



WP.Crl.No.681 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 27.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

WP.Crl.No.681 of 2026

K.L.Kamaraj,
S/o.Loganathan,
President,
Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bhajanai Temple Trust,
No.8, Gurusamy Nagar, 3rd Street,
Pulianthope, Chennai – 600 012.

... Petitioners

Vs.

- 1.The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Otteri Police Station Office,
Chennai.
- 2.The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Pulianthope Police Station Office,
Chennai.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
P-4 Police Station,
Pulianthope, Chennai – 600 012.
- 4.K.Govindamal
- 5.C.Saraswathi
- 6.S.Nagalakshmi
- 7.R.Chamundeswari
- 8.R.Gomathi
- 9.V.Victoria

... Respondents



WP.CrL.No.681 of 2026

PRAYER: Writ Petition (Criminal) filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ of Mandamus, directing the 1 to 3 respondents herein to not to grant police protection to the respondents 4 to 9 for the proposed “Thirukalyanam” function scheduled on 27.03.2026 at Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bhajanai Temple, situated at No.8, Gurusamy Nagar, 3rd Street, Pulianthope, Chennai – 600 012 and consequently to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to take appropriate action against the respondents 4 to 9 for illegally collecting money using the temple’s name.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Mutharasu
For R1 to R3 : Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam
Additional Public Prosecutor

ORDER

This writ petition is filed to direct the 1 to 3 respondents herein to not to grant police protection to the respondents 4 to 9 for the proposed “Thirukalyanam” function scheduled on 27.03.2026 at Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bhajanai Temple, situated at No.8, Gurusamy Nagar, 3rd Street, Pulianthope, Chennai – 600 012 and consequently to direct the respondents 1 to 3 to take appropriate action against the respondents 4 to 9 for illegally collecting money using the temple’s name.

2.The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the



petitioner as President of Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bhajanai Koil Arakattalai requested to restrain the respondents 4 to 9 not to interfere in the temple administration since the respondents are no way connected with the temple and also the petitioner obtained an injunction order in I.A.Nos.2 and 3 of 2025 in O.S.No.1622 of 2025 dated 28.03.2025 in his favour. This being so, against the order of the Civil Court, the private respondents on 27.03.2026 slated to conduct Sri Seetha Piratti and Sri Ramar Thirukalyanam. They printed hand bills, invitations and collecting money, thus illegally collecting Rs.5 lakhs from the public using the temple's name, due to which there is likelihood of clash and break down of law and order, hence no permission to be granted to conduct Thirukalyanam and also not to give any police protection to them.

3.In support of his contentions, the petitioner filed the copy of invitation of laying foundation stone of Sri Venkatesa Perumal Temple on 23.08.1971, copy of invitation calling for donation from the public and the copy of invitation for inauguration of Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bhajanai Koil at Gurusamy Nagar, held on 08.04.1979. He further annexed the registered Trust Deed Document No.36 of 2002 wherein the petitioner as a President,



one D.J.Thulasidoss as Secretary and K.L.Sathiya Moorthy, petitioner's brother as Treasurer, registered the Trust in the name of Venkatesa Perumal Bajanai Koil Trust to conduct Poojas on various occasions. According to the petitioner, following the formation of the Trust, the petitioner had taken all steps to conduct Kumabishekam of the temple on 02.02.2025 and thus the petitioner has got the right over temple's administration. Since the respondents 4 to 9 along with other others claiming to be local residents and member of Sri Ramanavami Pazhatheswari Magazhir Kulu misusing the name of private temple Sri Venkatesa Perumal Thirukoil and also name of Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bajanai Koil Trust, fabricating fake money receipt book, collecting money from general public and temple devotees, misappropriating the collected money and were contemplating to perform Thirukalyanam for Sri Ramanavami Sri Sita Sri Rama on 06.04.2025 and hence, lodged a complaint. The petitioner also filed a civil suit in O.S.No.1622 of 2025 and filed I.A.No.2 seeking injunction restraining the defendants 1 to 20 therein, in which the respondents 4 to 9 herein are also defendants, from using the name of private temple Sri Venkatesa Perumal Thirukoil and the name of the petitioner Trust Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bajanai Koil Trust for the purpose of doing any act inside and outside the



temple premises without the consent and permission of the petitioner Trust and I.A.No.3 of 2025 to restrain the defendants therein from printing any money receipt book in the name of the private temple and the Trust and collecting money from the general public and temple devotees. The Civil Court by order dated 28.03.2025 partly allowed I.A.No.2 of 2025 restraining the defendants from using the name of petitioner's Trust Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bajanai Koil Trust but dismissed the prayer as regards restraining the defendants from using the name of Sri Venkatesa Perumal Thirukoil for the purpose of doing any act inside and outside the temple premises without the consent and permission of the petitioner Trust. As regards I.A.No.3 of 2025, it was partly allowed granting injunction restraining the respondents/defendants therein from printing money receipt book in the name of petitioner Trust Sri Venkatesa Perumal Bajanai Koil Trust for collecting money from the general public and temple devotees, but dismissed the prayer as regards restraining the defendants from printing any money receipt book in the name of Sri Venkatesa Perumal Thirukoil and using the same for collecting money from general public and temple devotees.



4.The learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submitted that the issue is now pending before the Civil Court and in the interim order, it is held that only after full-fledged trial, the rights of the parties can be decided. This being so, now the petitioner coming to know that on 27.03.2026 misusing the name of Arakatalai, the respondents 4 to 9 are collecting money and complaint sent, but no action taken. Hence, the present petition filed.

5.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that today (27.03.2026) is the Thirukalyanam festival is slated to be held by Sri Ramanavami Pazhatheswari Magazhir Kulu. Already the petitioner filed a civil suit and the Civil Court only issued restrictions as regards using the name of Arakatalai and printing any money receipt book or collecting money in the name of Arakatalai. He referred to the invitation filed along with the petition. Further the invitation is very clear that it is in the name of Sri Seetha Priatti and Sri Rama Thirukalyanam and it has been conducted by Sri Ramanavami Pazhatheswari Magazhir Kulu, the list of persons who had given donations in cash and kind for the previous year is also printed along with the invitation and if the petitioner has got any grievance with regard to the misuse of funds, it is for him to approach the appropriate authorities. He



further submitted that the specific contention of the petitioner is that it is a private temple and the claim of the rival group is that it is a public temple which has been collecting money from the general public and further the revenue records is only in the name of the temple. The temple characteristic is public in nature. He would further submit that the primary contention of the petitioner seems to be misuse of Arakatalai's name which can be sorted out between both the groups in the civil suit which is pending. Hence, strongly opposed the petition.

6.Considering the submissions made and on perusal of the materials, it is seen that it is a dispute between the petitioner Trust and the rival group with regard to the nature of the temple, whether it is a private temple or public temple and who is entitled for the control and management of the temple, which can be decided only in the Civil Court by filing appropriate petition or under Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act (HR&CE Act) with the Department. With regard to the temple Arakatalai, no doubt it is the petitioner who registered the Trust and the revenue records are in the name of the temple and the Trust has been registered only in the year 2021 but the temple is in existence decades before, the temple called for donations



WP.CrL.No.681 of 2026

as early as in the year 1971 for construction of temple building and the temple building was inaugurated in the year 1979, which is the admitted position. In view of the above facts, the petitioner's prayer cannot be entertained.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

27.03.2026

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

cse



WEB COPY



WP.Crl.No.681 of 2026

To

- 1.The Deputy Commissioner of Police,
Otteri Police Station Office,
Chennai.
- 2.The Assistant Commissioner of Police,
Pulianthope Police Station Office,
Chennai.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
P-4 Police Station,
Pulianthope, Chennai – 600 012.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



WP.Crl.No.681 of 2026

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

cse

WP.Crl.No.681 of 2026

27.03.2026