbaraj Special Government Pleader
For R3	: Mr.K.Sathiya Singh
For R4	: Mr.T.Arul for Mr.M.R.Sreenivasan

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent, dated 08.08.2014 to quash the same.

2. The brief facts as stated in the affidavit are that the petitioner is the



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Arulmigu Alappancode Easwarakala Boothathan Temple, which is an aged old temple and the administration of the temple is vested with the Karanavans (senior most member) of each of the four Tarawad by the partition deed of 1102 M.E. The right of the four Tarawads to administer the temple and the temple properties are detailed in the judgment and decree in O.S.No.393 of 1119 M.E. of District Munsif Court, Kuzhithurai. The same is accepted by the H.R. and C.E. Department. On 08.09.1981 in O.A.No.36 of 1979, the then Deputy Commissioner of H.R. and C.E., Tirunelveli re-designated now as Joint Commissioner had declared that the administration of the temple is hereditary. The right of trusteeship springs from the old partition deed. As per the deed, the senior most male member of each family will be the trustee and that person has to be recognized as the trustee of that Tarawad by the respondent department. There were disputes among the trustees which culminated in a Civil Suit in O.S.No.88 of 2004 claiming right of management and the suit was dismissed. An appeal in A.S.No.126 of 2006 was filed and pending. In the meanwhile, the parties have resolved the dispute and a compromise was entered into between the parties. The 3rd respondent was



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

obstructing to the recording of compromise. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred a petition to the respondents 1 and 2 and the same was rejected. Aggrieved over the same, the petitioner filed a Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.12120 of 2011. Based on the compromise decree, the petitioner was acting as Chairman, Board of Trustees. This Court, by an order, dated 13.12.2011, directed the respondents 1 and 2 to record the Trustees temporarily and directed the Appellate Court to record the Compromise Memo, after considering the objections of the 3rd respondent. This order was challenged by the 3rd respondent herein in W.A. (MD)No.135 of 2012 and the same was dismissed. Pursuant to the orders of this Court, compromise decree came to be passed in the suit and the petitioner was elected as Chairman, Board of Trustees, as per the compromise memo and decree. Now the temple is under the administration of hereditary trustees and same was informed to the 2nd respondent.

3. When there was a dispute among the Trustees, the temple was under the control of the 3rd respondent and the allegation of the petitioner is that the 3rd respondent had encouraged the 4th respondent in the temple and that is being



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

taken advantage of by the 4th respondent. The 4th respondent took advantage of the dispute in the management and colluded with the 3rd respondent and was swindling the income from the temple and was acting against the interest of the temple. On and from 02.01.2012, the temple is under the administration of the hereditary trustees. The 4th respondent has never approached the trustees for any sort of employment. Further, he acted against the trustees and he was not willing to work in the petitioner temple and requested to appoint him in some other temple. In such circumstances, the 4th respondent has filed a writ petition in in W.P.(MD)No.14686 of 2012 for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents therein to permit him to continue his job as Clerk in Arulmigu Eswarakala Boothathan Temple, Alappancode. The said Writ Petition was disposed on 07.04.2014, directing the 2nd respondent to consider his representation, dated 11.08.2012, after giving the 4th respondent a personal hearing and pass orders within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the order.



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

4. Since the 1st respondent has no jurisdiction to decide the issue involved in the Writ Petition and further no opportunity of hearing was directed to be given to the trustees before the 2nd respondent herein in the order passed in W.P. (MD)No.14686 of 2012, a Writ Appeal was filed. While the Writ Appeal was under process, the 2nd respondent has passed the impugned order, dated 08.08.2014. The 2nd respondent issued a notice for hearing to the petitioner and an objection, dated 01.08.2014, was sent by the petitioner. Except this notice, there was no prior notice of hearing. The contention of the petitioner is that the impugned order states that the representation of 4th respondent was annexed, but the same was not annexed. The 2nd respondent without considering the objections, assumed jurisdiction under Section 56 (2) of Tamil Nadu H.R. and C.E. Act, 1959 and passed the impugned order, directing the hereditary trustees to reinstate the 4th respondent and further stated that the period between 02.01.2012 to the date of joining of service by the 4th respondent is to be treated as compulsory waiting period for employment and the salary for the said period is to be paid from the temple funds. The contention of the petitioner is that the 2nd respondent has no jurisdiction to pass the impugned order and he cannot assume



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

jurisdiction under Section 56 (2) of Tamil Nadu H.R. and C.E. Act, 1959, when the claim of the 4th respondent itself is to grant appointment in some other temple. Aggrieved over the said order, the present writ petition is filed.

5. The 4th respondent has filed a counter affidavit stating that he is not a party to any of the proceedings which was put to challenge before the authorities. The 4th respondent was tossed by the petitioner and the 3rd respondent and has denied that the 3rd respondent namely, the Executive Officer of the temple encouraged the 4th respondent to act against the trustees and he has also denied that there is no collusion between the 4th respondent and the 3rd respondent. The petitioner joined the temple as Musician in 1981 and the salary was approved by the Deputy Commissioner, H.R. and C.E. Board, Nagercoil, dated 03.12.1984. On 11.02.1987, pursuant to the request made by hereditary trustee, the Deputy Commissioner, H.R. and C.E. Board, Nagercoil, allotted the 4th respondent additional work of selling Archana Tickets. On 15.06.1990, an order was passed by the 1st respondent appointing the 4th respondent as a Clerk and it was on the recommendation of the hereditary trustee. Since then the 4th respondent had been working as a Clerk even after the Thakkar took charge of the temple in 2003. The



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

4th respondent submitted that the hereditary trustees took the management forcibly without following any legal procedure and there was a dispute between the hereditary trustees and the Thakkar. Since neither of them guided the employees, the employees were put in a dilemma and as an employee he was put to lots of trouble by the petitioner.

6.The 4th respondent further submitted that because of the dispute between the Hereditary Trustee and the Thakkar, the office of the temple was closed, also the office was locked with another lock. Then the 4th respondent was directed to go and meet the petitioner and the petitioner directed the 4th respondent to bring the key which was with the Thakkar. As a result, the 4th respondent was without any employment, since December 2011 and he was not paid any salary without any valid ground. Setting out these details, the 4th respondent sent a representation to the 2nd respondent requesting to continue the job as Clerk in the petitioner temple. The specific prayer in the said representation was to permit the 4th respondent to continue as Clerk in the petitioner's temple, since the 4th respondent was out of employment for more than a year. Since there was no response to the



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

representation, dated 11.08.2012, the 4th respondent filed a Writ Petition in W.P. (MD)No.14686 of 2012 and this Court has directed to consider and pass orders after affording opportunities to the parties concerned. Thereafter, the 2nd respondent sent notices to parties concerned and the petitioner after receiving the notice sent his explanation, dated 01.08.2014. The 4th respondent was examined and the records were perused. The 2nd respondent by his order, dated 08.08.2014, found that the 4th respondent was tossed between the petitioner and the 3rd respondent. The 2nd respondent came to the conclusion that that the 4th respondent was serving the petitioner's temple for more than 30 years and the 4th respondent was knocking at the doors of the petitioner and the 3rd respondent for a job. The 2nd respondent found that the petitioner ought to have permitted the 4th respondent to continue his job. Therefore, the petitioner was directed to permit to continue his job as Clerk and further, directed the petitioner to grant monetary benefits from 02.01.2012. The impugned order has dealt with the representation dated 11.08.2012 of the 4th respondent's claim to appoint him as Clerk in the petitioner's temple. The 2nd respondent has every jurisdiction to pass the impugned order and there is no illegality or perversity in the order. The petitioner is under the



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

mistaken impression that his request for appointment in a temple is under the control of the H.R. and C.E. Department. The 4th respondent submitted that he has not taken the key with him as alleged and he has also denied that he never came to the temple after 02.01.2012. The claim of the 4th respondent is that he was never allotted any work by the petitioner when he was still in service in the temple. The petitioner never raised any objection before this Court in the earlier Writ Petition. The repeated attack that the 4th respondent in seeking fresh appointment in some other temple is incorrect and the true facts can be gathered from the representation, dated 11.08.2012. Hence, the 4th respondent submitted that he is entitled to appointment and consequential monetary benefits and prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

7. The 2nd respondent has filed a counter affidavit stating that there is an alternative remedy under Section 21 of Tamil Nadu H.R. and C.E. Act, 1959, by way of statutory revision petition and the writ petition is not maintainable. The 2nd respondent submitted that the Arulmigu Alappancode Easwarakala Boothathan Temple is a public temple under the control of H.R. and C.E. Department. One



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

Eswara Pillai and another had filed a petition under Section 63(b) of the Act 22/59, before the then Deputy Commissioner, H.R & C.E. Department, Tirunelveli, to declare them as hereditary trustees of the suit temple. The Deputy Commissioner after due enquiry passed orders in O.A.36/79, dated 08.09.1981, declaring that the office of the trusteeship of the suit temple is hereditary in nature and the petitioners family members consisting of four karanvars called as matrapalli, kokkuvilagam, kizhakkeveedu and another kizhakkeveedu are holding the office of trusteeship of the temple as “Hereditary Trustees”. Based on that order, the members belonging to the above said four families were in the management of the temple for some years. Since there was mismanagement, misappropriation and the accounts were not maintained properly, to set right the administration of the temple, the department had intervened in the administration of the temple and appointed the Executive Officer, vide proceedings, dated 03.02.2003 and the fit person (Thakkar) had taken charge of the temple on 14.02.2003 and managed the temple till 13.12.2011. In the meantime, some hereditary trustees had died and the dispute arose among the legal heirs as to who are entitled to succeed to the office of the trusteeship. A suit in O.S.88/2004 in



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

DMC/ Kuzhithurai, was filed and the same was dismissed on 03.08.2006. They filed an appeal in A.S.126/2006 before the Sub-Court, Kuzhithurai and the same was pending. In the meanwhile, one Madhavan Nair filed a writ petition in W.P. (MD)No.26127 of 2009 to declare them as hereditary trustee and this Court, vide order, dated 11.01.2000, directed the 2nd respondent herein to pass final orders on the representation. Accordingly, the 2nd respondent herein rejected the claim in Pro.No.10611/2003, dated 03.05.2010. Then, the appeal was preferred before the 1st respondent and the said appeal was dismissed, vide order, dated 22.03.2011. They moved the High Court in W.P.(MD)No.12120 of 2011 and this Court, vide order, dated 13.12.2011, directed the respondents 1 and 2 to record the writ petitioners temporarily as hereditary trustees and also directed the lower appellate court to dispose of the A.S. on the basis of the compromise memo within three months. The fit person of the temple filed a writ appeal against the said order, but the Division Bench dismissed the writ appeal filed in W.A.(MD)No.135 of 2012 and the Division Bench also directed the appellate Court to pass orders in A.S.126 of 2006 within in a week.



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

8.The parties to the appeal suit in A.S.126 of 2006 colluded together and they filed a compromise petition among themselves to settle the matter. In the compromise decree the parties have made endorsement that the Department was an unnecessary party and based on that endorsement, a compromise decree was passed. The contention of the 2nd respondent is that the compromise decree was obtained without the consent or approval of the Commissioner, H.R&C.E. Thereafter, based on the compromise decree the petitioner and others immediately intruded in the administration and they forcibly entered and assumed office, even without waiting for formal permission from the 1st respondent. Now, the writ petitioner is managing the temple as its self-styled Chairman Board of Trustees. The petitioner is not properly maintaining accounts for the temple and there are so many allegations against the persons in management.

9. The 4th respondent is a temple servant from the year 1981 onwards. His appointment as a temple servant was approved, vide order, dated 03.12.1984. He was given the additional duties of sale of Archanai tickets. Thereafter, he was elevated as Clerk from 01.04.1988 and the same was approved by H.R. and C.E,



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

vide order, dated. 15.06.1990. Thus, the 4th respondent as a permanent servant of the suit temple had put in a service of 30 years in the temple from the year 1981 to 2011. When the writ petitioner along with other hereditary trustees forcibly assumed office as trustee of the temple on 02.01.2012, the writ petitioner declined to allow the 4th respondent to continue his service as a temple servant. Due to vengeance and vindictive motive, the writ petitioner had not allowed him even to enter the temple office. Despite several oral and written requests, the trustees had not allowed the 4th respondent. Hence, the fourth respondent filed a writ petition before the High Court seeking for a direction to permit him to continue his service in Arulmigu Eswarakala Boothathan temple, Alappancode. This Court by an order in W.P.(MD)No.14686 of 2012, dated 07.04.2014, directed the 2nd respondent to consider the 4th respondent's representation, dated 11.08.2012 and to pass orders, after due notice to the 4th respondent and the trustee, the matter was enquired into and final orders had been passed by this 2nd respondent, dated 08.08.2014, directing the hereditary trustee to allow the 4th respondent to continue in service of the said temple and also to settle the back wages.



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

10. The writ petitioner is not a law-abiding citizen. He had not moved this Court with clean hands. He is mismanaging the temple. He had not properly accounted for the income of the temple. There are several allegations against the petitioner including that he “break open” the Hundials of the temple and swindled the Hundial collection. The Executive Officer of the temple 4th respondent had already lodged a complaint with the Arumanai Police Station on 25.04.2013 and the same is still under investigation. The Chief Audit Officer of the department had also brought to light that the heavy loss caused to the temple by the defacto trustees in his report in, dated 25.04.2013 and the same is also under investigation. Based on the orders of this Court an enquiry notice, dated 19.06.2014 had been issued. Another notice dated 06.08.2014 was issued based on the representation dated 11.08.2012 of the 4th respondent to attend the enquiry on 25.06.2014. But the writ petitioner had not attended the enquiry and he sent a reply on 01.08.2014 and his reply was also taken into consideration and final orders were passed. Since this Court directed to pass orders within a stipulated time, the 2nd respondent was constrained to pass orders immediately. It is not an order issued under Section 56(2) of H.R. and C.E. and it is only an administrative



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

order passed as per the direction of the Court. It is not disputed that the writ petitioner in his reply suggested to give posting to the 4th respondent in some other temple. There is no justification in his suggestion. The 4th respondent had put in service of 30 years in the temple and hence, the temple is liable to pay the entire back wages due to the 4th respondent and he should be allowed to join duty at once. The trustees had given heavy torture to the 4th respondent by throwing him on streets and the aggrieved temple servant is facing severe financial difficulties to manage his family. The 2nd respondent has passed an order only based on the direction of the Court. The 2nd respondent is also an authority under the "Act" and empowered to enquire on the petitions of the temple servants and non-payment of salary and denial of service without any valid reason has no excuse and the trustee cannot escape from the clutches of the law. An innocent temple servant cannot be punished for a reason of cold war in the administration. Therefore, the 2nd respondent prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

11. Heard Mr.J.Anandhavalli, learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner, Mr.P.Subbaraj, learned Special Government Pleader appearing for respondents 1



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

and 2, Mr.K.Sathiya Singh, learned Counsel appearing for 3rd respondent and Mr.T.Arul, learned Counsel appearing for 4th respondent.

12. It is an admitted fact that the 4th respondent was appointed as Musician in the year 1981, his appointment was approved by 2nd respondent on 03.12.1984. Thereafter, he was directed by the 2nd respondent to discharge additional duty of sale of Archanai tickets vide order dated 11.02.1987, then elevated as Clerk by the Trustees and approved by the 1st respondent on 15.06.1990 and was serving as permanent employee.

13. It is also an admitted fact that the ancestor of the petitioner namely Eswara Pillai had filed a petition to declare them as hereditary trustees and after enquiry the Deputy Commissioner has passed an order dated 08.09.1981 in O.A.No.36 of 1979 declaring the petitioners family members consisting of four karanvars as Hereditary Trustees. Subsequently there was allegation of mismanagement and misappropriation allegation, hence the H.R. and C.E. appointed the 3rd respondent as fit person on 03.02.2003. The hereditary trustees



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

had preferred a suit in O.S.No.88 of 2004 on the file of District Munsif Court, Kuzhithurai and the same was dismissed on 03.08.2006. An Appeal Suit was preferred in A.S.No.126 of 2006 on the file of Sub Court, Kuzhithurai and the same ended in compromise.

14. From here the fight started between the petitioner and the HR and CE and the fit person. The writ petitioner alleges that the fit person appointed by the H.R. and C.E., was not allowing the Sub Court, Kuzhithurai, to record the compromise memo. Therefore, they preferred a writ petition to direct the official respondents and the fit person not to interfere in the compromise memo. The High Court has held and declared that the writ petitioner and the family members as “temporary trustees” to manage the temple and also directed the Sub Court to record the compromise memo within three months. In the Sub Court, the writ petitioners took a plea that the fit person is not a necessary party in the compromise memo, since the fit person is not cooperating to record the compromise memo. Such plea was put forth before the Civil Court and accepting the plea, the Sub Court has recorded the compromise memo of the hereditary



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

trustees. The writ petitioner and his family, the H.R. and C.E., and fit person all of them admit that the writ petitioner and his family members are “Hereditary Trustees of the temple, which has been declared by the competent authority. All the parties admit the fact that there was dispute among the hereditary trustees and the dispute is only among the hereditary trustees. In such circumstances that is the case, the plea of the writ petitioner that the H.R. and C.E. Department is not a necessary party in the compromise memo is acceptable one, fit person is only formal party. The fit person in order to continue as a fit person of the temple had put in spokes to record the compromise memo. This the fit person had continued even after the orders passed by the High Court, hence the attitude of the department and the fit person is totally against the orders of the High Court and also provisions of the H.R. and C.E. Act.

15. The 2nd respondent in his counter affidavit in para 5 has clearly established the attitude of the H.R. and C.E. Department. In para 5 of the counter affidavit filed by the 2nd respondent, it has been stated as under:



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

“5. I submit that the parties to the appeal suit in A.S.126/2006 colluded together and they filed a compromise petition among themselves to settle the matter. In the compromise decree in A.S. 126/2006 of Sub-Court, Kuzhithurai the H.R & C.E. department held to be unnecessary party, on the endorsement of the parties to the suit and passed the compromise decree. So the compromise decree was obtained without the consent or approval of the Commissioner, H.R&C.E. Department the first Respondent herein. Thiru.E.Madhavan Nair along with three others on receipt of High Court order W.P. 12120/11, dated 13.12.2011 immediately intruded in the administration and they forcibly entered and assumed office, even without waiting for formal permission from the 1st Respondent. Now the writ petitioner herein Thiru.P.Sreedharan Nair is managing the temple as its self-styled Chairman Board of Trustees. He is not properly maintaining accounts for the temple and there are so many allegations against the person in management.”

16.The Department is alleging that the parties have colluded and has entered into compromise. If there is any dispute among the hereditary trustees for managing the temple, the H.R. and C.E. Department has no role at all. Therefore, the allegation that the hereditary trustees have colluded among themselves and has entered into compromise would clearly show that the H.R. and C.E. Department does not want the hereditary trustees to manage the temple. This attitude of the H.R. and C.E. Department ought to be taken into account.



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

Therefore, this attitude clearly establishes the allegation put forth by the petitioner that “the 4th respondent has colluded with the 3rd respondent”. The allegation that the H.R. and C.E., Department creating problem in the management of the temple is absolutely true and ought to be accepted. In such circumstances, continuing the 4th respondent in the temple management is not good in the interest of management of the temple. Therefore, the writ petitioner has rightly rejected the candidature of the 4th respondent. Even in the counter affidavit filed by the 4th respondent, it has been stated as under:

“It is to be stated that the hereditary trustees took the management forcibly without following any legal procedures and there was a dispute between the hereditary trustees and the Thakkar. Since neither of them guided the employees, the employees were put in a dilemma and as an employee I was put to lots of trouble by the petitioner.”

When the 4th respondent has averred in the counter that “the hereditary trustees had took the management forcibly”, the allegation raised by the petitioner, “that the 4th respondent took side and he was acting under the direct instructions of the 3rd respondent” is acceptable. In fact, the petitioner has directed the 4th



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

respondent, vide letter, dated 02.01.2012, directing to hand over the keys of the office of the temple, wherein the 4th respondent has replied on 02.01.2012 the keys were already handed over to the H.R. and C.E., Department. The said letter clearly states that on 02.01.2012, the keys were handed over, which means until 01.10.2012 the 4th respondent was in possession of the keys. On that date, the petitioner had directed to hand over the keys to the petitioner, which has raised the doubt about the 4th respondent attitude. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that 4th respondent in order to create problem has handed over the keys on 02.01.2012 to fit person / 3rd respondent, inspite of letter dated 02.01.2012 directing him to hand over the keys to the petitioner. The 4th respondent does not want to obey the order of the petitioner.

17. On 14.03.2012, the 4th respondent has submitted a representation to the 1st respondent stating that there was dispute between the hereditary trustees and the fit person, for the past three months, he was without any job and he was not paid any salary. In the said letter, the 4th respondent has specifically stated to post him in any other temple and the contents of the letter is extracted hereunder:



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

“இல்லையென்றால் குமரி மாவட்டத்தில் உள்ள
அரநிலையத்துறையின் கீழ் செயல்படும் திருக்கோவிலுக்கோ, அலுவலக
பணிகளுக்கோ இடமாற்றம் செய்து தரும்படி பணிவாய்
கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.”

Admittedly, the 4th respondent requested the 1st respondent to transfer him to some other temple functioning under H.R.&C.E. control. Therefore, the plea raised by the writ petitioner is absolutely right that the 1st respondent ought to have posted the 4th respondent in some other place. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent is devoid of merits.

18. It is because of the attitude of the 2nd and 3rd respondents (especially the 3rd respondent), 4th respondent did not get any salary. In spite of compromise decree which was passed as per the order of the Hon'ble High Court, the 3rd respondent had demanded that the writ petitioner ought to have taken permission from the 1st respondent for taking over the charge of the temple. This would clearly indicate that the 3rd respondent was not inclined to implement the Compromise Decree of the Sub Court and he is the cause for all problems narrated by the parties. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

salary liability ought to be fixed on the 3rd respondent also for creating so much problem in the entire issue, especially created problem to the 4th respondent.

19. According to the petitioner, the 4th respondent was receiving Rs.4,116/- as salary until September 2011. From October 2011, he is entitled to Rs.5,556/- as salary. The 4th respondent has attained superannuation and he is entitled to salary until his date of superannuation. For the reasons stated supra, this Court is of the considered opinion that 4th respondent is entitled to salary 50% from temple and 50% from 3rd respondent. The petitioner and 3rd respondent shall pay their portion of the salary to the 4th respondent within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. If the 3rd respondent is not paying his portion of the salary within the period of 8 weeks, then the **respondents 1 to 3** shall pay the amount with interest of 8% per annum from the date of default. This Court is consciously directing the **respondents 1 to 3** to pay salary with interest. If the petitioner is defaulting in paying their 50% portion of salary within the period prescribed, the same shall carry interest of 8% from the day of default.



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

WEB COPY

20. On above terms and directions, the writ petition is allowed. No costs.

21. It is also submitted by the writ petitioner that the Thakkar has deposited in fixed deposit in his name and he has not returned those fixed deposit receipts / records to the temple. The said Thakkar has started account in his own name and was managing the finance of the temple. Therefore 3rd respondent is advised to be true to his conscious and return the fixed deposit receipts and other properties of the temple, if he holds it as per the allegations of the petitioner.

Index : Yes / No

22.11.2022

Internet : Yes

Tmg

To



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

- 1.The Commissioner,
H.R. and C.E. (Administration)
Department,
Chennai.
- 2.The Joint Commissioner,
H.R. and C.E. (Administration)
Department,
Tirunelveli.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

S.SRIMATHY, J

Tmg

W.P.(MD)No.15083 of 2014

22.11.2022