



W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 23-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

and

W.M.P(MD).No.6166 of 2026

Pitchai Velu

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department,
Muthuchamy Nagar,
Sivagangai Town and Taluk,
Sivagangai District - 630 561.
2. The Assistant Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department,
Sivagangai District.
3. The Inspector,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department,
Sivagangai District.
4. S.Narayanan
(R4 is suo motu impleaded vide order dated 23.03.2026
in W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026 by DBCJ.) ... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to carry out the necessary repair and restoration works in respect of the damaged epigraph and inscriptions relating to Thandi



W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

Thevars family inside the premises of Arulmighu Thondeeswaran Ayyanar Kovil, situated at Keelarangiyam Village, Tiruppuvanam Taluk, Sivagangai District, on the basis of the petitioners representation dated 23.02.2026 within such time as may be stipulated by this Honble Court and pass such other or further orders as this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of this case and thus render justice.

For Petitioner	: Mr.V.Malaiyendran
For R1 to R3	: Mr.J.K.Jayaselan Government Advocate
For R4	: Mr.V.R.Shanmuganathan

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed for a Mandamus to carry out the necessary repair and restoration works in respect of the damaged epigraph and inscriptions relating to Thandi Thevars Family inside the premises of Arulmighu Thondeeswaran Ayyanar Kovil at Keelarangiyam Village, Thiruppuvanam Taluk, Sivagangai District on the basis of the petitioners' representation dated 23.02.2026.

2. Heard Mr.V.Malaiyendran, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Mr.J.K.Jayaselan, learned Government Advocate, who takes notice on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3 and Mr.V.R.Shanmuganathan, learned counsel who takes notice for R4.



W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

3. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the representation submitted by him dated 23.02.2026, it can be seen that the temple in question or parts thereof was originally built by Thandi Thevar. An epigraph made of stone was said to have existed within the temple premises. The same is now stated to be damaged and therefore, the petitioner has made the above representation seeking permission to repair and reinstall it, properly depicting the name of the person who built the temple or parts thereof.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner also relies upon information furnished to the petitioner under the Right to Information Act, dated 29.12.2025, in response to a query as to who built the Arulmigu Thondeeswaran Ayyanar Kovil. It is stated therein that Mr. Thandi Thevar had constructed the Mandaba Kovil, while other persons had constructed the remaining portions. Detailed particulars have been provided.

5. By drawing the attention of this Court to page 14 of the typed set of papers, wherein the epigraph made on a granite stone is seen depicting the name of the said person, the learned counsel would submit



W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

that the family members are further aggrieved by the fact that the same has now been damaged. Therefore, the present writ petition has been filed.

6. When the matter was taken up for hearing today, the learned Government Advocate appearing on behalf of respondents 1 to 3 would submit that the petitioner's request had already been considered by the Assistant Commissioner, the 2nd respondent herein and was rejected by an order dated 13.03.2026. It is further submitted that a general circular has also been issued and the order clearly states that the petitioner's request cannot be granted.

7. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 4th respondent would submit that the temple in question is a common temple belonging to four villages. The petitioner's claim proceeds as though Thandi Thevar alone had constructed the temple and that it belongs to a particular village. It is further submitted that earlier disputes between the parties led to the filing of a suit in O.S. No. 166 of 1992 before the learned District Munsif, Manamadurai, and by a judgment dated 25.07.1995, a categorical finding was rendered that there was no proof that the temple



W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

had been constructed by Thandi Thevar in the year 1963. The appeal suit filed by the aggrieved parties was also dismissed and the said judgment and decree attained finality.

8. Thereafter, when a granite stone inscription was placed within the temple precincts, a writ petition in W.P.(MD).No.9944 of 2013 was filed. After considering the findings of the Civil Court, this Court directed the respondents to pass appropriate orders regarding removal of the inscription after hearing both sides. Pursuant thereto, an enquiry was conducted and the inscription was removed. Therefore, there is no question of reinstalling the same.

9. In reply, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that no proper order had been passed for removal of the inscription. It is contended that certain existing trustees had mischievously removed the same, and a criminal case has been registered in Cr.No.70 of 2019, which is presently pending trial and has been taken on file as P.R.C.No.50 of 2019. It is further submitted that if the removal was carried out without proper authority, the persons responsible are liable to be prosecuted.



W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

WEB COPY

10. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the material records of the case.

11. It is true that, in earlier times, many individuals contributed their personal wealth towards the construction of temples. However, this does not necessarily mean that in every case there must be an epigraph or granite inscription depicting the names of each and every contributor, particularly when the matter itself is under dispute.

12. In the present case, it is seen that the petitioner's request has already been rejected by the authorities. Further, it is evident that the inscription was not removed on account of damage but pursuant to an enquiry conducted in compliance with the directions issued by this Court in the earlier writ petition. The findings of the Civil Court also operate against the petitioner's claim, and there is no satisfactory proof to substantiate the same.



W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

WEB COPY

13. For all the above reasons, the prayer sought by the petitioner cannot be countenanced.

14. The writ petition stands disposed of with the above observations. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

23.03.2026
(2/2)

Index: Yes
Speaking Order: Yes
Neutral Citation: No
rgm



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

rgm

To

1. The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department,
Muthuchamy Nagar,
Sivagangai Town and Taluk,
Sivagangai District - 630 561.
2. The Assistant Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department,
Sivagangai District.
3. The Inspector,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Department,
Sivagangai District.

W.P.(MD).No.7534 of 2026
and
W.M.P(MD).No.6166 of 2026

23.03.2026
(2/2)