



W.P.(MD)No.21018 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 31.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE **MS.JUSTICE P.T.ASHA**

W.P.(MD).No.21018 of 2024

and

W.M.P(MD)Nos.17802 and 17803 of 2024

M.Ramkumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
2. The Commissioner,
Madurai Corporation,
Madurai.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Madurai,
Madurai District.
4. The Tahsildar,
Madurai West Taluk,
Madurai.
5. D.M. Maheshwaran

... Respondents



W.P.(MD)No.21018 of 2024

WEB COPY

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the 1st Respondent vide his impugned proceedings in Na.Ka.No. C1/e-966720/2023 dated 27.08.2024 and quash the same

For Petitioner	: Mr.M.Mohamed Zamil for M/s.Ajmal Associates
For R1 and R4	: Mr.D.Sasi Kumar Additional Government Pleader
For R2	: Mr.F.Deepak
For R5	: Mr.M.Sheik Mohamed

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for a certiorari to call for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide his impugned proceedings in Na.Ka.No. C1/e-966720/2023 dated 27.08.2024 and quash the same.



W.P.(MD)No.21018 of 2024

WEB COPY

2. The facts as set out in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition reads as follows:-

The petitioner would submit that he is running a theatre in the name and style of “Nataraj Theatre Jeyam” at Pasumpon Nagar, Palanganatham, Madurai. Originally, the license was issued in the name of the 5th respondent namely D.M.Maheshwaran. By an unregistered rental agreement dated 24.11.2022, the petitioner has been running the theatre and the license would be periodically renewed. While so, the 5th respondent had applied for renewal of license and he had also paid the required fees.

3. At this juncture, a quarrel arose between the petitioner and the 5th respondent with respect to the payment of higher rent contrary to the rental agreement and the petitioner has refused to pay higher rent. In this connection, the 5th respondent intended to terminate the rental agreement. Therefore, the petitioner has filed a civil suit in O.S.No.31 of 2023 and the same is pending.



W.P.(MD)No.21018 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. He would submit that the 1st respondent vide order dated 27.08.2024 had ordered to temporarily close down the theatre as no documents were produced for renewal of license.

5. He would submit that vide letter dated 01.03.2023, he informed the authorities regarding the dispute between him and the 5th respondent prior to the impugned order.

6. He would further submit that only on the basis of the non production of the C-Form License to the authorities, the impugned order has been passed.

7. That apart, he would submit that the 5th respondent sent a legal notice dated 21.12.2023 to pay the rental arrears and vacate the premises. Pursuant to the legal notice dated 21.12.2023, the petitioner has sent a reply notice dated 26.12.2023 stating that there are no arrear of rent and requested the 5th respondent to had over the C-Form license.



W.P.(MD)No.21018 of 2024

WEB COPY

8. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the impugned order has been passed without affording any opportunity to the petitioner is abuse of process of law.

9. He would further submit that without conducting proper enquiry, the 1st respondent has passed the impugned order dated 27.08.2024 is against principles of natural justice. Therefore, he seeks to quash the impugned order dated 27.08.2024.

10. Heard the learned counsel on either side.

11. A perusal of the impugned order dated 27.08.2024 would reflect that the petitioner is running the theatre and against whom the complaint has been lodged by the 1st respondent and orders have been passed without hearing the petitioner. This is a violation of the principles of natural justice which is the corner stone of the justice delivering system.



W.P.(MD)No.21018 of 2024

WEB COPY

12. Therefore, the impugned order dated 27.08.2024 is liable to be set aside and is accordingly set aside and the writ petition stands allowed. The matter is remitted back to the 1st respondent to consider the representation of the 5th respondent afresh, affording an opportunity of personal hearing to both parties after receiving their representation/objections, if any and thereafter, pass a speaking order within a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

13. The writ petition is allowed with the above directions. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

31.10.2025

NCC :yes/No
Index :yes/No
Internet:yes/No
rgm



W.P.(MD)No.21018 of 2024

WEB COPY

To

1. The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
2. The Commissioner,
Madurai Corporation,
Madurai.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Madurai,
Madurai District.
4. The Tahsildar,
Madurai West Taluk,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.21018 of 2024

P.T.ASHA, J.

rgm

W.P.(MD).No.21018 of 2024
and
W.M.P(MD)Nos.17802 and 17803 of 2024

31.10.2025