



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 24 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.10.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.D. AUDIKESAVALU

**W.P. No. 24 of 2023
and
W.M.P. No. 15 of 2015**

R.Vairavan

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Nungambakkam High Road,
Chennai – 600034.

2. The Executive Officer (Additional Charge)/Joint Commissioner,
Arulmigu Dandayuthapani Swamy Temple,
Palani, Dindigul District.

... Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records relating to the impugned order dated 30.12.2022 in Na. Ka. No. 972/2021/C6 of the Second Respondent and order dated 29.12.2022 in RP No. 72 of 2022 of the First Respondent and the order dated 22.04.2022 in Na. Ka. No. 972/2021/E3 of the Second Respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner

: Mrs. A.L. Ganthimathi,
Senior Counsel
for Ms.S.meenakshi

For Respondents

: Mr. K.Karthikeyan,
Government Advocate (for R1)



W.P. No. 24 of 2023

ORDER

WEB COPY Heard Mrs. A.L. Ganthimathi Learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner and Mr. K.Karthikeyan, Learned Government Advocate appearing for the First Respondent and perused the materials placed on record, apart from the pleadings of the parties.

2. The Writ Petition has been filed challenging the order dated 30.12.2022 in Na. Ka. No. 972/2021/C6 passed by the Second Respondent, order dated 29.12.2022 in RP No. 72 of 2022 passed by the First Respondent and the order dated 22.04.2022 in Na. Ka. No. 972/2021/E3 passed the Second Respondent.

3. It is not in dispute that the office of the Second Respondent is situated within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Madurai Bench of this Court. The only reason stated by the Petitioner for approaching the Principal Seat of this Court instead of Madurai Bench is that the office of the First Respondent is located in Chennai. There cannot be any doubt that the First Respondent exercises powers for the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu, but it cannot mean as if the cause of action has arisen within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Principal Seat of this Court at Chennai. Even if it is assumed that a part of cause of action has arisen within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of this



W.P. No. 24 of 2023

Court, the principle of *forum conveniens* would come into play as held by the

Division Bench of this Court in **C.Ramesh -vs- Director General of Police**

(Order dated 06.06.2013 in W.P. (MD) No. 8790 of 2013), as follows:-

“7. *Exercise of jurisdiction is based on arising of the cause of action, either in whole or in part in any one of the said Revenue Districts. [See RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT ADVOCATES' ASSOCIATION Vs. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS (2001 (2) SCC 294) and B.STALIN Vs. THE REGISTRAR, SUPREME COURT OF INDIA AND OTHERS (2012 (3) LW 489 (FB))].*

8. *It should be remembered that the part of cause of action must be substantial in nature. The territorial jurisdiction of the Court is linked with the place of accrual of cause of action. [See U.P. RASHTRIYA CHINI MILL ADHIKARI PARISHAD, LUCKNOW Vs. STATE OF U.P. AND OTHERS (1995 (4) SCC 738)].*

9. *Referring to KUSUM INGOTS & ALLOYS LTD. Vs. UNION OF INDIA (2004 (3) CTC 365), a Full Bench of this Court in SANJOS JEWELLERS Vs. SYNDICATE BANK, BANGALORE*



W.P. No. 24 of 2023

AND OTHERS (2007 (5) CTC 305), held as under:-

WEB COPY

"30. We must, however, remind ourselves that even if a small part of cause of action arises within the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court, the same by itself may not be considered to be a determinative factor compelling the High Court to decide the matter on merit. In appropriate cases, the Court may refuse to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction by invoking the Doctrine of forum conveniens. [See BHAGAT SINGH BUGGA Vs. DEWAN JAGBIR SAWHNEY, AIR 1941 CAL 670 : ILR (1941) 1 CAL 490; MADANLAL JALAN Vs. MADANLAL, 1945 (49) CWN 357: AIR 1949 CAL 495; BHARAT COKING COAL LTD. Vs. JHARIA TALKIES & COLD STORAGE (P) LTD., 1997 CWN 122; S.S.JAIN & CO. Vs. UNION OF INDIA, 1994 (1) CHN 445, and NEW HORIZONS LTD. Vs. UNION OF INDIA, AIR 1994 DEL 126]."

10. Question of entertaining a lis disclosing a cause of action or part of cause of action is based on the averments contained in the affidavit etc. At that stage, the truth or otherwise of the



W.P. No. 24 of 2023

WEB COPY

averments need not be gone into. But, there must be necessary averments disclosing a cause of action, so that the Court can take cognizance of/entertaining the lis exposed in the petition for taking further action. [See OIL AND NATURAL GAS COMMISSION Vs. UTPAL KUMAR BASU AND OTHERS (1994 (4) SCC 711)].

11. A Court cannot arrogate/assume/confer upon itself a jurisdiction-territorial jurisdiction, when it has no such jurisdiction. Lack of jurisdiction to entertain a matter goes to the root of the matter, otherwise whatever action taken or orders passed by the Court becomes a nullity, it is non est and of no consequence at all resulting in wasting of precious public time. Courts are barred from indulging in hypothetical and academic exercises.”

Having regard to the aforesaid legal position *viz-a-viz* factual matrix of this case, the cause of action for the Writ Petition, would have to be necessarily construed as having arisen wholly outside the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Principal Bench of this Court, notwithstanding that the office of the First Respondent is located in Chennai.



W.P. No. 24 of 2023

WEB COPY

4. When it is pointed out that the Writ Petition cannot be entertained in the Principal Seat of this Court in that backdrop, Learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner seeks permission of the Court to withdraw this Writ Petition with liberty to file fresh Writ Petition for the same relief before the Madurai Bench of this Court and Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has made an endorsement to that effect in the court record.

5. Since the interim order had been granted by this Court on 03.01.2023, it shall continue to be in force till 19.10.2023.

In fine, the Writ Petition is dismissed as withdrawn granting such liberty. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. No costs.

06.10.2023

kv

Index: Yes/No

Note: Issue order copy by 13.10.2023.



W.P. No. 24 of 2023

To

WEB COPY

1. The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Nungambakkam High Road,
Chennai – 600034.
2. The Executive Officer (Additional Charge)/Joint Commissioner,
Arulmigu Dandayuthapani Swamy Temple,
Palani, Dindigul District.



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 24 of 2023

P.D. AUDIKESAVALU, J.

kv

W.P. No. 24 of 2023

06.10.2023