



WEB COPY

Writ Petition No. 9512 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

Writ Petition No. 9512 of 2026

and

W.M.P.No.10255 of 2026

R.Raja
S/o Rangasamy

..Petitioner

Vs

1. The Regional Transport Officer,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.
2. K. Sundaram
3. Green valley school
Rep by its Secretary,
Bagalur Road, Kalahasthipuram,
Avalapalli Post, Hosur 635 109.

..Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of certiorarified mandamus calling for the records relating to the impugned proceedings of the first respondent in Na.Ka.No.49954/2024/E2 dated ...02.2026 and quash the same and consequently, direct the first respondent to restore the permits of the school buses bearing Registration Nos. TN70AM5701, TN70AM5718, TN70AM5783, TN70AM5816, TN24R4626 and TN24R4624.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Elayaraj Kumar
for Mr.R.Krishnan

For Respondents : Mr.N.Naveen Kumar
Government Advocate [R1]
Mr.M.Palani [R2 & R3]



ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned proceedings of the first respondent dated ...02.2026 accepting the surrender of the bus permits made by the second respondent.

2. The petitioner is a trustee of the third respondent school. There seems to be a dispute between the petitioner and the second respondent with regard to the management of the third respondent school. Criminal complaints are also pending. The petitioner claims that through a fabricated board resolution said to have been passed by the third respondent school, the second respondent has unauthorisedly applied for surrender of third respondent school bus permits with the first respondent. According to the petitioner, erroneously and illegally, the first respondent has also accepted the surrender of the bus permits made by the second respondent under the impugned order.

3. The petitioner participated in the impugned proceedings and he was also heard by the first respondent. Admittedly, there is an appellate remedy available to the petitioner, if aggrieved by the impugned order. Instead of filing the appeal, the petitioner has filed this writ petition. Since the impugned order is a speaking order and an order passed after hearing the petitioner, the question of entertaining this writ petition does not arise since there is an alternate statutory



appellate remedy available to the petitioner. The appellate remedy available to the petitioner is also not disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner during the course of his arguments. However, his contention is that since several buses are plying to transport students/teachers, the petitioner has directly approached this Court by filing this writ petition to protect the interest of the students/teachers. Under the impugned order, the petitioner has also been granted liberty to submit a fresh application with the first respondent seeking for issuance of fresh permits for the buses in favour of the third respondent school. The petitioner has chosen to challenge the impugned order and has not chosen to file a fresh application with the first respondent seeking for issuance of bus permit.

4. This Court is not expressing its view as to whether the procedure adopted by the petitioner is correct or not. This Court suggested to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether the petitioner will be willing to submit a fresh application to the first respondent seeking for issuance of fresh bus permits in favour of the third respondent school and a direction will be issued to the first respondent school to consider the same on merits and in accordance with law within a time frame to be fixed by this Court. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to get instructions as to whether the petitioner is willing to submit a fresh application seeking for issuance of fresh bus permits in favour of the third respondent school. In view of the fact that the



impugned order is a speaking order and an order passed after hearing the petitioner, the question of entertaining this writ petition does not arise when there is a statutory appellate remedy available to the petitioner before the competent appellate authority. Since there is a statutory appellate remedy available to the petitioner as against the impugned order, necessarily the petitioner will have to approach the appellate authority and this Court cannot entertain this writ petition at this stage.

5. For the foregoing reasons, this writ petition is disposed of by granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent appellate authority in the manner known to law. The only limited relief that can be granted is to direct the appellate authority to consider the plight of the students/teachers, which are at stake and dispose of the appeal once the same is filed by the petitioner within a period of six (6) weeks thereafter. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

13-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

gm



WEB COPY

To

The Regional Transport Officer,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.

Writ Petition No. 9512 of 2





WEB COPY

Writ Petition No. 9512 of 2



ABDUL QUDDHOSE, J.

gm

Writ Petition No. 9512 of 2026

13-03-2026