



W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 28.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE P.T.ASHA

W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025
in
Rev.Aplw(MD)SR.No.87424 of 2025

Kuthbu Sulthan Syed Ibrahim Hyeed
Oliyullah Dharga Haqdar Administrative Committee,
Through its President
Ahamed Ibrahim. .. Applicant/3rd Party

Vs.

- 1.Sheikh Ali ... Respondent/Petitioner
- 2.The District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Keezhakarai Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 4.The Block Development Officer (Village Panchayat),
Kadaladi Block Development Office,
Kadaladi,
Ramanathapuram District.



W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025

WEB COPY

5.Ervadi Village Panchayat,
Rep.By its Special Officer,
Ervadi, Keezhakarai Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.

6.The Divisional Engineer,
Highways Department,
Buildings and Maintenance,
Ramanathapuram.

7.The Assistant Divisional Engineer,
Highways Department,
Buildings and Maintenance,
Mudhukulathur.

... Respondents/Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to pass an order granting leave to the petitioner/applicant to file the review application challenging the order dated 16.09.2025 passed in W.P(MD)No.23591 of 2025 on the file of this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Barathan

For R1,2,6 & 7 : Mr.D.Sasikumar
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The above application is filed seeking a leave of this Court to prefer an application to review the order dated 16.09.2025 passed by this Court in W.P(MD)No.23591 of 2025.



W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. The writ petition has been filed by the 1st respondent herein seeking a mandamus against the respondents 2 and 4 from interfering with his operation of the Aavin Parlour situate on the road margin of Ervadi – Chinna Ervadi Road at 1/6 km in Survey No.502 of Ervadi Village, Keezhakarai Taluk, Ramanathapuram District.

3. By the aforesaid order, taking note of the representation that even before the filing of the writ petition, the writ petitioner's bunk had been shifted to a nearby place and was currently situated at the road margin, this Court had directed the respondents not to initiate eviction proceedings against the writ petitioner. This Court had further directed the respondents to permit the writ petitioner to continue to operate his shop, namely Aavin Parlour and to take steps to evict him in a manner known to law after issuing notice.

4. The petitioner herein seeks to review the order on the ground that the petitioner had been permitted to operate the Aavin Parlour only on the Ervadi – Chinna Ervadi Road which road commences from Ervadi



W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025

village till the main entrance of the Ervadi Dharga. The petitioner would further submit that the 1st respondent is seeking to operate the Parlour in Survey No.502 of Ervadi Village where a ban order was in force. According to the petitioner, this fact had not been brought into the notice of this Court and therefore, the order dated 16.09.2025 came to be passed.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the area in Survey Nos.502 and 504 was required for the construction of a shopping complex and a fish market and is being used as a parking area by the general public who attended the mosque. Therefore, he would submit that the order had to be reviewed and he being a third party, leave should be granted to review the said order.

6. Heard the learned counsels on either side.

7. The arguments of the petitioner that the 1st respondent had put up the parlour at a different place than what was granted to him cannot be



W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025

countenanced for the simple reason that even while passing orders in the writ petition, it had been clearly stated that the 1st respondent had shifted his place of business to the road margin and this Court had directed the respondents not to evict him from that place except by following due process of law. The contention of the petitioner that the 1st respondent is occupying the area earmarked for parking cannot also be countenanced for the reason that the 1st respondent's bunk had been shifted to its current position where he is permitted to run the business till the other respondents follow the due process of law to evict him. The petitioner is in no way affected by the order and that apart, the petitioner has not made out any grounds in and by which it could be stated that the order in question suffers from material irregularity or suffers from an error apparent on the face of the record.

8. Therefore, for the aforesaid reasons, this application is dismissed and the Review Application is rejected in the SR stage itself.

28.10.2025

NCC : Yes/No



W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes

gbg

To

- 1.The District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The Tahsildar,
Keezhakarai Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Block Development Officer (Village Panchayat),
Kadaladi Block Development Office,
Kadaladi,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 4.The Special Officer,
Ervadi Village Panchayat,
Ervadi, Keezhakarai Taluk,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 5.The Divisional Engineer,
Highways Department,
Buildings and Maintenance,
Ramanathapuram.
- 6.The Assistant Divisional Engineer,
Highways Department,
Buildings and Maintenance,
Mudhukulathur.



WEB COPY



W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025



WEB COPY



W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025

P.T.ASHA, J.

gbg

W.M.P(MD)No.22994 of 2025

28.10.2025