



W.A.(MD)No.519 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 17.06.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN


W.A.(MD)No.519 of 2026
and C.M.P.(MD)No.4720 of 2026

Marimuthu

...Appellant

Vs.

1. T.S.A.Subramanian
2. The Superintendent of Police,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Sankarankovil Town Police Station,
Sankarankovil, Tenkasi District.
4. The Deputy Inspector General of
Registration, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
5. The District Registrar,
Registration Department,
Railway Feeder Road, Tenkasi District.
6. Sengunthar Abiviruthi Sangam,
Bearing Registration Number, 1/1979,
Represented by its President,
Mr.P.G.P. Ramanathan,



W.A.(MD)No.519 of 2026

WEB COPY

Sankar Nagar, 2nd Street,
Sankarankovil, Tenkasi District.

....Respondents

PRAYER:- Writ Appeal – filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, against the order passed by this Court in W.P.Crl(MD)No.640 of 2026, dated 18.03.2026.

For Appellant : Mr.G.Prabhu Rajadurai
for Mr.S.Selva Aditya

For Respondents : Mr.R.J.Karthick for R1
Mr.I.Murugesan,
Govt. Advocate (Crl.side) for R2 & R3
Mr.M.S.Parthiban,
Counsel for State for R4 & R5

JUDGMENT

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

This Writ Appeal has been filed challenging the order of the learned Single Judge directing that the General Body Meeting be conducted in the presence of the Advocate Commissioner and further directing the parties to bear the Advocate Commissioner's remuneration equally, in the ratio of 50% each



W.A.(MD)No.519 of 2026

WEB COPY

2. We have heard the submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.

3. On a perusal of the records, we find that a common order has been passed in both the Writ Petition and the Contempt Petition. The contemnor, namely the appellant, also appeared before the learned Single Judge, agreed to convene a General Body Meeting, and expressed no difficulty in doing so.

4. Now, the contention of the learned counsel appearing for the appellant is that their only grievance is that they may not be in a position to bear 50% of the expenses towards the remuneration payable to the Advocate Commissioner.

5. We are of the considered view that, having consented before the learned Single Judge, the appellant cannot now be permitted to resile from such consent and challenge the order on the ground that he is not liable to bear the expenses. We, therefore, find no merit in the Writ Appeal and the same is liable to be dismissed.



W.A.(MD)No.519 of 2026

6. Accordingly, this Writ Appeal is dismissed. It is made clear

that the appointment of an Advocate Commissioner and the grant of police protection in the present case shall not be treated as a precedent.

The General Body Meeting and all future elections shall be conducted strictly in accordance with the relevant Rules and the bye-laws governing the association. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

[N.S.K., J.] & [M.J.R., J.]
17.06.2026

Index : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No
vsm



W.A.(MD)No.519 of 2026

WEB COPY

To

1. The Superintendent of Police,
Tenkasi,
Tenkasi District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Sankarankovil Town Police Station,
Sankarankovil, Tenkasi District.
3. The Deputy Inspector General of
Registration, Palayamkottai,
Tirunelveli District.
4. The District Registrar,
Registration Department,
Railway Feeder Road, Tenkasi District.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)No.519 of 2026

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

vsm

W.A.(MD)No.519 of 2026

17.06.2026