



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.10.2023

CORAM

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

W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

and

M.P. No. 2 of 2015

P.A.M.Sundaravel

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Secretary to Government,
Tamil Development and Religious Endowment Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai – 600009.
2. The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Chennai – 600034.
3. The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Tirunelveli – 2.
4. P.K.S.A.A. Brahmaraj
5. V.N.M.S.A. Soundara Pandiyan
6. A.Selvarajan
7. A.Pitchai Kani
8. K.S.S.P.A. Ravindran
9. D.Jeya Seelan



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

10. The Secretary to Government,
Tourism, Culture and Religious Endowment Department,
Fort.St.George,
Chennai – 600009.

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 orders passed by the Third Respondent dated 19.01.2011 in O.A. No. 3 of 2003, the order passed by the Second Respondent in R.C. No. 18409 of 2011 dated 08.02.2012, order passed by the First Respondent in G.O. Rt. No. 402, Tamil Development Religious Endowments and Information (A. Ni. 5-1) Department dated 28.11.2012 and G.O. Ms. No. 126, Tourism Culture Religious Endowment (A. Ni. 5-1) Department dated 12.11.2014 passed by the Tenth Respondent quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr. V.Selvaraj

For Respondents : Mr. K.Karthikeyan,
Government Advocate
(for R1 to R3 & R10)

: Mr. V.Srikanth (for R4, R6, R8 & R9)

: Not Ready in Notice (for R5 & R7)

ORDER

Heard Mr. V.Selvaraj, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. K.Karthikeyan, Learned Government Advocate appearing for the First to Third and Tenth Respondents and Mr. V.Srikanth, Learned Counsel for the Fourth, Sixth, Eighth and Ninth Respondents and perused the materials placed



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

on record, apart from the pleadings of the parties.

2. The Writ Petition has been filed challenging orders in O.A. No. 3 of 2003 dated 19.01.2011 passed by the Third Respondent, R.C. No. 18409 of 2011 dated 08.02.2012 passed by the Second Respondent, G.O. Rt. No. 402, Tamil Development Religious Endowments and Information (A. Ni. 5-1) Department dated 28.11.2012 passed by the First Respondent and G.O. Ms. No. 126, Tourism Culture Religious Endowment (A. Ni. 5-1) Department dated 12.11.2014 passed by the Tenth Respondent relating to Arulmigu Veeriya Perumal Ayyanar Temple in Vembar Village in Vilathikulam Taluk, Thoothukudi District of Tamil Nadu.

3. It is not in dispute that the said Temple 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 offices of the First, Second and Tenth Respondents are located in Chennai. There cannot be any doubt that the First, Second and Tenth Respondents exercise 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



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

jurisdiction of this 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*



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

WEB COPY

OF INDIA (2004 (3) CTC 365), a Full Bench of this Court in

SANJOS JEWELLERS Vs. SYNDICATE BANK, BANGALORE

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

"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]."



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

WEB COPY

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 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



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

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 offices of the First, Second and Tenth Respondents are located in Chennai.

4. When it is pointed out that the Writ Petition cannot be entertained in the Principal Seat of this Court in that backdrop, Learned 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 he has made an endorsement to that effect in the court record.

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

05.10.2023

kv

Index: Yes/No

Note: Issue order copy by 31.10.2023.

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
The State of Tamil Nadu,
Tamil Development and Religious Endowment Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600009.



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

2. The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Chennai – 600034.

3. The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Tirunelveli – 2.

P.D. AUDIKESAVALU, J.

kv

4. The Secretary to Government,
Tourism, Culture and Religious Endowment Department,
Fort.St.George,
Chennai – 600009.

W.P. No. 5012 of 2015



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 5012 of 2015

05.10.2023