



WEB COPY

W.P.No.13550 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.04.2026

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

WP No. 13550 of 2026
and WMP No.14815 of 2026

C.Geetha
D/o.Chinnadurai,
Residing at No.216, Pillaiyar Kovil Street,
Athikanur Post, Kannandahalli,
Bargur Taluk, Krishnagiri District,
Tamil Nadu - 635203.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Chief Electoral Officer, Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600009.
2. The District Election Officer / District Collector,
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri.
3. The Electoral Registration Officer,
51-Uthangarai (SC) Assembly Constituency and
52-Bargur Assembly Constituency,
Krishnagiri District.
4. The Returning Officer,
51-Uthangarai (SC) Assembly Constituency
Krishnagiri District.



W.P.No.13550 of 2026

5. The Returning Officer,
52-Bargur Assembly Constituency,
Krishnagiri District.
6. The Booth Level Officer,
Part No.3, 51-Uthangarai Assembly Constituency,
Kannandahalli, Krishnagiri District.
7. The Inspector of Police,
Mathur Police Station, Krishnagiri District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing respondents 1 to 3 to forthwith verify the petitioner's earlier electoral entry bearing EPIC No.FCW5631791, pertaining to 51-Uthangarai Assembly Constituency, Part No.3, Serial No.916, and consequently restore the petitioner's name in the electoral roll by undoing the deletion and returning the petitioner to her original electoral status, and thereafter issue the necessary electoral roll extract, verification and certification in respect of the petitioner's electoral status, and consequentially direct respondents 4 and 5 to act upon the same so as to enable the petitioner to participate in the document verification on 06.04.2026 and the scrutiny of nomination on 07.04.2026 in relation to her candidature as an independent candidate for 51-Uthangarai (SC) Assembly Constituency and 52- Bargur Assembly Constituency in the General Election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly, 2026.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. P.V.Balasubramanian
Senior Counsel
for Mr. Prashanth Nadaraj B

For Respondent(s): Mr. Niranjan Rajagopalan
Standing Counsel
for R1 to R6



WEB COPY



W.P.No.13550 of 2026

Mr. K.M.D.Muhilan
Additional Public Prosecutor
for R7

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

Alleging that the name of the petitioner has been erroneously deleted from the electoral rolls, the petitioner sent a representation on 4.4.2026, through email, to the respondents seeking restoration of her name. As the said representation did not evoke any response, the present writ petition is filed seeking a mandamus to restore the petitioner's name in the electoral roll and to thereafter issue necessary electoral roll extract, verification and certification in respect of the petitioner's electoral status, and consequentially direct respondents 4 and 5 to act upon the same so as to enable the petitioner to participate in the document verification on 06.04.2026 and the scrutiny of nomination on 07.04.2026 in relation to her candidature as an independent candidate for 51-Uthangarai (SC) Assembly Constituency and 52- Bargur Assembly Constituency in the General Election to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly, 2026.



W.P.No.13550 of 2026

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submitted that no notice of proposed deletion of the name of the petitioner from the electoral roll was ever served on her and no hearing was afforded, nor any communication sent and, therefore, unbeknownst to the petitioner, her name was deleted. He hastened to add that only on 2.4.2026, when the petitioner sought to file here nomination, she was informed that her name is not found in the electoral roll. He further submits that the deletion of the name of the petitioner appears to be based on a false local report and appears to be motivated and premeditated with a view to defeat her candidature.

3. It is admitted in the writ petition that specific timelines have been drawn for Special Intensive Revision (SIR) of Electoral Roll. The schedule starting from the date for commencement of house-to-house enumeration to the date of final publication of electoral roll was published, inter alia, specifying the timeline for publication of draft electoral roll and filing of objections thereto. The petitioner fairly admits that she had no knowledge of the deletion of her name until 2.4.2026. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner has not filed any objection within the timeline announced by the Election Commission of India.



W.P.No.13550 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The petitioner, in our considered opinion, ought to have been on the qui vive and availed of the right to submit the objections within the timeline announced by the Election Commission of India. This Court exercising discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is not inclined to grant such relief, as the law aids the vigilant and not those who sleep over their rights.

5. The petitioner has sought a consequential direction against respondent authorities to enable her participate in the document verification and scrutiny of nomination.

6. It is trite that once the election process has commenced, the invocation of judicial remedy has to be postponed till the completing of proceedings in elections. The Supreme Court in *Election Commission of India v. Ashok Kumar*¹, held thus:

"32. For convenience sake we would now generally sum up our conclusions by partly restating what the two Constitution Benches have already said and then adding by clarifying what follows therefrom in view of the analysis made by us hereinabove:

¹ (2000) 8 SCC 216



(1) If an election, (the term election being widely interpreted so as to include all steps and entire proceedings commencing from the date of notification of election till the date of declaration of result) is to be called in question and which questioning may have the effect of interrupting, obstructing or protracting the election proceedings in any manner, the invoking of judicial remedy has to be postponed till after the completing of proceedings in elections.

(2) Any decision sought and rendered will not amount to "calling in question an election" if it subserves the progress of the election and facilitates the completion of the election. Anything done towards completing or in furtherance of the election proceedings cannot be described as questioning the election.

(3) Subject to the above, the action taken or orders issued by Election Commission are open to judicial review on the well-settled parameters which enable judicial review of decisions of statutory bodies such as on a case of mala fide or arbitrary exercise of



WEB COPY



W.P.No.13550 of 2026

power being made out or the statutory body being shown to have acted in breach of law.

(4) Without interrupting, obstructing or delaying the progress of the election proceedings, judicial intervention is available if assistance of the court has been sought for merely to correct or smoothen the progress of the election proceedings, to remove the obstacles therein, or to preserve a vital piece of evidence if the same would be lost or destroyed or rendered irretrievable by the time the results are declared and stage is set for invoking the jurisdiction of the court.

*(5) The court must be very circumspect and act with caution while entertaining any election dispute though not hit by the bar of Article 329(b) but brought to it during the pendency of election proceedings. **The court must guard against any attempt at retarding, interrupting, protracting or stalling of the election proceedings. Care has to be taken to see that there is no attempt to utilise the court's indulgence by filing a petition outwardly innocuous but essentially a subterfuge or pretext for achieving an ulterior or hidden end. Needless to say that in the very***



WEB COPY



W.P.No.13550 of 2026

nature of the things the court would act with reluctance and shall not act, except on a clear and strong case for its intervention having been made out by raising the pleas with particulars and precision and supporting the same by necessary material."

[emphasis supplied]

7. In the light of the law expounded by the Supreme Court in the aforesaid decision, we are not inclined to entertain the present writ petition.

8. For the aforegiven reasons, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, WMP No.14815 of 2026 is closed.

(SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,CJ) (G.ARUL MURUGAN,J)

07.04.2026

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
sasi



W.P.No.13550 of 2026

To:

WEB COPY

1. The Chief Electoral Officer, Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600009.
2. The District Election Officer / District Collector,
Krishnagiri District, Krishnagiri.
3. The Electoral Registration Officer,
51-Uthangarai (SC) Assembly Constituency and
52-Bargur Assembly Constituency,
Krishnagiri District.
4. The Returning Officer,
51-Uthangarai (SC) Assembly Constituency
Krishnagiri District.
5. The Returning Officer,
52-Bargur Assembly Constituency,
Krishnagiri District.
6. The Booth Level Officer,
Part No.3, 51-Uthangarai Assembly Constituency,
Kannandahalli, Krishnagiri District.
7. The Inspector of Police,
Mathur Police Station, Krishnagiri District.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.13550 of 2026

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
G.ARUL MURUGAN,J.

(sasi)

WP No. 13550 of 2026

07.04.2026