



W.P(MD)No.5961 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 26.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR

W.P.(MD)No.5961 of 2026
and WMP(MD) Nos.4980, 4981& 4983 of 2026

S.Kayalvizhi

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Principal Secretary,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Chennai 600 009.

2. The Managing Director,
TAHDCO, Teynampet,
Chennai 18.

3. The Chief Engineer,
TAHDCO, Teynampet,
Chennai 18.

4. The Executive Engineer,
TAHDCO, Madurai District,
Madurai.

5. Anbu Devakumari,
Chief Engineer, TAHDCO,
Teynampet, Chennai 18.



W.P(MD)No.5961 of 2026

6. B.Natarajan,
Formerly Executive Engineer,
Madurai Division,
TAHDCO,
Presently Working
at TAHDCO, Coimbatore.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified mandamus calling for the records relating to the impugned cancellation order in letter No. 1600/2025/DB/dated 27.02.2026 issued by the 4th respondent and quash the same consequently direct the 4th respondent to execute the agreement pursuant to Work Orders Serial Nos.106 and 110 dated 12.11.2025.

For Petitioner	:Dr.S.Kayalvizhi (Party in Person)
For R1	:Mr.S.S.Madhavan Additional Government Pleader
For R2 to R4	:Mr.C.A.Ashok Kumar Standing Counsel

ORDER

The petitioner, a successful bidder, challenges the impugned order dated 27.02.2026 issued by the fourth respondent, whereby the work orders issued in favour of the petitioner were cancelled.



W.P(MD)No.5961 of 2026

WEB COPY

2. The respondent TAHDCO had floated a tender for construction of ADW Village Knowledge Centres at Natchukulam Village, T. Vadipatti Taluk, Madurai District, and at Vazhuthani in Sivagangai District. The petitioner participated in the tender process by submitting her bid. Upon evaluation of the technical and financial bids, the petitioner was declared the lowest bidder, and work orders were issued to her on 12.11.2025. As per the terms of the work orders, the petitioner was required to furnish a security deposit, provide details of the Technical Assistant and Electricity Licensee, and execute an agreement on a non-judicial stamp paper of Rs.100/-.

3. Subsequently, a show cause notice was issued by the fourth respondent alleging that the petitioner had forcibly obtained a withdrawal letter from another bidder, namely Marisamy, and had created a disturbance by questioning the authority of the Chief Engineer. The petitioner submitted her explanation denying the allegations. However, not being satisfied with the explanation, the fourth respondent passed the impugned order cancelling the work orders.



W.P(MD)No.5961 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. Dr. S. Kayalvizhi, the petitioner, who appeared in person, submitted that no complaint had been made by the said contractor, Marisamy, alleging any coercion. It is her contention that the allegations are baseless and made with an ulterior motive to deprive her of the work. She further submitted that she is fully qualified and ready to comply with all the conditions of the work order. Hence, the impugned order is arbitrary and liable to be set aside.

5. Per contra, Mr. C.A. Ashok Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for respondents 2 to 4, submitted that the petitioner had coerced the said contractor to withdraw his bid and had behaved in an inappropriate manner towards the officials. It is contended that the explanation offered by the petitioner was not satisfactory and, therefore, the cancellation of the work order is justified.

6. This Court has considered the submissions made on either side and perused the materials placed on record.

7. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was declared the successful bidder and that work orders were issued in her favour. It is also not the



W.P(MD)No.5961 of 2026

WEB COPY

case of the respondents that the petitioner failed to comply with the terms and conditions of the work order. The sole basis for cancellation is the allegation that the petitioner forcibly obtained a withdrawal letter from another bidder and created a disturbance.

8. However, it is seen that the said contractor, Marisamy, has not lodged any complaint against the petitioner. No material or documentary evidence has been placed on record to substantiate the allegations made against the petitioner.

9. It is well settled that once a work order is issued to a successful bidder, the same can be cancelled only on valid grounds, such as non-compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract. In the present case, there is no such allegation. On the contrary, the petitioner has expressed her willingness to comply with all the requirements and execute the agreement.

10. Therefore, the cancellation of the work order based solely on unsubstantiated allegations, without any supporting evidence, is arbitrary and cannot be sustained in law.



W.P(MD)No.5961 of 2026

WEB COPY

11. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 27.02.2026 issued by the fourth respondent is set aside. The fourth respondent is directed to permit the petitioner to carry out the work entrusted under the work orders, subject to the petitioner complying with all requisite formalities and executing the necessary agreement within a period of one (1) week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Index :Yes / No

26.03.2026

Internet :Yes / No

NCC :Yes / No

PNM

To

1. The Principal Secretary,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Chennai 600 009.

2. The Managing Director,
TAHDCO, Teynampet,
Chennai 18.

3. The Chief Engineer,
TAHDCO, Teynampet,
Chennai 18.

4. The Executive Engineer,
TAHDCO, Madurai District,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.5961 of 2026

HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J.

PNM

ORDER IN
W.P.(MD)No.5961 of 2026
and WMP(MD) Nos.4980, 4981& 4983 of 2026

26.03.2026