



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

WP No. 11320 of 2026

Elavarasan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The District Collector
Perambalur District.
2. P.K.Sekar
Block Development Officer,
Perambalur District,
Perambalur- 621 212.
3. Arivazhagan,
Block Development Officer,
Perambalur District,
Perambalur- 621 212.
4. Anandan
Engineer,
Perambalur District,
Perambalur- 621 212.
5. Jaishankar
Assistant Executive Engineer,
Perambalur District,
Perambalur- 621 212.

..Respondent(s)

Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking for issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the 1st respondent to consider petitioner's representation dated 14.11.2025 and consequently direct



the 1st respondent to take appropriate action against the 2nd to 5th Respondents and the above said tender work fully investigated and further provide compensation for the economic loss incurred by the petitioner within stipulated period.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M Abdul Rahman

For Respondent(s): Mr.K.Surendran, AGP for R1

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking for a direction to the first respondent to take appropriate action against the respondents 2 to 5 for the alleged misconduct said to have been committed by them while conducting tenders.

2. The petitioner claims to be a contractor and registered with the Government. He claims that he has been regularly participating in tenders in respect of Government tenders. According to the petitioner, the respondents 2 to 5, who are the officials involved in the conduct of the tenders, have misconducted themselves in order to help specific tenderers. Under these circumstances, the petitioner seeks for a direction to the first respondent to take appropriate action against the respondents 2 to 5.



3. Mr.K.Surendran, learned Additional Government Pleader, accepts notice on behalf of the first respondent.

WEB COPY

4. The petitioner has not challenged any tender in this writ petition. The allegations levelled against the respondents 2 to 5 in this writ petition are also vague and bald. The petitioner, if aggrieved, must first challenge the award of contract in any tender. Having not challenged the award of any contract awarded to any third party in a tender, the question of directing the first respondent to take action against the respondents 2 to 5 for the alleged misconduct said to have been committed by them does not arise.

5. Eventhough in the affidavit filed in support of this writ petition, the petitioner has referred to certain tenders, where the petitioner had participated and claims to have been declared as L1 tenderer, but, was not issued with any work order by the respondents, for the reasons best known to the petitioner, he has not challenged those tenders through any legal proceedings. Instead, he has chosen to file this writ petition only for a direction to the first respondent to take action against the respondents 2 to 5, who are officials, which is not maintainable. Only when the petitioner is able to establish through documentary evidence that the respondents 2 to 5 have misconducted themselves while conducting auctions, the question of directing the first respondent to take action against the respondents 2 to 5 will arise.



6. For the foregoing reasons, since this writ petition is bereft of any particulars and since the petitioner has not challenged the award of contract based on any specific tender/s, this writ petition cannot be entertained by this Court. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed. No Costs.

27-03-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
RKM

To

1. The District Collector
Perambalur District,
Perambalur- 621 212.



WEB COPY

WP No. 11320 of 2



ABDUL QUDDHOSE, J.

RKM

WP No. 11320 of 2026

27-03-2026