



W.P.(MD) No.832 of 2024

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 12.01.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.KRISHNAKUMAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.832 of 2024
and W.M.P.(MD)No.845 of 2024

R.Manickam

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
- 2.The Block Development Officer,
Madurai East Union,
Madurai.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
East Taluk,
Madurai.



W.P.(MD) No.832 of 2024

WEB COPY

4.The President,
Andarkottaram Panchayat,
Madurai-20.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 3 to put village in name board as original as per the Survey Map, as per the Government Records, as per the Village People Records, to put name Lakshmipuram in front of the village, and School Name Board as Lakshmipuram Village in Andarkottaram Panchayat, Madurai District within a period stipulated time by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Prakasam

For Respondents : Mr.P.Thilak Kumar,
Govt. Pleader for R1 to R3

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.]

The petitioner has filed this Writ Petition styled as a Public Interest Litigation, seeking for a direction to the respondents 1 to 3 to put village in name board as original as per the Survey Map, as per the Government Records,



W.P.(MD) No.832 of 2024

WEB COPY

as per the Village People Records, to put name Lakshmipuram in front of the village, and School Name Board as Lakshmipuram Village in Andarkottaram Panchayat, Madurai District within a period stipulated time by this Court

2. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader, who accepts notice on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3 and we have also perused the materials available on record.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that though his village name is originally 'Lakshmipuram' as per the records, his village name board has been wrongly kept as 'Poolangulam'. In this regard, the petitioner has made a representation seeking to keep the village name board as original viz., Lakshmipuram as per the records. Since the same has not been considered by the respondents, the petitioner has filed this Writ Petition styled as a Public Interest Litigation.



W.P.(MD) No.832 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the view that the prayer sought for by the petitioner is not come under the Public Interest Litigation and the prayer of the respondents has to be considered by the respondents. Therefore, this Writ Petition is not maintainable.

5. At this juncture, it is appropriate to refer to the following observations made by the Apex Court in ***Ashok Kumar Pandey vs. State of West Bengal and others*** reported in (2004) 3 SCC 349, the Apex Court at paragraphs 5 to 16, held as follows:-

“16. As noted supra, a time has come to weed out the petitions, which though titled as public interest litigations are in essence something else. It is shocking to note that courts are flooded with a large number of so-called public interest litigations, whereas only a minuscule percentage can legitimately be called as public interest litigations. Though the parameters of public interest litigation have been indicated by this Court in a large number of cases, yet unmindful of the real intentions and objectives, courts at times are entertaining such petitions and wasting valuable judicial time which, as noted above, could be otherwise utilized for disposal of genuine cases. Though in Duryodhan Sahu (Dr) v.



W.P.(MD) No.832 of 2024

WEB COPY

Jitendra Kumar Mishra (1998) 7 SCC 273, this Court held that in service matters PILs should not be entertained, the inflow of the so-called PILs involving service matters continues unabated in the courts and strangely are entertained. The least the High Courts could do is to throw them out on the basis of the said decision. This tendency is being slowly permitted to percolate for setting in motion criminal law jurisdiction, often unjustifiably just for gaining publicity and giving adverse publicity to their opponents. The other interesting aspect is that in the PILs, official documents are being annexed without even indicating as to how the petitioner came to possess them. In one case, it was noticed that an interesting answer was given as to its possession. It was stated that a packet was lying on the road and when out of curiosity the petitioner opened it, he found copies of the official documents. Apart from the sinister manner, if any, of getting such copies, the real brain or force behind such cases would get exposed to find out whether it was a bona fide venture. Whenever such frivolous pleas are taken to explain possession, the court should do well not only to dismiss the petitions but also to impose exemplary costs, as it prima facie gives impression about oblique motives involved, and in most cases shows proxy litigation. Where the petitioner has not even a remote link with the issues involved, it becomes imperative for the court to lift the veil and uncover the real purpose of the petition and the real person behind it. It would be desirable for the



W.P.(MD) No.832 of 2024

WEB COPY

courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as aforesaid so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the courts.”

6. Public interest litigation is an extremely important jurisdiction exercised by the Supreme Court and the High Courts. The Apex Court in ***Neetu v. State of Punjab, (2007) 1 SCC 614***, held that when a particular person is the object and target of a petition styled as public interest litigation, the Court has to be careful to see whether the attack in the guise of public interest is really intended to unleash a private vendetta, personal grouse or some other mala fide object.

7. That apart, in ***State of M.P. Vs. Narmada Bachao Andolan, (2011) 7 SCC 639***, the Apex Court has held as follows:-

"13. Strict rules of pleading may not apply in PIL, however, there must be sufficient material in the petition on the basis of which the court may proceed.

The PIL litigant has to lay a factual foundation for his



W.P.(MD) No.832 of 2024

WEB COPY

averments on the basis of which such a person claims the reliefs. The information furnished by him should not be vague and indefinite. Proper pleadings are necessary to meet the requirements of the principles of natural justice. Even in PIL, the litigant cannot approach the court to have a fishing or roving enquiry. He cannot claim to have a chance to establish his claim. However, the technicalities of the rules of pleading cannot be made applicable vigorously. Pleadings prepared by a layman must be construed generously as he lacks the standard of accuracy and precision particularly when a legal wrong is caused to a determinate class.”

8. In the light of the decisions cited supra, we are not inclined to entertain this Writ Petition. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

[D.K.K., J.]

[R.V., J.]

12.01.2024

Neutral Citation: Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
vsm



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.832 of 2024

D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.
and
R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

vsm

To

- 1.The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
- 2.The Block Development Officer,
Madurai East Union,
Madurai.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
East Taluk,
Madurai.

W.P.(MD)No.832 of 2024

12.01.2024