



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **08.04.2026**

CORAM:

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

AND

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

W.P.(MD)No.5788 of 2026

and

W.M.P(MD)No.4811 of 2026

M.Ravichandran

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector/
Regional Transport Officer,
Sivagangai District.

2.The Commissioner,
Sivangangai Municipality,
Sivagangai.

3.The Regional Director of
Municipal Administration (RDMA)
294, Melakkal Main Road,
Kochadai, Madurai-625 016.

4.The Deputy Director,
Department of Town and Country Planning,
Sivagangai Regiona,
District Collectorate Campus,
Sivagangai-630562.

...Respondents



WEB COPY

PRAYER:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 11.02.2026 in respect of the illegalities in the construction of 18 shops within Rani Ranga Nachiyar bus stand, Sivagangai District and to take appropriate action for the legal compliance for the construction of such public building / Bus Stand within a time framed fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner	: Mr.G.Prabhu Rajadurai for M/s.K.Swathini
For R1,R3 & R4	: Mr.J.Ashok Additional Government Pleader
For R2	: Mr.J.Lawrance Standing Counsel

ORDER

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

The petitioner has filed the present writ petition seeking a direction to the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 11.02.2026 with regard to the alleged illegalities in the construction of 18 shops within the Rani Ranga Nachiyar Bus Stand, Sivagangai District, and to take appropriate action to ensure legal compliance in the construction of such public building/bus stand within a time frame to be fixed by this Court.



WEB COPY

2. The main grievance of the writ petitioner is that, while developing the existing building, the authorities did not follow the mandatory provisions under Section 58 of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act. In this regard, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 11.02.2026. However, without taking any action on the said representation, the respondents proceeded to conduct an auction.

3. The second respondent has filed a counter affidavit stating that a requisition was sent to the first respondent on 23.09.2022 seeking allocation of funds for renovation of the bus stand. The first respondent, by proceedings dated 26.09.2022, forwarded the proposal to the Director of Municipal Administration, Chennai. Based on the said proposal, the Government sanctioned funds. Pursuant thereto, tenders were invited by the second respondent for various works, including construction of a cement concrete floor within the bus stand premises, demolition and removal of existing shops, and construction of new toilets and shops.

After completion of the construction, the respondent Municipality proposed to lease out the shops through a tender-cum-public auction, vide notice dated 26.02.2025. Subsequently, on 17.12.2025, a public



WEB COPY

auction-cum-tender notice was issued, but the auction could not be conducted. In the meantime, one Udhayakumar filed a writ petition in W.P.(MD) No.4973 of 2026 seeking a direction to conduct a public auction. Thereafter, the second respondent issued a fresh notification dated 19.02.2026 fixing the auction on 06.03.2026. Taking note of the same, the said writ petition was disposed of on 24.02.2026.

4. It is further stated that, prior to the filing of the present writ petition, the auction notification had already been issued and applications were received. However, due to administrative reasons, the tender process could not be finalised on 06.03.2026 and was postponed to 10.03.2026. It is also contended that since the work carried out is only renovation, undertaken with the approval of the first respondent, the requirement of permission under Section 58 of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act does not arise.

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

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is



a clear violation of statutory provisions and, therefore, the building should not be put to use.

7. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the second respondent submitted that the work undertaken is only renovation and that the construction has been carried out with the approval of the first respondent. It is further submitted that the public auction has already been conducted and the shops have been leased out to third parties.

8. Be that as it may, we are of the view that there is no mandatory requirement under Section 58 of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act in the present case. Therefore, the failure to inform the authorities about the renovation work cannot be a ground to stall the entire project. However, the second respondent is directed to approach the competent authority and seek ratification of the construction. The respondents shall also ensure compliance with the mandatory requirements under Rule 45 of the Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicles Rules. The respondents shall obtain the necessary approval/ratification within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



9. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

[N.S.K., J.] & [M.J.R., J.]
08.04.2026

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes
am

To

1. The District Collector/
Regional Transport Officer,
Sivagangai District.
2. The Commissioner,
Sivangangai Municipality,
Sivagangai.
3. The Regional Director of
Municipal Administration (RDMA)
294, Melakkal Main Road,
Kochadai, Madurai-625 016.
4. The Deputy Director,
Department of Town and Country Planning,
Sivagangai Regiona,
District Collectorate Campus,
Sivagangai-630562.



WEB COPY



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

am

W.P.(MD)No.5788 of 2026

08.04.2026