BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE KRISHNAN RAMASAMY

W.P.(MD)No.3751 of 2026
& W.M.P(MD)No.3066 of 2026

K.R.Periyakaruppan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department
Chennai.

2. The Joint Commissioner
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department
Thanjavur.

3. The Assistant Commissioner
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department
Pudukkottai.

... Respondents

Prayer:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, to directing the respondents to constitute thirupani Committee to renovate the temple of Arumigu Sree Kannudaiyar Ayyanar Temple Situate at pudunilaipatti village, Thirumayam Taluk, Pudukottai district and consequently direct the respondent to receive contribution from the villagers towards the removation and kumbavisegam of the said temple by recalling order dated 27.01.2026 made in na.Ka.No.3411/2025/E1 by considering petitioner representation dated 31.01.2026.

For Petitioner	: Mr.K.Balasundaram, Sr.counsel for M/s.KBS Law Office
For Respondent	: Mr.Veerakathiravan, AAG Asst. by Mr.K.Balasubramani, SGP

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed to direct the respondents to constitute "Thirupani Committee" to renovate the subject temple and consequently, direct the respondents to receive contribution from the villagers towards the renovation and kumbavisegam of the said temple by recalling order dated 27.01.2026.

2. The learned Senior counsel for the petitioner would submit that in this case, initially, the petitioner had filed a writ petition in WP(MD)No.36641 of 2025, seeking for a direction to dispose the representation dated 25.11.2025, which was filed for formation of "Thirupani Committee". The said writ petition was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 02.01.2026, whereby, the 3rd respondent was

directed to dispose of the aforesaid representation dated 25.11.2025 within a period of 4 weeks. Pursuant to the same, the 3rd respondent had passed the order dated 27.01.2026, whereby, he rejected the representation filed by the petitioner for formation of "Thirupani Committee".

3. Now, by referring the order dated 27.01.2026 passed by the 3rd respondent, the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner would submit that as per Rule 53 of the Administration and Protection of Temple Property Rules (hereinafter called as "the Rules"), if any donation is collected for the purpose of renovation or Kumbavisegam of the Temple, it is mandatory on the part of the incumbent to form "Thirupani Committee". However, without doing so, the respondents are directly collecting the donations, which is contrary to the said Rule 53 of the Act. Hence, this petition.

4. In reply, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents had strongly opposed the submissions made by the petitioner and would submit that as per Rule 53 of the Rules, it is

mandatory to form a “Thirupani Committee” only if there is any requirement for donation for the purpose of conducting Kumbavisegam of the Temple. However, in this case, the Kumbavisegam of the subject Temple is going to be conducted out of the Temple funds and not from donations. Hence, the question of formation of “Thirupani Committee” will not at all arise in the present case. He would also submit that if the petitioner is intend to contribute any amount, he is very much welcome to do so and the said amount will be kept in a General Account of the Temple.

5. Further, he pointed out that there is some infighting among the villagers and hence, if the donation is received for Kumbavisegam, a Committee has to be formed, for which all the people will ask for membership and the same would ultimately lead to further infighting. Therefore, in order to provide sufficient protection and to conduct the Kumbavisegam in a peaceful manner, the respondents had rejected the request for formation of committee and decided to utilise the funds available with the Temple for conducting Kumbavisegam. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of this petition.

6. Heard the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents and also perused the entire materials available on record.

7. In the case on hand, upon perusal of the records, it appears that this Court, vide order dated 02.01.2026, had directed the 3rd respondent to consider the petitioner's representation, which was filed for formation of "Thirupani Committee".

8. Pursuant to the same, the respondents had passed the order dated 27.01.2026, whereby, they rejected the said representation of the petitioner by citing the reason that in terms of Rule 53 of the Act, it is mandatory to form a Committee only if any donation is required/collected for the purpose of conducting Kumbavisegam. However, in this case, the respondents are going to conduct the Kumbavisegam only out of the funds available with the Temple and not from donations. Hence, there is no requirement to form any committee.

9. Further, it was pointed out by the respondents that there is infighting among the Villagers and a group of people staged road roko during an earlier occasion. Therefore, in order to control them and provide protection to the general public, 500 police were deployed at that time. By taking into consideration of all these aspects only, now, the respondents is not inclined to form any committee and accordingly, rejected the petitioner's representation vide order dated 27.01.2026.

10. As rightly contended by the respondents, once the Committee is formed, all the people will make attempts to participate in that committee, which leads to further infighting. In the result, the respondents will not be able to conduct Kumbavisegam in a peaceful manner. Therefore, the respondent had rightly arrived at a decision to conduct Kumbavisegam out of the funds available with the Temple, for which, it is not mandatory to form a Committee as per Rule 53 of the Rules.

11. In view of the above, it is clear that the respondents had rejected the request made by the petitioner, vide order dated 27.01.2026,

only in order to protect the interest of the Temple and safeguard the general public. In such case, there is no fault on the part of the respondent in the decision making process and hence, the order passed by the respondent needs no interference of this Court.

12. Therefore, this Court is inclined to dismiss the present petition as devoid of merits. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner is intend to make any contributions/donation to the temple, they can very well do so.

13. At this juncture, the learned Senior counsel for the petitioner had expressed his apprehension with the respondents in providing permission to the petitioner and his people to worship the temple.

14. In reply, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents would fairly submit that the question of providing permission to the petitioner and his people will not come into picture unless and otherwise there is any problem or infight among them.

15. Hence, it is made clear that if any group made an attempt to create any problem or infight, they shall not be allowed to enter the temple and necessary police complaint shall be lodged against them by the respondents.

16. In the result, this writ petition is dismissed. No cost. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

11.02.2026

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

To

1. The Commissioner
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department
Chennai.

2. The Joint Commissioner
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department
Thanjavur.

3. The Assistant Commissioner
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department
Pudukkottai.

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY.J.,

nsa

W.P.(MD)No.3751 of 2026
& W.M.P(MD)No.3066 of 2026

11.02.2026