



W.P. No.40699 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 17.11.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. DHANDAPANI

W.P. No.40699 of 2025

Uthayarani

Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Collector
O/o.District Collector,
Mailaduthurai District.

2.The District Manager
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing
and Development Corporation,
Mailaduthurai District.

3.The Branch Manager
Thirukalancheri Branch
Indian Overseas Bank,
Mayiladuthurai District.

Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue Writ of Mandamus, directing the 3rd respondent to disburse the sanctioning amount of Rs.1,80,000 /- as per the sanctioning order of vide Na.Ka. No.A1/ 21/ 2024 dated 26.05.2025 by the 2nd respondent.



W.P. No.40699 of 2025

For petitioner
For respondents

: Mr.P. Muthamizh Selvakumar
: Mr.A.M. Ayyadurai
Govt. Advocate for R1 & R2

ORDER

It is the case of the petitioner that she intends to engage in business activities in order to meet the financial needs of her family. With a view to start a milch cow business and supply milk to the Dairy Department, she approached the 2nd respondent seeking financial assistance under the CM-ARSIE Scheme on 21.04.2025. It is her contention that the said application was duly considered by the 2nd respondent, and a recommendation was made to the 3rd respondent for sanction of a loan amount of Rs.1,80,000/- to the petitioner for carrying on the said business activity. Accordingly, the 2nd respondent issued a sanction order dated 26.05.2025 recommending disbursement of the loan amount.

2. It is the grievance of the petitioner that, despite such sanction and recommendation, the 3rd respondent failed to take any steps to disburse the sanctioned loan amount. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner filed the present writ petition seeking a Writ of Mandamus directing the 3rd respondent to disburse the sanctioned loan amount of Rs.1,80,000/-. Hence, this writ petition.



3. Though very many grounds have been raised, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it would suffice, if a direction is issued to the 3rd respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 23.09.2025 and disburse the sanctioned loan amount to the petitioner, within a time frame.

4. This Court, questioned the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents, as to why the sanctioned amount was not disbursed to the petitioner.

5. Replying to the aforesaid question, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 submitted that immediately after receipt of the recommendation of the 2nd respondent, an order was passed by the 3rd respondent on 30.07.2025, which was also communicated to the petitioner. In the said communication, it was stated that the petitioner did not have sufficient space to house the number of milch cows mentioned in the application and that the available area was inadequate for establishing the proposed dairy unit. Thus, the recommendation made by the 2nd respondent was negated by the 3rd respondent vide order dated 30.07.2025.



W.P. No.40699 of 2025

6. Recording the aforesaid submissions, this Court, dispose of the writ petition by granting liberty to the petitioner to challenge the said order dated 30.07.2025 before the Ombudsman, in accordance with the applicable guidelines. No costs.

17.11.2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

vsi2

To

1. The District Collector
O/o.District Collector,
Mailaduthurai District.

2.The District Manager
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing
and Development Corporation,
Mailaduthurai District.

3.The Branch Manager
Thirukalancheri Branch
Indian Overseas Bank,
Mayiladuthurai District.



WEB COPY



W.P. No.40699 of 2025

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

vsi2

W.P. No.40699 of 2025

17.11.2025