



WA No. 3977 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19-12-2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R. SURESH KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED

WA No. 3977 of 2025

AND CMP Nos. 32257 and 32260 OF 2025

Sri Poondi Mahan Attru Swamigal Ashrama
Committee, Rep. by its Treasurer M.Bavani, Poondi
Village and Post, Kalasapakkam Taluk,
Tiruvannamalai District.

..Appellant

Vs

1. The Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Mandaveli Pakkam, Raja Annamalai Puram,
Chennai -600 028.
2. The District Registrar,
Tiruvannamalai District, At Tiruvannamalai.
3. Sri Poondi Mahan Attru Swamigal
Rep. S.Balamurugan (Gurukkal)
S/o.Subramanyaswamy Late, Poondi Village and
Post, Kalasapakkam Taluk, Tiruvannamalai District.

..Respondents

Prayer : Writ Appeal under Clause XV of the Letters Patent to set aside the Order 27-10-2025 passed by the learned Judge in WP.No.31032 of 2023.

For Appellant :
For Respondents :

Mr. A.Mohan
Mr.U.Bharanidharan
Special Government Pleader – for R1
Ms.Akila Rajendran
Government Advocate – for R2



WA No. 3977 of 2025

WEB COPY

Judgment
(Judgment of the Court was delivered by R.Suresh Kumar J.)

This intra Court appeal is directed against the order of the learned Writ Court dated 27.10.2025 made in WP.No.31032 of 2023.

2. The appellant was the writ petitioner who is a Society in the name of Sri Poondi Mahan Attru Swamigal Ashrama Committee. The said Society was registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1975 with Registration No.41 of 1985 dated 05.08.1985.

3. In order to renew the Society, an application was made on 18.08.2023 along with statement of accounts for the period 2022-23. Thereafter on 17.10.2023 the writ petitioner / appellant applied for renewal of registration through on-line with necessary fee and later on 18.10.2023 a reminder was also sent. Despite the same, the second respondent who is the authority to verify the application and to renew the registration has not acted upon. Therefore, the petitioner approached the writ Court seeking a writ of Mandamus.

4. During the pendency of the writ petition, the third respondent Sri Poondi Mahan Attru Swamigal represented by S.Balamurugan (Gurukkal) filed an impleading



WA No. 3977 of 2025

petition in W.M.P.No.849 of 2024, which was allowed by the Writ Court on 01.08.2024. Thereafter, the third respondent has become one of the party respondents to the writ petition.

5. The learned Judge through the impugned order dated 27.10.2025 directed the second respondent to consider the application submitted by the writ petitioner / appellant dated 17.10.2023 and the reminder dated 18.10.2023 and pass orders within a time frame, after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to both the writ petitioner as well as the third respondent.

6. Aggrieved over the said direction given by the learned Writ Court, the present appeal, though had been filed, the learned counsel for the appellant would submit that the third respondent is noway connected with the appellant society and therefore he should not be heard by the second respondent and therefore in this regard the direction given by the learned Single Judge to the second respondent to hear the third respondent also along with the appellant may not be justifiable or lawful and hence, in order to remove that portion of the direction the appellant has filed the present appeal, he contended.

7. We are not impressed with the said contention of the learned counsel for the appellant for the simple reason that the third respondent filed an impleading



WA No. 3977 of 2025

petition to implead himself as one of the party respondent, which was allowed by an order of the writ Court dated 01.08.2024, against which no appeal has been filed by the present appellant, thereby it was accepted by the writ petitioner / appellant that the third respondent can be one of the party respondent to the writ proceedings.

8. If the third respondent becomes one of the party respondent to the writ proceedings and he makes rival claim over the Society, whether the said claim made by the third respondent is valid or not cannot be decided by the writ Court and that is the reason why the learned Judge, while disposing the said writ petition, has given a direction to the second respondent to consider the application of the writ petitioner / appellant for renewal of registration after giving an opportunity of hearing to both the writ petitioner as well as the third respondent.

9. We do not find any infirmity in the said direction given by the learned Judge. Resultantly, the writ appeal fails and hence it is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

(R.S.K.,J.) (S.S.A.,J.)
19-12-2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

KST



WA No. 3977 of 2025

To

1. The Inspector General of Registration,
No.100, Santhome High Road, Mandaveli Pakkam,
Raja Annamalai Puram, Chennai -600 028.
2. The District Registrar,
Tiruvannamalai District, At Tiruvannamalai.



WEB COPY



WA No. 3977 of 2025

**R.SURESH KUMAR J.
AND
SHAMIM AHMED J.**

KST

WA No. 3977 of 2025

19-12-2025

Page 6 of 6