



W.P.(MD)No.29592 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **12.12.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE **Mr. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY**

W.P.(MD)No.29592 of 2023 &
W.M.P(MD)No.25543 of 2023

Kamuthi Vatar Varasandhai Viyabarigal Sangam,
Rep. by its Treasurer,
V.Aladi Eswaran,
S/o.Veeru,
37, Kittangi Street,
Kamudhi,
Ramanathapuram District.

...Petitioner

vs.

1.The District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.

2.The Director of Municipal Administration,
O/o.The Director of Municipal Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai.

3.The Muthukulathur Town Panchayat,
Rep. by its Executive Officer,
Muthukulathur,
Ramanathapuram District.

4.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.the Superintendent of Police,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Muthukulathur Police Station,



W.P.(MD)No.29592 of 2023

Muthukulathur,
Ramanathapuram District.

6.S.Prabhakaran

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents No.1 to 3 to forbear the extension of license for collecting vending fee in Mudukulathur weekly market in favour of the respondent no.6 and conduct enquiry upon the complaint lodged by the petitioner dated 06.11.2023 against the respondent no.6 with regard to the excess collection of the vending fees as prescribed under the Tamil Nadu Street Vendors (Protection of Livelihood, Regulation of Street Vending and Licensing) Scheme, 2015.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mahaboob Fazil
for M/s.Lajapathi Roy and Associates

For Respondents : Mr.S.Shanmugavel,
Additional Government Pleader
for R1 & R2

Mr.N.Dilip Kumar for R3

Mr.A.Albert James,
Government Advocate
for R4 & R5

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed to forbear the respondents 1 to 3 from extending the license in favour of the sixth respondent for collecting vending fees in Muthukulathur weekly market and conduct enquiry upon the



W.P.(MD)No.29592 of 2023

complaint lodged by the petitioner on 06.11.2023 against the sixth respondent with regard to excess collection of the vending fees.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has given a representation on 06.11.2023 for regulating the collection of vending fees and to cancel the licence issued to the sixth respondent. Since the same has not been considered, the present Writ Petition has been filed. In support of his case, the learned counsel relied on the Hon'ble Division Bench Judgment of this Court in the case of *R.Mayil Vahanam vs. I.R.Jeyabharath and others* in W.A.(MD)No.758 of 2024, dated 25.07.2025, to the effect that private individuals shall not be granted licence for collection of vending fees.

3. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 would submit that a fresh tender has been called for and therefore, they have not extended the licence for collecting vending fees. Hence, the above proposition of law relied on by the petitioner will not be applicable to the facts of the present case.



W.P.(MD)No.29592 of 2023

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would also confirm that a fresh tender notification has been issued for collection of vending fees.

5. I have given due consideration to the submissions made on either sides.

6. The petitioner seeks not to extend the licence granted to the sixth respondent for collecting vending fees in Muthukulathur weekly market. According to the learned Additional Government Pleader, the licence granted to the sixth respondent for collecting vending fees has not been extended. If suppose, the Government Authorities have extended the license in favour of the sixth respondent, the law laid down by the Hon'ble Division Bench will be applicable to the present case. However, no such extension was granted and as such, fresh tender notification was issued. Therefore, the question of charging vending fees by the sixth respondent does not arise and hence, the law laid down by the Hon'ble Division Bench in the case of *R.Mayil Vahanam vs. I.R.Jeyabharath and others* in W.A.(MD)No.758 of 2024, dated 25.07.2025 is not applicable to the facts of the present case. There is no merit in the Writ Petition and hence, it is liable to be dismissed.



W.P.(MD)No.29592 of 2023

7. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

12.12.2025

Speaking / Non-speaking order

Index : Yes/No

NCC : Yes/No

mbi

To

1.The District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.

2.The Director of Municipal Administration,
O/o.The Director of Municipal Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
O/o.the Superintendent of Police,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Muthukulathur Police Station,
Muthukulathur,
Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.29592 of 2023

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

mbi

W.P.(MD)No.29592 of 2023

12.12.2025