



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 15-09-2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

WP No. 34524 of 2025

K.Mary

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Dean

Kilpauk Medical College, Kilpauk,
Chennai 600 010

2.The Commissioner

Greater Chennai Corporation, Ribbon
Building, Chennai 600 003

3.The Zonal Officer

Zone 8 Greater Chennai Corporation,
Tiru V Ka Nagar, Chennai 600 030

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for an issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the 3rd respondent to delete the name 'Lakshmi' wrongly mentioned as wife in Death Certificate No D58295598198838087/2025 dated 01.06.2025.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.N.Beulah John Selvaraj

For Respondents: Mr.E.Sundaram for R1
Government Advocate
Mrs.K.Asmini Devi
for R2 and R3

ORDER



This petition is filed for an issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the 3rd respondent to delete the name 'Lakshmi' wrongly mentioned as wife in Death Certificate No D58295598198838087/ 2025 dated 01.06.2025.

2. With consent on either side, the main writ petition itself is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner's brother, Murali died on 15.05.2025 and one Lakshmi made an application before the respondents for issuance of a death certificate on the ground that she is the wife of said Murali. However, the petitioner's brother is an unmarried man and there is no marriage link between the said Murali and Lakshmi, hence the death certificate indicating that Lakshmi, wife of Murali, is certainly not a sustainable one, accordingly prayed for appropriate orders.

4. The learned counsel for the respondents / corporation would submit that based on the representation made by the said Lakshmi, death certificate has been issued after conducting enquiry, if at all the petitioner has any grievance with regard to the marriage of Lakshmi and the petitioner's brother, Murali, the remedy available to the petitioner is only before the competent civil court and



not before this Court, accordingly prays for dismissal.

WEB COPY

5. It is relevant to note that based on the representation of one Lakshmi seeking death certificate of one Murali indicating that she is the wife of the said Murali, the Respondents / Corporation, after conducting detailed enquiry, issued death certificate. Further, the petitioner, who is the relative of the said Murali has come before this Court to cancel the relationship of Murali and Lakshmi, by indicating that the said Murali is an unmarried man. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the relationship of Murali and Lakshmi, the remedy available to the petitioner is before the competent civil court and not before this Court under Article 226 of Constitution of India.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed, with liberty to the petitioner to work out the remedy before the appropriate forum. No costs.

15-09-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ssd

To

1. The Dean

3/5



Kilpauk Medical College, Kilpauk,
Chennai 600 010

2. The Commissioner
Greater Chennai Corporation Ribbon
Building, Chennai 600 003

3. The Zonal Officer
Zone 8 Greater Chennai Corporation,
Tiru V Ka Nagar, Chennai 600 030

M.DHANDAPANI, J.,



WEB COPY

WP No. 34524 of 2

