



W.P.(MD)No.15185 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 26.09.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE P.T.ASHA

W.P.(MD)No.15185 of 2025
and
W.M.P(MD)No.11466 of 2025

Muthukrishnan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Revenue Officer,
Ramanathapuram.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ramanathapuram.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for records pertaining the impugned order dated 26.10.2024 in Moo.Mu.COLREV/6381/2024-C4 Passed by the first respondent and quash the same and consequentially directing him to renew the Cracker License No.8 of 1991 standing in the name of the petitioner for a period of two years from the date of renewal.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Barathan



W.P.(MD)No.15185 of 2025

For Respondents : Mr.D.Sasikumar
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for the following relief :

“to call for records pertaining the impugned order dated 26.10.2024 in Moo.Mu.COLREV/6381/2024-C4 Passed by the first respondent and quash the same and consequentially directing him to renew the Cracker License No.8 of 1991 standing in the name of the petitioner for a period of two years from the date of renewal.”

2. The facts are briefly set out herein below:

2.1 The petitioner was running crackers shop at Door No.7A, Railway Feeder Road, Ramanathapuram from the year 1991 under Cracker License No.8 of 1991. The license has been periodically renewed and the same had expired on 31.03.2017. The petitioner would submit that his renewal application was rejected and consequently, he had filed W.P(MD)No.17884 of 2018. This Court directed the authorities



W.P.(MD)No.15185 of 2025

to reconsider the application and his license was renewed from 01.04.2019 to 31.03.2021.

2.2 The petitioner would submit that he had submitted renewal application for the period 01.04.2021 to 31.03.2024 on 10.02.2021 to the first respondent. On 15.09.2021, the same was rejected citing safety violations and an appeal was filed before the Commissioner of Revenue Administration, Chennai who remitted the matter back to the 1st respondent directed him to decide the same within a period of 30 days.

2.3 However, once again the 1st respondent rejected the renewal application by the impugned order, dated 26.10.2024 quoting certain deficiencies and defects in the shop. Challenging the same, the petitioner is before this Court.

3. The 1st respondent in his counter affidavit has stated as follows :

The cracker business is conducted by the petitioner in the middle of the town, i.e., the bus stand is 30 meter distance from said premises, railway station is 90 meter distance from said



premises, temple (Arulmigu Kaliyamman Temple) is 15 meter distance from said premises, hotel is 20 meter distance from said premises, hospital (Kani Hospital) is 60 meter distance from said premises, and petrol bulk is 95 meter distance from said premises and all are nearby the petitioner's licensed premises, and this could, at any time result in an accident and hence it is a threat to the public.

4. Heard the learned counsels on either side.

5. A perusal of the impugned order would show that the same has been rejected for the following reasons :

a) The shop is situate in a market place which is bustling with activities and is situate close to temple.

b) The shop has only one access.

c) The shop measures 14 x 11 and in which the petitioner is not only running a watercan shop, but also other grocery items.

d) The Police have not given their no objection for running the shop.

e) There is no enter and exit available in the premise.



W.P.(MD)No.15185 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. The photograph of the shop has been produced on the side of the respondent which clearly shows that the same is a small shop and is completely packed with water cans, eggs and other products. The petitioner would submit that during the crackers season, he would remove all the items and only run the crackers shop. The petitioner appears to be running an aqua vending unit which is a perennial requirement. That apart, there is no proper exit and entry to the shop and the same appears to be located in a congested place. The public safety would also be compromised, if the petitioner is permitted to operate in the said premise. Hence, I see no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

7. Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

26.09.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes

gbg



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.15185 of 2025

P.T.ASHA, J.

gbg

To

- 1.The District Revenue Officer,
Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ramanathapuram.

W.P.(MD) No.15185 of 2025

26.09.2025