



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.8688 of 2026



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 01.04.2026

CORAM

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

W.P(MD)No.8688 of 2026

N.Anbalagan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Thoothukudi District.

2.The Assistant Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Thoothukudi District.

3.The Executive Officer(E.O)
Arulmigu Meenakshi Sundareswarar Temple,
Vilathikulam, Thoothukudi District.

4.A.Subbiramanian

5.M.R.Thangadurai

6.R.Narasimman

7.T.Selvaganesh

8.M.Ramachandiran

9.M.Krishnamurthy

10.R.Palpandian

11.S.Muthukumar

...Respondents

Writ Petition is filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India,
praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to dispose
of the petitioner's petition dated 12.03.2026 consequently, to initiate



appropriate action against the respondents 4 to 11 for producing forged documents and misleading the authority and obtain the order in their favour dated 09.07.2025 passed in O.A.NO.13/2024 on his file.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner

:Mr.G.Kartheeban

For R1 to R3

:Mr.J.K.Jayaseelan,
Government Advocate

For R4 to R7

:Mr.W.Dilipkumar

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for a mandamus directing the first respondent to dispose of the petitioner's representation dated 12.03.2026 and consequently to initiate appropriate action against the respondents 4 to 11 for producing forged documents and misleading the authority and obtaining an order in their favor on 09.07.2025 in O.A.No.13/2024.

2.Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material records of the case, the grievance of the petitioner is that an application in O.A.No.13 of 2024 was filed in the year 2020. One of the petitioner is B.Chella Perumal. According to the petitioner, the said Chella Perumal died in the year 2023 itself. After his death, by forging his signature, the above application in O.A.No.3 of 2024 was filed and orders were also passed. Therefore, the entire episode is an act of forgery and impersonation and therefore he has made the above representation and the first respondent has to take action in the manner known to law on the representation.



3. When the matter came up for hearing, the learned Additional Government Pleader taking notice on behalf of respondents 1 to 3 would submit that already draft scheme was published in the said O.A.No.13 of 2024 and the petitioner had also given his objections and only after considering his objections, a modified order is now passed on 03.01.2026. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the draft order or as the modified order as the case may be, it will be open for him to take such steps in the manner known to law. The final scheme is yet to be published.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents 4 to 11 would submit that the only 5 persons are needed to file the above application for framing the scheme. When the application was prepared, the same was done very early in the year 2023 itself. The signature that was made only belongs to the said Chella Perumal and no signature was forged. However, when after preparing the application, there was time lag between the preparing of the application and filing, the learned counsel, without verifying with the parties, had simply presented the same, which also contained the dead person's name. The same is only an innocuous mistake that was committed while filing and no signature was forged and there was also undue benefit is also taken on account of the same.



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

WEB COPY

6.In view of the assertion made on behalf of the respondents 4 to 11 that the signature was never forged, if the petitioner contends to the contrary, it is for the petitioner to approach the jurisdictional police with the prayer that the signature has been forged and also allege the further ingredients of the criminal offences upon which, after being satisfied about the prima facie Commission of the offenses, the jurisdictional police shall register a case and take action. With reference to the scheme or the modified scheme, appropriate remedy is available to the petitioner either to challenge the draft stage or to await the final scheme to be notified and challenge the same in the manner known to law by way of filing appropriate appeal under the HR&CE Act 1959. Therefore, keeping open the liberty of the petitioner to both approach the police and also to file such appeal as against the scheme framed, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

01.04.2026

NCC:Yes/No



To

- 1.The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Thoothukudi District.
- 2.The Assistant Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Thoothukudi District.
- 3.The Executive Officer(E.O)
Arulmigu Meenakshi Sundareswarar Temple,
Vilathikulam, Thoothukudi District.



WEB COPY

W.P(MD)No.8688 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

Ns

W.P(MD)No.8688 of 2026

01.04.2026