IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED:25.09.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN

W.P.No.13928 of 2024
and
W.M.P.Nos.15122, 15123 and 16983 of 2024

1.Veerasundari
2.Nadanasabapathy
3.Sivaguru
4.Rajendran
5.Thiruthanivel
6.V.Rengaraj ... Petitioners

.Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government, Tourism,
Culture and Religious Endowments Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Nungambakkam High Road,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai-600 034.

3.The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
NSC Bose Nagar, Ramani Nagar,
Thanjavur-613 007.

4.The Assistant Commissioner,

Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
NSC Bose Nagar, Ramani Nagar,
Thanjavur-613 007.

5.The Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Subramania Swamy Temple,
Vendakottai Village,
Thanjavur District.

6.Purusottaman

7.N.Govindhammal

8.Devika ... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the entire records of the impugned order passed by the fourth respondent in Se.Mu.Na.Ka.No.5245/2023/A6/dated 24.11.2023 and to quash the same as arbitrary, unjust, unlawful and subsequently, direct the respondents 1 to 5 to dispose of the original application in O.A. No. 7 of 2024 pending before the third respondent and appoint the petitioners 1 to 5 as hereditary trustees of TM015127 Arulmigu Subramania Swamy Temple and pass orders accordingly.

For Petitioners : Mr.Srinath Sridevan Sr. Advocate
(For M/s.Raja.S and others)
For Respondents: Mr.N.R.R. Arun Nadarajan for R1 to R5.
(Spl Government Pleader)
:Mr. M. Santhanaraman for R6 to R8

******

ORDER

This Writ petition has been filed seeking to issue a for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the entire records of the impugned order passed by the fourth respondent in

Se.Mu.Na.Ka.No.5245/2023/A6/dated 24.11.2023 and to quash the same as arbitrary, unjust, unlawful and subsequently, direct the respondents 1 to 5 to dispose of the original application in O.A. No. 7 of 2024 pending before the third respondent and appoint the petitioners 1 to 5 as hereditary trustees of TM015127 Arulmigu Subramania Swamy Temple and pass orders accordingly.

2.The case of the petitioners is as follows:

(i)The TM015127 Arulmigu Subramania Swamy temple is located at S. No.8 to the extent of 0.86.0 Hectares, Vendakottai village in Pattukottai Taluk, Thanjavur District. The said temple and Chandra Pushkaraní tank situated in front of the said temple were built 300 years ago by the indigenous communities who initially settled in Vendakottai village namely the Velalar community of the first bank (Karai), the Chettiar community of the Sena headman of the second bank, the Thondaman community of the Kallar community of third bank and the Mudallar community of the fourth bank. Further the sub-shrines of the said temple namely Arulmigu Mariamman temple. Arulmigu Ayyanar temple and Arulmigu Muni temple is also situated over there. Further, Thiru. Vedamani from Nattusalai is working as Gurukal for the said temple.

(ii)For the said temple, the aforementioned four Karaidhars chartered the lands comprised in S. No. 110/7B, 111, 112/1, 112/2 and 112/3 to the extent of 4.08.0 Hectares, established it as a Hindu religious endowment and whereby they had made arrangements to maintain the said temple in a good manner and to maintain regular pujas and festivals. Till date, the Village Revenue records of the lands purchased for the said temple are also stands in the name of D. Rajappa Velalar, P. Dharmaraja Velalar. Ramasamy Chettiar, R. Chidambara Mudaliar and P. Arunachala Thondaiman who were the hereditary trustees of the four karaidhars. Also, if there was a shortage of funds for the maintenance, pujas and festivals of the said temple, the said karaidhars used to collect funds among themselves for the said activities. At this juncture, when there was a dispute between the Karaidhars regarding the administration and maintenance of the said temple. The heirs belonging to four banks numbering 23 entered into an arrangement in the year 1911, reduced it to writing in the form of a deed of settlement dated 19.08.1911 and registered as document no. 5208/1911 before the Joint Sub-Registrar, Pattukottai.

(iii)As per the said settlement deed, the temple and its properties shall be administered and protected by five Dharamakarthas among the 23 heirs of four karaidhars namely 1. Govindasamy Velalar S/o. Dharmaraja Velalar, 2. Rasappa Velalar S/o. Tharmarayar Velalar. 3. Chokkalinga Chettiar

S/o. Sami Chettiar, 4. Govindasamy Nayakar S/o. Vadamalai Nayakar and 5. Rengasamy Mudhaliar S/o. Ramasamy Mudaliar. The said persons named above to officiate as Thalaimaidhars Dharmakarthas (Trustees), maintain proper accounts and make proper arrangements for the performance of the festivals and daily poojas. They also managed and maintained the sub-shrines of the said temple. The Karaidhars of the village who were the parties to the said settlement deed dated 19.08.1911, gave up their right in the management of the temple and nominated the aforesaid five persons as the Dharmakarthas to be in the management for a period of 10 years. Thereafter the Dharmakarthas were to continue in the management and in case of their death, their legal heirs to continue in the management and administration of the said temple as hereditary trustees. Since the date of the above settlement deed, the temple has been solely under the administration and management of the aforementioned five trustees and they had made improvements in the said temple and performed festivals and Pujas regularly. Also, since the resurvey and settlement in the year 1958, the said five trustees named in the settlement register carried on the management and administration of the said temple. The Persons named as Trustees in the settlement register of the year 1958 died leaving behind their heirs as their legal representatives who continue in the management of the temple as hereditary trustees.

(iv)Accordingly the descendants of the said five trustees nominated under the settlement deed dated 19.08.1911 namely 1. G. Veerasundari, 2. R. Nadanadabapathy Velalar, 3. E. Sivaguru Chettiar, 4. Rajendran Thondaiman and 5. A. Thiruthanivel Mudhaliar, the Petitioners 1 to 5 herein is the present hereditary trustees of the said temple. The said temple was being administrated, festivals are being conducted and the Pujas were being performed by the above said five person's predecessors in interest and their successors in interest as hereditary succession as contemplated in the said settlement deed. Further, since the said temple which is more than 300 years old was damaged, it was demolished and the said temple was built anew with bore well facility for water supply and an electric connection (Connection No.614) and the Kumbaphisekam was done At the time of Kumbaphisekam of the said temple, one Thiru. Ramasamy Velalar, a lawyer by profession was appointed as one of the members of the temple renovation committee. Due to the influence of a large political party, he took unfair advantage and forged documents that he was one of the heirs of the deceased hereditary trustee and filed an original application in O.A. No. 05/2007 on the file of the 3rd Respondent Joint Commissioner, Thanjavur and obtained an order dated 08.02.2011 declaring himself and 4 others as the hereditary trustees of the said temple. During the proceedings before the Joint Commissioner in O.A.

No. 5/2007, the 6th Respondent herein deposed in favour of the said Mr. Ramasamy Velalar's claim of being a descendent and hereditary trustee. Later the Petitioners' karaidhars objected to the appointment of Mr. Mr. Ramasamy Velalar as hereditary trustee and preferred an appeal in A.P. No. 14/2014/D2 on the file of 2nd Respondent, Commissioner of HR & CE Department. Consequently. by an order dated 08.02.2011 of appointment of the said Ramasamy Velalar and 4 others as hereditary trustees was set aside and the matter was remitted back to the 3rd Respondent to conduct a De Novo enquiry by the virtue of an order dated 23.11.2012 whereby the necessary parties were impleaded and the said remanded matter in O.A. 05/2007 came up for hearing on 05.11.2017. However, neither the claimants nor the counsel for the claimants in the said O.A. No. 5/2007 appeared for the said hearing and there were no submissions preferred from their end. Hence the 3rd Respondent, Joint Commissioner, Thanjavur passed an order dated 10.02.2017 dismissing the said application for default due to the non-appearance. However, while dismissing the O.A. No. 5/2007, the Joint Commissioner failed to consider the rival claims of the Petitioner 1 to 5 for hereditary trusteeship and pass orders appointing them as hereditary trustees.

(v)When matters stood thus, it is necessary to appoint the Petitioners No. 1 to 5 herein as hereditary trustees of the said temple on the basis of said settlement deed dated 19.08.1911. Therefore, an Original application in O.A. No. 07/2024 on the file of the 3rd Respondent has been filed to appoint the Petitioners No. 1 to 5 claiming to be appointed as hereditary trustees of the said temple and it is still pending. In the meantime an advisory committee has been constituted by the 1st Respondent for Thanjavur Revenue District as per G.O Ms No. 104 Tourism, Culture and Charitable Institutions (A.N.3-1) Department Date: 29.05.2023 Thanjavur District Committee for Non- Hereditary Trustee Appointment Resolution Date 14.07.2023 regarding appointment for 1304 listed and non-listed temples in Thanjavur district for the temples other than those classified under section 46 (iii) of HR & CE Act, 1959 and temples with hereditary trustees. The aforementioned advisory committee recommended trustees for the said temple without conducting any investigations, field surveys, or consultations. They unlawfully suggested individuals with political backgrounds like Thiru. Purusottaman, Tmt. Devika, and Tmt. Govinthammal, the Respondents 6 to 8 herein who lack qualifications u/s 25-A of Tamil Nadu HR & CE Act, 1959 and are political appointees. Most importantly, these three persons are non-hereditary trustees who are not decedents in the lineage of the five families nominated in the settlement deed of the year 1911 to be hereditary trustees. Subsequently, the 4th Respondent appointed these non- hereditary trustees vide impugned order in Se.Mu.Na.Ka. No.5245/2023/A6/ dated.24.11.2023 on the basis of recommendation of said advisory committee without seeking objections or publicizing the process which is the clear violation of principles of natural justice.

(vi)Knowing that the said temple is a temple under the management of hereditary trustees, the Inspector and the 5th Respondent, Executive Officer have remained silent till date without raising any objection to the appointment of respondents 6 to 8 as trustees. The appointment of the Respondents 6 to 8 by the 4th Respondent vide impugned order in Se.Mu.Na.Ka. No.5245/2023/A6/dated. 24.11.2023 as non-hereditary trustees of the said temple are deemed unlawful, illegal, and invalid under the law. The HR & CE department is fully aware from at least from 2007 that the temple has to be managed only by hereditary trustees. The Joint Commissioner of the department in fact appointed 5 persons as hereditary trustees and the same was set aside and remanded back for fresh consideration by the Commissioner, HR & CE. due to the pending adjudication of O.A.7/2024 by the 3rd Respondent, Joint Commissioner, Thanjavur. Additionally, the aforesaid Ramasamy Velalar previously asserted in O.A.5/2007 that the said temple is under the management of hereditary trustees from four karaidhars. However, contradictorily. Ramaswamy Velalar, along with Thanjavur district revenue advisory board and individuals opposed to the temple and the four karaidhars, have conspired to unlawfully and illegally appoint the Respondents 6 to 8 herein as the non-hereditary trustees of the said temple.

(vii) The 6th Respondent Thiru. Purusottaman, the husband of Tmt. Vijayalakshmi, the panchayat president of Vendakottai, has been illicitly made a non-hereditary trustee of the temple, assisted by the aforesaid Ramasamy Velalar, a lawyer with political influence. Initially, in said O.A.5/2007, filed by Thiru. Ramasamy Velalar supported that the temple being managed by hereditary trustees, owned by four karaidhars. However, he has now changed his stance,claiming that the temple is non-hereditary solely for his personal gain, which is unlawful. The appointment of the Respondents 6 to 8 as non-hereditary trustees, of the said temple is in violation of Section 49 (1) of The Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act. 1959.

(viii) Th said temple is a non-listed traditional temple. identified as serial number 3026 on the HR & CE department's website. The revenue documents for the temple's lands and properties are held in the name of the Thalaimaidhars of the four banks, who were the trustees of the said temple. Until 1972, the said temple was never under the management of the HR & CE Department. However, in 1972, the HR & CE department took over its administration unlawfully. Subsequently, the heirs of the four banks filed a case in the Pattukottai District Court, escalating to this Hon'ble Court, to declare the temple as exempted. This Hon'ble High Court ruled that the temple as denomination temple exclusively belongs to the four karaidhars.

(ix)The present hereditary trustees of the temple, the Petitioners 1 to 5 herein filed an original application in O.A. No. 07/2024 on the file of the 3rd Respondent to appoint themselves as hereditary trustees of the said temple and it is still pending. Additionally, in the said O.A. 07/2024 several suggestions and objections has been raised by sending a letter dated 11.03.2024 to the 2nd Respondent herein seeking for the cancellation of illegal appointment of Respondents 6 to 8 as non-hereditary trustees of the said temple vide impugned order in Se.Mu.Na.Ka. No.5245/2023/A6/ dated 24.11.2023. Due to the issue of appointment of trustees, the management and administration of the said temple was significantly affected because of which the temple festivals cannot be held and proper pujas cannot be performed. Hence, the 2nd and 6th Petitioners herein filed an application u/s 47 and 63 of Tamil Nadu HR & CE act, 1959 before the 3rd Respondent, Joint Commissioner, Thanjavur, to form a temporary committee to organise the said temple's Vaikasi Visakha festival, Vellotam and Chariotam to be held on May 22, 2024 consisting of five members, of which two are among the four banks (Karaidhars) and the other two are among the present five hereditary trustees of the said temple, along with the 5th Respondent, the Executive Officer of the said temple. The said application was received and numbered as O. Mu. No.6338/2024/A1 dated 25.04.2024 by the 3rd Respondent and subsequently, it was transferred to the 4th Respondent to take the appropriate action on the said representation. Regrettably, both the 3rd and 4th Respondent, Joint and Assistant Commissioner, Thanjavur, have failed to take any appropriate action on the said application till date, causing severe grievance to the petitioners herein. aggrieved by the order passed by the 4th Respondent in Se.Mu.Na.Ka. No.5245/2023/A6/dated. 24.11.2023, the Writ petition has been filed.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Temple has been traditionally managed by hereditary trustees based on a valid settlement deed dated 19.08.1911 (registered as document no. 5208/1911). The said deed nominated five individuals from four communities (Velalar, Chettiar, Thondaman, Mudaliar) as trustees and established a hereditary succession plan for future generations. Whereas the appointment of non-hereditary trustees by the 4th Respondent on the basis of recommendation of Advisory committee constituted by the 1st Respondent disregards the existing legal framework established by the deed and violates the petitioners' hereditary management rights.

4. It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the actions of the Respondents, particularly the appointment of non hereditary trustees by the 4th Respondent without due process and in contravention of established hereditary rights, infringe upon the constitutional right to manage and administer the temple in accordance with their religious beliefs and practices, as guaranteed under Article 25 of the Constitution of India. Further, the appointment of non- hereditary trustees by the 1st Respondent disregards the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1959, particularly Section 49 (1), which governs the appointment of trustees by the 4th Respondent for Hindu religious institutions. This section specifies that after conducting an adequate inquiry and for reasons recorded, if it is found that the institution's affairs are not being or are unlikely to be properly managed by the hereditary trustee(s), the 4th Respondent may appoint non- hereditary trustees. Regrettably, no such enquiry was conducted and reasons were recorded as contemplated in the said act.

5. It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the 4th Respondent ought to have granted an opportunity of being heard to the Petitioners, the members of four karais, and the local residents & villagers before passing the impugned order and has therefore violated the basic principle of nature justice "Audi Alterum Partem". They unlawfully suggested individuals with political backgrounds who lack basic qualifications u/s 25-A of Tamil Nadu HR & CE act, 1959 and are political appointees.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the Respondents 3 and 4 failed to take appropriate action on the petitioners' emergent application requesting the formation of a temporary committee to organize temple festivals constitutes a dereliction of administrative duty and adversely affects the petitioner's rights and interests. The appointment of trustees by the 4th Respondent is unlawful and invalid under the law due to the pending original application in O.A. No. 07/2024 before the 3rd Respondent. This contravenes Section 49 (1) of The Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act 1959. Hence, he seeks the relief as prayed therein.

7. The learned counsel for the respondents 6 to 8 submits that originally, the petitioners have filed the writ petition before the Madurai Bench and the same was rejected and returned 14.5.24 by the vacation officer for the reason that the impugned order was passed on 24.11.2023 and the jurisdiction falls within the Principal Bench, the same could not be filed during the vacation sitting and therefore, subsequently the writ petition was presented again during the 3rd phase of vacation sitting on 20.5.2024 before the Madurai Bench but the vacation officer once again refused to allow its filing and that with no option the petition was filed before the before the principal Bench and got it numbered and in the meantime the writ petition filed before the Madurai Bench was numbered and therefore after getting interim order in this writ petition before the Principal Bench, they withdrew the writ petition in Madurai Bench on 22.5.2024.

8. It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the respondents 6 to 8 that the impugned order passed by the Assistant Commissioner of HR & CE Department, Thanjavur, the 4th respondent herein is functioning under the territorial jurisdiction of Madurai bench of this Hon'ble Court and however, in the averment made by the petitioners in the writ petition to the effect that since the impugned order was passed by the

officer situated within the jurisdiction of Principal Bench, the Madurai Bench refused to number the writ petition is nothing but deliberate false statement.

9.The learned counsel for the respondents 6 to 8 further submits the writ petitions filed in Principal Bench as well as the Madurai Bench is dated 12.05.2024 and 13.05.2024 respectively as borne out by the paper books filed by the petitioners. Therefore, the petitioners have simultaneously filed writ petition before the Madurai Bench as well as the Principal Bench making it obvious that their statement in the affidavit is false. Further, the writ petitions in both Principal Bench as well as Madurai Bench were filed on the same day i.e. 20.05.2024 vide SR (Filing) Nos. 63340 of 2024 and W.P (MD) 35301 of 2024 and both were numbered and listed for hearing on 21.5.2024 and 22.05.2024 and the interim order was granted in the writ petition filed before the Principal Bench on 21.5.2024 and the petitioners withdrew the petition filed before the Madurai Bench on 22.5.2024. Thus, their explanation about refusal by the Registry of Madurai bench is the only reason for filing similar writ petition before the Principal Bench is also a deliberate lie.

10. It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the respondents 6 to 8 that the Madras High Court Writ Rules under Rule 7(b) mandates that in an affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, a statement

shall be made by the petitioner that he has not filed any other legal proceedings on the same cause of action and for the same relief. Further, Rule 7 (c) mandates that the petitioner shall make a statement disclosing details of legal proceedings, if any, relating to the same subject matter, either pending, or disposed. However, affidavits filed in support of both the writ petitions are conspicuously bereft of the above said mandatory statement substantiating the conduct of the petitioners in defrauding this Hon'ble Court.

11.The learned counsel for the respondents 6 to 8 further submits that If the petitioners' contention that since they could not number the writ petition before the Madurai Bench, they have filed the same before the Principal Bench, they should have stated the same in the writ petition filed before the Principal Bench. However, this was not done because both the writ petitions were filed simultaneously. Further, the petitioners have moved the above writ petition during the vacation sitting challenging the impugned order which is dated 23.11.2023 with the only object of preventing the respondents 6,7 and 8 from participating in the Vaishaki visakam celebrations held on 22.05.2024. Even though the petitioners have stated that they got knowledge about the impugned order only on 05.05.2024, in the representation dated 11.03.2024 itself, the petitioners have stated that they were aware of the appointment o respondents 6,7 and 8 as Non-hereditary Trustees of the S Subramania Swamy Temple, Vendakottai. Hence, in view of the contrary statement made by the petitioners, they are liable to be proceeded against for committing perjury and abusing due process of law. Therefore, the writ petition is liable to dismissed with exemplary costs.

12. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

13. On perusal of the materials available on record, it is seen that the temple is a non-listed temple and based on a deed of settlement dated 19-08-1911 registered as document No.528 of 1911 before the sub-registrar, Pattukottai, the temple was administered. However the above arrangement is not recognised under the provisions of the Tamil Nadu HR&CE, Act. In 2007, Mr.Palanivel Velalar, Mr.Ramasamy Velalar, Mr.Perunthagai Elango, Mr.Rajendran Thondaiman, Mr. Rengasamy Mudhalair and Mr.Solaivasan filed an application under 63 (b) in O.A. No.5 of 2007 for a declaration declaring them as the hereditary trustees of the temple, before the Joint Commissioner, HR&CE Department, Thanjavur District. The said application came to be allowed by the Joint Commissioner, Thanjavur by order dated 08-02-2011.

14. Further, it is seen that Mr.Singaravelu, Mr.S.Natesan and Mr.Thiruneelakandan filed an appeal in A.P. No.14 of 2012 under Section 69 (1) of the HR&CE Act, before the Commissioner, HR&CE challenging the order dated 08-02-2011 passed by the Joint Commissioner, Thanjavur in O.A. No.5 of 2007. The Commissioner, HR&CE by order dated 23-11-2012 remanded the case back to the Joint Commissioner, Thanjavur for passing fresh orders. The case in O.A. No.5 of 2007 (Remanded) was listed for hearing before the Joint Commissioner, Thanjavur but since the Petitioner in the said case, did not appear before the Joint Commissioner, HR&CE, the said application came to be dismissed by order dated 10-02-2017 for non-prosecution. However, no application was filed to restore OA.5/2007.

15. Further, it is seen that in the meantime, the Assistant Commissioner, HR&CE Department, Thanjavur District by order dated 24-11-2023 appointed non-hereditary trustees for the temple for the period from November, 2023 till November, 2025. Thereafter the Petitioners in the present case filed an application in O.A. No.7 of 2024 under Section 63 (b) of the HR&CE Act before the Joint Commissioner, HR&CE for appointment of Hereditary Trustees. Thereafter the Petitioner has filed the present Writ

Petition seeking to set aside the appointment of the private respondents as non- hereditary trustees and for a direction to the Joint Commissioner, HR&CE to dispose of the Petitioners' application for appointment as Hereditary Trustees.

16. While so, this Hon'ble Court by order dated 21-05-2024, granted interim stay of the appointment of the private Respondents as non hereditary trustees and directed the Joint Commissioner, HR&CE to dispose of the application of the Petitioners for appointment of the Hereditary Trustees for the temple within a period of 4 months. In the said order, it is observed as follows:

"10. I am on another fundamental point. The O.A filed under Section 63(b) could not have been dismissed for non-prosecution. There are certain proceedings which will have to be disposed of only on merits. It is beyond dispute that if the office of the trusteeship is hereditary, the appointment under Section 49 cannot be made. The competent authority had originally declared this very office as hereditary. When the matter was remanded, the issue before the authority was whether the office of trusteeship was hereditary or not. Answer should have been given one way or the other."

17. Further, O.A. No.7 of 2024 filed by the Petitioners seeking for appointment of Hereditary Trustees is posted for hearing on 27-06-2024 before the Joint Commissioner, HR&CE, Thanjavur. Since the issue of hereditary trusteeship for the temple is pending consideration, the executive officer of the temple will hold charge of the temple till the Joint Commissioner, HR&CE decides on the application filed by the Petitioners for appointment of Hereditary Trustees for the temple.

18. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions made by both side counsel, it is seen that the application has been called for appointment of Non- Hereditary Trustee in the said temple based on the notification of the 1st respondent and then only the respondents have been appointed as Non- Hereditary Trustee. However, the petitioners have not challenged Resolution for appointment of Non- Hereditary Trustee passed by the 1st respondent and however, they have filed the present writ petition seeking the relief as they are Hereditary Trustee of the temple as per the settlement Deed dated 19.08.1911 (registered as document no. 5208/1911).

19. Under such circumstances, it is seen that the Non-Hereditary Trustees have been appointed under Section 49 (1), which governs the appointment of trustees by the 4th Respondent for Hindu religious

institutions. This section specifies that after conducting an adequate inquiry and for reasons recorded, if it is found that the institution's affairs are not being or are unlikely to be properly managed by the hereditary trustee(s), the 4th Respondent may appoint non- hereditary trustees. However, according to the petitioners, no such enquiry was conducted and reasons were recorded as contemplated in the said act. Hence, the 3rd respondent is hereby directed to pass appropriate orders in O.A. No.7 of 2024 filed by the petitioners herein and O.A. No.5 of 2007 which was dismissed for non-prosecution on 10.02.2007 tagging together on merit in the manner known to law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

20. With the aforesaid direction, this Writ petition is disposed of. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

25.09.2024

Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Lbm

To:
1.The Secretary to Government, Tourism,
Culture and Religious Endowments Department,

Fort St.George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Nungambakkam High Road, Nungambakkam, Chennai-600 034.

3.The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
NSC Bose Nagar, Ramani Nagar, Thanjavur-613 007.

4.The Assistant Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
NSC Bose Nagar, Ramani Nagar, Thanjavur-613 007.

5.The Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Subramania Swamy Temple,
Vendakottai Village, Thanjavur District.

V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN, J.,

Lbm

W.P.No.13928 of 2024
and
W.M.P.Nos.15122, 15123 and 16983 of 2024

25.09.2024