



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 25-02-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY**

**WP No. 7651 of 2026**

Sri Kishan Bhattad

..Petitioner

Vs

1. The Commissioner,  
Hindu Religious and Charitable  
Endowment Department,  
Uthamar Gandhi Salai,  
Nungambakkam, Chennai – 600034.
2. Joint Commissioner,  
Chennai Division I,  
Hindu Religious and Charitable  
Endowment Department,  
No.163, Linghi Chetti Street,  
Chennai 600 001.
3. Arulmigu Sinthathri Vinayagar Temple  
No.139, N.S.C.Bose Road  
Chennai - 600079  
Rep. by its Executive Officer.

..Respondents

**Prayer:** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, directing the second respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 10.11.2025 requesting to handover the newly constructed shop portion to the petitioner to enable him to continue as tenant to do his business in the newly constructed premises.

For Petitioner:

Mr.K.Rajasekaran

For Respondents:

Mr.N.R.R.Arun Natarajan  
Special Government Pleader



## ORDER

WEB COPY The writ petition is filed for a direction to the second respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 10.11.2025 requesting to hand over the newly constructed shop portion to the petitioner to enable him to continue as a tenant.

2. The case of the petitioner is that originally he was a tenant and since the temple wanted to redevelop the property, on that understanding, however without any express agreement, the petitioner vacated and handed over. Now the redevelopment has already been completed. The shop is now not being auctioned or handed over to the petitioner to continue as a tenant and therefore the petitioner has made the representation.

3. When the matter came up for hearing, *Mr.N.R.R.Arun Natarajan*, the learned Special Government Pleader taking notice on behalf of the respondents would submit that there was no express agreement to give back the shop to the petitioner. After the petitioner vacated, the property was developed and fresh construction was made. The shop was let out by public auction and advertisement was issued in the *Makkalkural* daily dated 17.12.2025 and the auction was conducted on 31.12.2025 and one *Dhanaram* was the successful bidder. The bid is confirmed and the shop is also allotted to him for a monthly



rent of Rs.24,500/- and the rental agreement is also executed on 01.02.2026.

WEB COPY

4. In reply thereof, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire action seems to be sham and nominal and has been done secretly.

5. Even if the petitioner pleads that the entire action is done in a secretive manner, he has to challenge the above proceedings and the prayer to consider the representation cannot now be granted. With such liberty reserved to the petitioner, this writ petition stands *disposed of*. The respondent authorities are directed to serve the copies of the advertisement as well as the allotment order to the learned counsel for the petitioner, which was done in the Court. No costs.

**25-02-2026**

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

NSL



1. The Commissioner,  
Hindu Religious and Charitable  
Endowment Department,  
Uthamar Gandhi Salai,  
Nungambakkam, Chennai – 600034.

2. Joint Commissioner,  
Chennai Division I,  
Hindu Religious and Charitable  
Endowment Department,  
No.163, Linghi Chetti Street,  
Chennai 600 001.

3. The Executive Officer,  
Arulmigu Sinthathri Vinayagar Temple  
No.139, N.S.C.Bose Road  
Chennai – 600079.



WEB COPY

WP No. 7651 of 2



**D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.**

**NSL**

**WP No. 7651 of 2026**

**25-02-2026**