



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.6063 of 2



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 06.03.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE D.BHARATHA
CHAKRAVARTHY**

**W.P(MD)No.6063 of 2026
and
W.M.P(MD)No.5095 of 2026**

Thiruvavadudurai Adhinam,
Rep.by South Zone Manager,
G.Ramachandran

... Petitioner

Vs.

The District Forest Officer,
Tenkasi Division,
Kaalaankarai, Senkottai,
Tenkasi District-627 809.

...Respondent

Writ Petition is filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned notice in Na.Ka.No.Va2/4458/2024, dated 11.02.2026 issued by the respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent not to interfere into administration of the petitioner's Mutt's lands in Patta 1, situated at Mekkarai Village, Sengkottai Taluk, Tenkasi District without due process of law.

For Petitioner
For Respondent

:Mr.M.Ramu
:Mr.M.Lingadurai
Special Government Pleader

**ORDER**

The writ petition is filed, challenging the impugned order dated 11.02.2026.

2. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material records of the case, it can be seen that the impugned notice states that the petitioner has to produce the five documents mentioned therein and it further states that, in spite of earlier direction issued by this Court to produce the said document, the petitioner is not producing the same and the petitioner is violating the order. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner is before this Court.

3. The factual basis on which the impugned order came to be passed is that there is a reserved forest, namely Puliyarai Reserve Forest extending to the Mekkarai village also. It is contended by the Forest Department that there is a superstructure and building wherein a the Resort is conducted in the name style of Mohan Resorts, Karikalam. The same is only 60 meter from the reserve forest boundary. The inmates staying in the said resort are indulging in Camp fire, use of loudspeaker in the night, singing and dancing etc., The pictures of the wildlife, including tigers, elephants, in the vicinity



are also produced. In the said circumstances all that, the Forest Department wants to verify that whether or not such a resort is put up after due permission of the local authorities and whether it is in accordance with the law as at any moment, a human animal conflict is likely.

4. Secondly, the nocturnal environment in the area cannot be disturbed. With that object in mind, when they issued an earlier notice, the petitioner challenged the same before this court by way of writ petition in W.P(MD)No.24971 of 2025.

5. The contention of the petitioner was that the language of the notice itself was defamatory and was unnecessarily issued to the petitioner, which is Adhinam holding pious position in the society. The court also noted that the language could have been different, at the same time also recognized the purpose with which the notice is issued and passed the following order and it is essential to extract para 7 of the said order, which is as under:-

“7. The language of the communication could have been better and more appropriately worded. The learned counsel for the petitioner is right in expressing his anguish. Be that as it may, only to facilitate the Forest Department to take effective action for protection of wild life as well as the forest area, certain details have been sought from the petitioner. The petitioner need not part with the original



WEB COPY



documents. He can assist the respondent by furnishing the photo copies of the documents that have been sought from him. I do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned communication.”

6. It is now stated in the present impugned order that even after the same, the documents are not furnished and therefore, the present notice is issued. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner when they issued a reply they had attached the documents which are necessary, therefore, no further documents need be asked from the petitioner.

7. Per Contra, the learned Special Government Pleader would submit that the relevant particulars, including the ownership, the permissions that are granted by the local authority have to be verified by the forest department in order to come to any conclusion, so as to take any further action or even to request the appropriate other departments to take action.

8. I have considered the rival submissions made on either and perused the material records of the case.

9. The parties are bound by the earlier order which is extracted supra. Therefore, it was expected of the petitioner to furnish photocopies of the



documents. It is the contention of the petitioner that some of the documents have already been annexed along with their reply also. Be that as it may, five specific documents are now mentioned in the impugned notice. The petitioner shall, in respect of each item, furnish photocopies of the documents, if available, by mentioning the item number and describing the document. In respect of any entry for which the petitioner does not have the document, the petitioner may state that no such document as requested is available. Upon such furnishing of documents, the same may be looked into by the respondent authority. This writ petition is disposed of in the following terms:-

(i) Within two weeks from the date of receipt of the web copy of the order, the petitioner shall give item wise reply for the five documents mentioned in the impugned notice. Wherever the documents are available, the photocopies of the same shall be enclosed. Wherever the documents are not available, the reason shall be specifically stated as to the documents are not available. The respondents shall consider the same and pass orders in accordance with law.

(ii) Needless to mention that the documents in respect of



the survey number where the resort building in question alone be circulated and not in respect of the entire land holding of the petitioner Adhinam.

(iii) As a matter of fact, the survey numbers are already mentioned in the impugned notice with reference to the survey number of the building. In respect of the doubt entertained regarding the entire holding/common land, it would be open for the District Forest Officer to write to the District Collector, and the departments can conduct a joint enquiry.

10. With the above directions, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

06.03.2026

NCC:Yes/No
am



W.P(MD)No.6063 of 2



To

The District Forest Officer,
Tenkasi Division,
Kaalaankarai, Senkottai,
Tenkasi District-627 809.



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.6063 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

am

W.P(MD)No.6063 of 2026

06.03.2026