



**W.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025**

**BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT**

WEB COPY

DATED : 01.09.2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN**

W.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025

M.Chitra

... Petitioner


Vs.

1.The Regional Transport Authority  
cum District Collector,  
Thiruchirappalli District,  
Thiruchirappalli.

2.The Regional Transport Officer,  
Thiruchirappalli (West),  
Thiruchirappalli.

... Respondents

**Prayer :** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to make an entry restored the variation in permit No.23/TRY/2024, granting 1) Extension of sector from Seranathan Cross Road to Sikkathambur 2) (a) Curtailment of Sector from Tollgate to Pullampadi (Via), Lalgudi (b) Curtailment of Sector from Seranathan Cross Road to Narasingapuram (c) Curtailment of Sector from Thiruvallarai Cross Road to Thanjavur (Via), Omanthur 3) Deviation of Sector from Thiruvallarai Cross Road to Thuraiyur (via), Peramangalam, Pulivalam and Karattampatti, 4) grant of four additional single between



**W.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025**

Tollgate and Thiruvallarai Cross Road via, Manachanallur, Thiruvallarai Cross Road, Pulivalam with change of halt from Narasingapuram to Sikkathambur grant of two additional single between Trichy and Tollgate and for other reliefs.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.C.Asaithambi

For Respondents : Mr.M.Gangatharan,  
Government Advocate.

### **ORDER**

The writ petitioner wants the variations granted in her favour in the year 1996 in the permit. The petitioner claims that request was made by her on 14.05.2025 and that since it was not considered, the present writ petition for issuance of Writ of Mandamus came to be filed.

2.When the matter was taken up for hearing, the learned Government Advocate submitted that the writ petitioner never approached the first respondent. In the typed set of papers, no proof has been enclosed to show that the application was submitted to the first respondent. The petitioner claims that she met the first respondent in person. This is not sufficient. If the first respondent did not issue any



**W.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025**

acknowledgment for having submitted the application, then on the same day, the petitioner should have sent either e-mail or through registered post. Such course of action was not adopted by the writ petitioner. I, therefore, hold that there is no proof that the petitioner ever made a demand before the first respondent. Unless there is demand and the same was not considered by the first respondent, no Writ of Mandamus can be issued. The written instructions of the first respondent reads as follows:-


*“With reference to the above writ petition, I wish to state that the petitioner has not filed the request dated 14.05.2025 to effect entry of restoration of variations on the permit. If such request is received from the petitioner, the same will be considered on merits under the provisions of MV Act and Rules.”*

The petitioner is given liberty accordingly.

3.This writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

**01.09.2025**

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



**W.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025**

To:-

WEB COPY

- 1.The Regional Transport Authority  
cum District Collector,  
Thiruchirappalli District,  
Thiruchirappalli.
- 2.The Regional Transport Officer,  
Thiruchirappalli (West),  
Thiruchirappalli..



WEB COPY



**W.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025**



WEB COPY



**W.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025**

**G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.**

ias

**W.P(MD)No.23573 of 2025**

**01.09.2025**