



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 15.04.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR**

**Writ Petition(MD)No.10735 of 2026**

**and**

**W.M.P(MD)No.8416 of 2026**

M.Muniyandi

.. Petitioner

Vs

1.The Commissioner,  
Madurai Corporation,  
Madurai.

2.The Inspector of Police,  
Tallakulam Police Station,  
Madurai City.

..Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned proceedings of the 1st respondent dated 08.04.2026 (Received on 09.04.2026) in A1/02483/2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st respondent to renew and extend the license of the petitioner as per the proceedings of the 1st respondent dated 26.02.2021 in MaVa2/029762/14 and pass such further or other orders as this Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

For Petitioner : Mr.Isaac Mohanlal  
Senior Counsel for  
Mr.J.Anandkumar

For Respondents : Mr.N.Dilipkumar  
Standing Counsel for R1  
Mr.M.Vaikkam Karunanithi  
Govt. Advocate (crl.side) for R2

### **ORDER**

The petitioner challenges the order dated 08.04.2026 passed by the first respondent, by which the petitioner's request for extension of licence to run the Corporation swimming pool was rejected.

2.The petitioner was originally granted a licence to operate the Corporation swimming pool for an initial period of three years, with a clause permitting renewal for a further period of up to nine years, subject to a 5% increase in the licence fee. The initial three-year licence period expired on 31.03.2025. However, by virtue of the interim orders passed by this Court, the petitioner was permitted to continue operating the swimming pool pending consideration of his request for extension of the licence period.

3.In the meantime, on 15.03.2026, an unfortunate incident occurred in which a young man named Karthik Raja drowned in the swimming pool. He was immediately taken to the Government Rajaji Hospital, where he was declared dead on arrival.



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

WEB COPY

4.Pursuant to the incident, the Commissioner of Police, Madurai issued a communication dated 19.03.2026 stating that an investigation had been conducted. The investigation revealed that two staff members, namely, Alaguraja and Ajithkumar, who had been specifically appointed to monitor the swimming pool and to take necessary action during emergencies, were present on duty at the relevant time. However, it was found that the said staff members were negligent in discharging their duties. They failed to provide the required life-saving equipment to the deceased, they were not properly trained in swimming, and their lack of prompt action was considered to be one of the contributing factors for the death of Karthik Raja.

5.The investigation also revealed that members of the public were allowed to use the swimming pool without proper supervision and that the CCTV cameras installed around the swimming pool had not been functioning properly for nearly one year.

6.Based on the communication received from the Commissioner of Police and the earlier show-cause notice dated 23.03.2026, the respondent Corporation issued proceedings dated 25.03.2026 refusing extension of the petitioner's licence. Since the said proceedings were issued without granting the petitioner an opportunity of personal hearing, this Court directed that the order be treated as a show-cause



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

notice and permitted the petitioner to submit his explanation. Accordingly, the petitioner submitted his reply and also appeared in person before the Commissioner of Madurai Corporation. After conducting the enquiry and considering the explanation submitted by the petitioner, the Commissioner passed the impugned order dated 08.04.2026 rejecting the request for extension of licence.

7.Mr.Isaac Mohanlal, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner, submitted that the impugned proceedings travelled beyond the scope of the original show-cause notice, which was confined only to the incident dated 15.03.2026. He further contended that the police investigation relating to the said incident was still pending and no final report had been filed fixing negligence upon the petitioner. Therefore, according to him, the petitioner was entitled to renewal of licence in terms of the licence conditions, which permitted renewal for a further period of nine years.

8.On the other hand, Mr.N.Dilipkumar, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the first respondent Corporation, submitted that under the Tamil Nadu Urban Local Bodies (Installation of Closed Circuit Television Units) in Public Buildings Rules, 2012, the petitioner was under a mandatory obligation to install and maintain functional CCTV cameras in public premises such as swimming pools.



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

He further submitted that during the enquiry, the petitioner himself admitted that although CCTV cameras had been installed, they were not functioning properly. It was also contended that the death of Karthik Raja was the direct result of negligence on the part of the petitioner and his staff, and therefore, the Corporation was fully justified in refusing extension of the licence.

9.This Court carefully considered the submissions made on both sides.

10.It is true that the licence agreement itself did not specifically contain a condition requiring installation of CCTV cameras. However, the Rules of 2012 clearly mandate installation and proper maintenance of CCTV cameras in public buildings, including swimming pools. Therefore, the petitioner was legally bound to comply with the same.

11.It is also not in dispute that the petitioner had installed CCTV cameras. However, by his own admission, the cameras were not functioning properly for a considerable period of time.

12.Further, the Commissioner of Police had communicated to the respondent Corporation that there was negligence on the part of the petitioner and his staff in relation to the incident dated



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

15.03.2026, particularly in failing to provide timely safety measures and emergency assistance to the deceased. The original licence granted to the petitioner had already expired. The petitioner was permitted to continue only because of the interim protection granted by this Court pending consideration of the request for renewal. The respondent Corporation, after taking into account the petitioner's violations, including non-functioning CCTV cameras and negligence connected with the drowning incident, decided not to extend the licence.

13.It is well settled that extension or renewal of licence is not an absolute right of the petitioner. Such renewal is always subject to the discretion of the competent authority, especially when serious issues of safety and negligence are involved. In any event, the petitioner had been allowed to continue operating the Corporation swimming pool only until a public auction was conducted for granting licence to a successful bidder.

14.In the light of the above facts and circumstances, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has not made out any prima facie case for grant of extension of licence. Accordingly, the impugned proceedings passed by the first respondent do not warrant any interference.



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

15. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to continue operating the Corporation swimming pool only till 25.04.2026. The petitioner shall hand over vacant possession of the swimming pool on or before 25.04.2026, failing which, the respondent Corporation shall be at liberty to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

16. Any observation made in this order is only for the purpose of deciding the present writ petition and shall not be construed as a finding establishing negligence on the part of the petitioner or his staff in connection with the unfortunate incident that occurred on 15.03.2026.

17. The police shall file the final report only on the basis of available material on record without being influenced by any observation made in this order. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

**15.04.2026**

NCC : Yes/No  
Index : Yes/No  
Internet: Yes  
skn



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

WEB COPY To

The Inspector of Police,  
Tallakulam Police Station,  
Madurai City.



WEB COPY



*W.P(MD)No.10735 of 2026*

**HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J.**

skn

**Writ Petition(MD)No.10735 of 2026  
and  
W.M.P(MD)No.8416 of 2026**

15.04.2026