



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-02-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.No.8042 of 2026

and

W.M.P.No.8698, 8700, 8702 and 8772of 2026

Sri Sakthi Periyamariamman Temple
Represented by its Secretary P. Arjunan,
Thangapuripattina, Mettur Dam,
Salem District.

...Petitioner

Vs

1. The Additional Secretary to
Government of Tamil Nadu
Department of Tourism, Culture and
Religious Endowments, St George Fort,
Chennai.

2.The Assistant Commissioner,
Hindu Religious Charitable and
Endowment Department,
Kottai Mariamman Thirukovil Office,
Salem.

3.The Executive Officer,
Hindu Religious charitable and
Endowment Department, Arulmigu
Meenakeshi Sokkanathar Thirukovil,
Mettur Town and Taluk,, Salme
District.

4.The Revenue Divisional officer
Mettur

...Respondents

**PRAYER**

Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the entire records relating to the impugned order passed by the 4th respondent dated 04.02.2026 in Na.Ka.No.4206/2025/T and the consequential proceedings passed by the 3rd respondent dated 17.02.2026, quash the same consequently direct the respondents to restore possession, keys and complete administration of the petitioner temple namely Arulmigu Sri Sakthi Periyamariamman Temple, Thangapuripattinam, Kaveripuram Village, Mettur Taluk, Salem District to the petitioner trustees forthwith.

For Petitioner Mr.R.Nalliyappan

For Respondents Mr.N.R.R.Arun Natarajan,
Spl.G.P. for R1 to R3

Mr.E.Senthil Murugan, Spl.G.P.
for R4

ORDER

This writ petition is filed challenging the impugned orders dated 04.02.2026 and 17.02.2026, to quash the same and consequently, to direct the respondents to restore the possession, keys and complete administration of the petitioner temple, namely, Arulmigu Sri Sakthi Periyamariamman Temple, Thengapuripattinam, Kaveripuram Village, Mettur Taluk, Salem District, to the petitioner trustees forthwith.



2. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material records of the case, it is seen that in the same village, there are two temples. The first temple is, Arulmigu Thangamalai Periyamariamman Temple situated in S.Nos.228/21, 228/3 and 229/1, Kaveripuram village, Mettur Taluk, Salem District. There is yet another temple, which is called as Arulmigu Sri Sakthi Periyamariamman Temple, which is situated in T.S.No.13/38B, (Old S.F.No.60/3 Ward D, Block I at Thangama puripattinam) Mettur Town, Salem District. Earlier, when proceedings were taken with respect to taking over the management of Arulmigu Thangamalai Periyamariamman Temple, confusion arose. The petitioner had approached this Court. It can be seen that by an order in W.P.No.24495 of 2025, the existence of two temples was decided and this petitioner temple, namely, Arulmigu Sri Sakthi Periyamariamman temple, was held to be a different temple and the fact that the confusion arose because part of the name Periya Mariamman, is similar to both the temples, was also noted and the temple authorities were also directed to accordingly notify the names of both the temples and act accordingly. Once again, when the confusion arose, the same order was followed in W.P.No.5976 of 2024. While so, trustees were appointed only in respect of Arulmigu Thangamalai Periyamariamman temple in the impugned order as well as in the consequential proceedings. However, as if both the temples are one and the same and by giving alias name, the management of the petitioner temple is also sought to be interfered with. The



RDO has also passed an order in the name of the Peace Committee Meeting.

WEB COPY

3. Per contra, the learned the Special Government Pleader would submit that the mention of an alias name may not be correct. However, those proceedings relate to taking over of the management to Arulmigu Thangamalai Periyamariamman temple and if necessary, for this temple also separate steps will be taken for appointment of trustees.

4. I have considered the submissions made on either side and perused the medical records of the case.

5. In view of the categorical orders in the earlier writ petitions, it can be seen that both temples are different. As far as the petitioner temple is concerned, no proceedings have been taken separately to bring the temple under the management or to appoint trustees. It will be open for the authorities to do so, if it is necessary. However, as far as the impugned orders are concerned, they can only relate to the other temple, namely Arulmigu Thangamalai Periyamariamman temple and the management and the affairs of Arulmigu Sri Sakthi Mariamman temple situated in New T.S.No.13/38B, (Old S.F.No.60/3, Ward D, Block I at Thangamapuripattinam), Mettur Town, Salem District, shall not be interfered with by virtue of the impugned orders. To that extent, the impugned orders are declared to be illegal. It will be open for the respondents



authorities to apply their mind and if any other steps have to be taken with reference to Arulmigu Sri Sakthi Periyamariamman Temple, in New T.S.No.13/38B, (Old S.F.No.60/3, Ward D, Block I at Thangamapuripattinam), Mettur Town, Salem District, separate steps can be taken in accordance with law. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. No costs.

27-02-2026

Neutral Citation:No
ari

To

1.The Additional Secretary to
Government of Tamil Nadu
Department of Tourism, culture and Religious
Endowments,
St.George Fort, Chennai

2.The Assistant Commissioner
Hindu Religious charitable And Endowment
Department, Kottai Mariamman Thirukovil
office, Salem

3.The Executive Officer
Hindu Religious charitable And Endowment
Department, Arulmigu Meenakchi, Sokkanathar
Thirukovil, Mettur Town and Taluk, Salem
District

4.The Revenue Divisional Officer
Mettur



WEB COPY

W.P.No.8042 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

ari

**W.P.No.8042 of 2026
and
W.M.P.No.8698, 8700,
8702 and 8772of 2026**

27-02-2026