



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 02.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.31282 of 2025
and W.M.P.(MD)Nos.24479, 24483 & 24484 of 2025

M/s.R.V.Agro Marketers

Rep by its Proprietor Mr.T.Venkatahalapathy,

S/o. Thirupathy,

Shop No.195, Agri Input Trade Centre,

Mattuthavani,

Madurai – 625007.

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Assistant Director of Agriculture,
Quality Control,
Melakanmoi Street,
Tallakulam,
Madurai - 625002.

2. Rajeshkannan

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order in Letter No.Thi3/10939/2025-2026 dated 22.08.2025 issued by the 1st respondent and quash the same as



WEB COPY

illegal and direct the 1st respondent to immediately restore petitioner's fertilizer license No.MDU.MDUE.RS.190/2021-2026 forthwith and permit the petitioner to continue his business activities under the same premises.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Balaji

For Respondents : Mr.K.Balasubramani,
Spl. Govt. Pleader for R1

Mr.s.S.Modharshini for R2

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed challenging the impugned order in Letter No.Thi3/10939/2025-2026 dated 22.08.2025, passed by the 1st respondent, wherein, the petitioner's license was suspended.

2. According to the petitioner, he is having a permanent license for selling fertilizer issued by the 1st respondent and the petitioner is carried out his business at Shop No.195, in Agri Input Trade Centre, Mattuthavani, Madurai. The said shop was purchased by the petitioner and the 2nd respondent. Since there was a dispute between the petitioner



and the 2nd respondent, the second respondent lodged a complaint to the 1st respondent. On receiving the said complaint, the 1st respondent passed the impugned order, suspending the petitioner's vending license for fertilizer, without hearing the petitioner. Challenging the same, the petitioner has filed this Writ Petition.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner will file his reply to the impugned order and the 1st respondent may be directed to consider the said reply.

4. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the first respondent would submit that if any reply is filed by the petitioner, the same will be considered and appropriate orders will be passed.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent would submit that if the petitioner is getting license, they have no objection to run the shop at Shop No.N195 by the petitioner.



WEB COPY

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court directs the petitioner to file his reply to the impugned order. If any such reply is filed, the first respondent is directed to consider the same and pass orders on merits and in accordance with law, after hearing the petitioner, within a period of two weeks from the date of receiving reply from the petitioner. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the said order, which is to be passed, it is open to him to challenge the same in the manner known to law.

6. With the above direction, this Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

02.12.2025

Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

vsm



WEB COPY



To

The Assistant Director of Agriculture,
Madurai West,
Melakanmoi Street,
Tallakulam,
Madurai - 625002.



WEB COPY



KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

vsm

W.P.(MD)No.31282 of 2025

02.12.2025



W.P.(MD).No.31282 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

Today, the matter is listed under the caption “For Being Mentioned” at the instance of the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

2. Accepting the submissions of the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent, the following paragraphs are incorporated in the order portion as Paragraph Nos.5(a) and 7. Consequently, the existing Paragraph Nos.6 in the order portion is re-serialised as Paragraph No.8.

“5(a). The learned counsel appearing for the second respondent would submit that the petitioner



WEB COPY



and the second respondent are joint owners of the properties bearing Shop No.J163 and Shop No.N195. She would further submit that insofar as Shop No.J163 is concerned, the second respondent has made an application for the grant of licence. In that regard, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has no objection to the second respondent for running the shop in Shop No.J163. She would further submit that as far as Shop No.N195 is concerned, the petitioner has made an application for the grant of licence. She would further submit that the grant of any licence in respect of Shop No.J163 or Shop No.N195 shall be subject to the outcome of the partition suit pending between the parties.

6.....

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is permitted to run Shop No.N195 and the second respondent is permitted to run Shop No.J163, provided they have



WEB COPY



obtained the requisite licence. It is made clear that such permission shall be subject to the outcome of the partition suit, which shall ultimately determine the rights of the parties in respect of the subject properties.”

3. Registry is directed to carry out the necessary corrections and issue fresh order copy to the parties concerned.

06.01.2026

TSG



WEB COPY



KRISHNA RAMASAMY.J.,

TSG

W.P.(MD).No.31282 of 2025



WEB COPY



06.01.2026