



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **10.04.2026**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR**

AND

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN**

W.P.(MD)No.3807 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD)No.3441 of 2026

R.Panneerselvam

... Petitioner

/Vs./

1.The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Usilamapatti,
Madurai District.

3.The Tahsildar,
Peraiyur,
Madurai District.

4.I.Jeyachandran

... Respondents

PRAYER:- Writ Petition - filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 2 and 3 to execute the order passed by the first respondent vide Na.Ka.No. 1558/Kanimam/2025 dated 05.11.2025 and to take appropriate action based on the petitioner's representation dated 14.10.2025 and

1/5



consequently directing the respondents to cancel the stone quarry license of fourth respondent in Survey No.19/1 and 19/2 for an extent of 2.53.0 hectares situated at Perungamanallur Village Peraiyur Taluk, Madurai District.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Karthikeya Venkitachalapathy
For Respondents : Mr.S.P.Maharajan (R1 to R3)
Special Government Pleader
Mr.T.Palanichamy (R4)

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.**)

The petitioner seeks a direction to implement the proceedings of the first respondent dated 05.11.2025.

2.The contention of the petitioner is that the fourth respondent is operating a stone quarry in the subject property, which is classified as Panjami land. He has purchased the said property unlawfully and obtained the requisite licence without following the due process of law.

3.The learned counsel for the fourth respondent submits that the petitioner is none other than the brother-in-law of the fourth



WEB COPY

respondent. Due to some dispute between the family members, the present writ petition has been filed.

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

5. In this writ petition, the petitioner seeks to execute the internal communication given by the District Collector. We are surprised as to how this internal communication came into the hands of the petitioner.

6. It is also to be noted that earlier similar application has been given to the Collector, who in turn has forwarded the same to the Taluk Level Committee for appropriate consideration. Now it is for the Taluk Level Committee to look into the matter, before whom it is pending. In such circumstances, this Court is of the view that the petitioner cannot, as a matter of right, seek a direction under the guise of public interest litigation. On the contrary, it appears that the writ petition is motivated more by private interest than by any genuine public interest.



WEB COPY

7.Hence, we are not inclined to entertain this writ petition.

Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

[N.S.K., J.] & [M.J.R., J.]
10.04.2026

Index :Yes/No
Internet :Yes
ta

To

- 1.The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Madurai.
- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Usilamapatti,
Madurai District.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Peraiyur,
Madurai District.



WEB COPY



**N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.
AND
M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.**

ta

W.P.(MD)No.3807 of 2026

10.04.2026