



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 12.01.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.113 & 136 of 2026

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.113 of 2026 :

P.Alagappan Pooasari,
Hereditary Trustee,
Arulmigu Sri Ayyanar Kovil,
Paaraipatti Village,
Kodangipatti PO,
Vadipatti Taluk,
Madurai District.

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Samayanallur Range,
Madurai.

3.The Sub Inspector of Police,
Palamedu Police Station,
Madurai.

4.Suryaprakash

... Respondents



PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing respondent Nos.1 to 3 to give adequate police protection to the petitioner for keeping Thai Pongal on 15.01.2026 in Arulmigu Ayyanar Kovil, Paaraipatti Village, Vadipatti Taluk, Madurai District, based on the petitioner's representation dated 23.12.2025.

For Petitioner	: Mr.A.Mohamed Ashfalk for Mr.S.Ramanathan
For R1 to R3	: Mr.A.S.Abul Kalaam Azad, Government Advocate (Criminal Side)
For R4	: Mr.Ramesh Mahadev

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.136 of 2026 :

Surya Prakash

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
District Collectorate,
Madurai.

2.The Joint Commissioner,
Office of the Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable and Endowments Department,
Madurai.

3.The Inspector,
Office of the Inspector,
Hindu Religious and Charitable and Endowments Department,
Alanganallur Division, Vadipatti Taluk,
Madurai.



4.Hereditary Trustee,
Arulmighu Ayyanar Temple,
Paraipatti, Vadipatti Taluk,
Madurai District.

5.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Samayanallur Range,
Madurai – 625 007.

6.The Tahsildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Vadipatti, Madurai District.

7.The Inspector of Police,
Alanganallur Police Station,
Vadipatti Taluk, Madurai District.

8.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Palamedu Police Station,
Vadipatti Taluk, Madurai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing respondent Nos.5, 7, and 8 respondents to grant permission and provide necessary police protection for “Thai Pongal Festival” (i.e. give the sacred offering Food (Annathanam) to all the worshipers) at Arulmighu Ayyanar Temple, Paraipatti Village, Vadipatti Taluk, Madurai District, scheduled to be held on 15.01.2026 by considering the petitioner's representation on 15.12.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.Ramesh Mahadev

For RR1, 2, 3 & 6 : Mr.P.Thambidurai,
Government Advocate

For R4 : Mr.A.Mohamed Ashfalk



WEB COPY



For RR5, 7, & 8

: Mr.A.S.Abul Kalaam Azad,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

COMMON ORDER

These Writ Petitions have been filed seeking a direction to the respondent Police to provide adequate police protection for conducting the “Thai Pongal Festival” on 15.01.2026 at Arulmigu Ayyanar Kovil, situated at Paaraipatti Village, Vadipatti Taluk, Madurai District.

2. The petitioner, P. Alagappan Poosari, in W.P.(MD) No.113 of 2026 is the Hereditary Trustee appointed and approved by the HR & CE Department and the said order was passed subsequently taking into consideration the *suo motu* contempt proceedings. He is now seeking police protection.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the 4th respondent, Surya Prakash, vehemently objected to the petition filed by P.Alagappan Poosari. The contention of the 4th respondent is that the festival is conducted by five villages in and around the said area. So far, the 4th respondent has conducted three festivals. According to the 4th respondent, the petitioner, P.Alagappan Poosari, has not conducted even a single festival. Further submitted there has been a dispute between the villages and the petitioner for more than 35 years. The 4th respondent claims that he has taken efforts to resume the festival and has conducted the same for the past three years. Therefore, the 4th respondent



vehemently objected to the petition, stating that he alone is entitled to conduct the festival and that the five villages are entitled to participate in the same.

WEB COPY

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

5. After hearing the rival submissions, this Court is of the considered opinion merely because the 4th respondent has conducted the festival for the past three years, he does not acquire any right to claim Hereditary Trusteeship or Hereditary Poojariship. He cannot deny the rights accrued to the petitioner, P.Alagappan Poosari, who has been duly recognized and approved by the HR & CE Department. Any activity affecting the Trusteeship rights cannot be permitted. Therefore, the petitioner, P.Alagappan Poosari, is entitled to conduct the Pongal function.

6. As far as the 4th respondent, Surya Prakash, is concerned, since he has conducted three festivals, he claims a right to conduct the Pongal festival. Further, the allegation against the petitioner, P.Alagappan Poosari, is that the petitioner, being the Hereditary Poojari, refused to offer the Pongal prepared by the 4th respondent to the Deity. The 4th respondent had sent two letters to the petitioner, despite being called upon through two letters, he did not respond.



7. Per contra, the learned counsel for the petitioner, P.Alagappan Poosari, submitted that the petitioner will not interfere with the keeping of the Pongal by the 4th respondent before the temple. However, it is submitted that the said Pongal may be handed over to him in order to offer the same to the Deity, since he is the Hereditary Trustee-cum-Hereditary Poojari.

8. If the allegation against the petitioner, P.Alagappan Poosari is true, then the petitioner has failed in his duty. Therefore, the petitioner, P.Alagappan Poosari, is strictly directed to adhere to and perform his duties as a Poojari. Consequently, the 4th respondent is directed to keeping the Pongal, thereafter the 4th respondent is directed to hand over the Pongal to the petitioner, who is the Hereditary Poojari. The petitioner is directed to offer the same to the Deity and thereafter hand it over back to the 4th respondent.

9. Both the petitioner and the 4th respondent are directed to conduct the Pongal festival without any discrimination and to celebrate the same together.

10. With the above directions, these Writ Petitions are disposed of.

12.01.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
mkn



To

1. The District Collector,
District Collectorate,
Madurai.

2. The Joint Commissioner,
Office of the Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable and Endowments Department,
Madurai.

3. The Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Superintendent of Police,
Madurai District.

4. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Samayanallur Range,
Madurai – 625 007.

5. The Thasildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Vadipatti, Madurai District.

6. The Inspector,
Office of the Inspector,
Hindu Religious and Charitable and Endowments Department,
Alanganallur Division, Vadipatti Taluk,
Madurai.

7. The Inspector of Police,
Alanganallur Police Station,
Vadipatti Taluk, Madurai District.

8. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Palamedu Police Station,
Vadipatti Taluk, Madurai District.

9. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY

W.P.Crl.(MD)Nos.113 & 136 of 2



S.SRIMATHY, J.

mkn

W.P.Crl.(MD)No.113 & 136 of 2026

12.01.2026