



W.A.(MD)No.1776 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 16.12.2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.KALAIMATHI**

W.A.(MD)No.1776 of 2025

1.G.Gururajan
2.G.Ramanathan ... Appellants

Vs.

1.The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable
Endowment Administration,
Nungampakkam High Road,
Chennai - 600 006.

2.The Joint Commissioner / Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Ramanathasamy Thirukoil,
Rameswaram.

3.S.Ramasamy
4.T.Namburajan
5.M.Mathuresan
6.K.Thillai marimuthu
7.R.Veeramuthukumar
8.N.Nagalakshmi
9.R.Velayutham

1/6



W.A.(MD)No.1776 of 2025

- 10.P.Kuppamuthu
- 11.S.Rajendran
- 12.K.Kalimuthammal
- 13.R.Kalyanaraman
- 14.G.Lakshmi
- 15.S.Kalimuthammal
- 16.K.Subbammal
- 17.G.Indirani
- 18.T.Arumugam
- 19.V.Nagammal
- 20.R.Ramayee
- 21.V.Boomadevi
- 22.G.Panchavarnam
- 23.T.Namburajan
- 24.N.Arumugam
- 25.K.Suburamanian
- 26.A.Rajendran
- 27.A.Muniyandi
- 28.T.Renuka
- 29.P.Maruthurajan
- 30.S.Lalitha @ Srividya
- 31.K.Santhosh
- 32.M.Pandi
- 33.M.Karuppayee
- 34.C.Udayanatchi



W.A.(MD)No.1776 of 2025

35.M.Karuppayee

36.R.Mariammal

37.K.Marithaai

38.K.Marithaai

39.M.Muniyandi

40.Vetri Selvi

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Appeal filed under Clause XV of Letters Patent, to allow the writ appeal by setting aside the order passed in W.P.(MD).No.3708 of 2020 dated 17.03.2021 on the file of this Court.

For Appellants : Mr.R.Ramasamy

For Respondents : Mr.J.K.Jeyaseelan,
Government Advocate for R1.
Mr.S.Ramesh for R2
Mr.K.Thangarajan for R3 to R40

JUDGMENT
(By G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.)

Heard both sides.

2.The appellants are retired temple employees. Seeking payment of gratuity, they moved the Controlling Authority under the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972. The claim was allowed and the temple management

3/6



W.A.(MD)No.1776 of 2025

also had deposited the entire gratuity amount subsequently. In the meanwhile, to implement the order of the Controlling Authority, the appellants filed W.P.(MD)No.3708 of 2020. The writ petition was allowed. However, the learned Single Judge directed that the gratuity amount allowed by the authority would carry interest at the rate of 6% per annum. Aggrieved by the same, this writ appeal has been filed.

3.The learned counsel for the appellants draws our attention to quite a few orders including the recent one passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in S.L.P.(C) No.20740 of 2022 (Gagan Bihari Prusty Vs. Paradip Port Trust) in which, award of 10% interest has been sustained.

4.The temple employees are paid pittance of salary. In such cases, it is only just and proper that 10% interest rate is awarded. Our attention is drawn to Section 7(3A) of the Payment of Gratuity Act. It states that the interest rate would be the one awarded for long term deposits by Reserve Bank of India as per the notification of the Central Government. It is seen that for long term deposits, the Reserve Bank of India has directed that 10% interest can be awarded.



W.A.(MD)No.1776 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. In this view of the matter, we modify the order of the learned Single Judge. Instead of 6%, the interest rate to be paid to the appellants would be 10% per annum. The writ appeal is allowed on these terms. No costs.

(G.R.S. J.) & (R.K.M. J.)
16.12.2025

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

To:

The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable
Endowment Administration,
Nungampakkam High Road,
Chennai - 600 006.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)No.1776 of 2025

G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.
and
R.KALAIMATHI, J.

ias

W.A.(MD)No.1776 of 2025

16.12.2025
(3/4)