



W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 27.04.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

Jayaraman

... Petitioner

vs.

1.The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests,
(Head of Forest Force)
Forest Headquarters Building,
Near Kannikapuram Check Post,
Velacherry Main Road,
Guindy,
Chennai - 600 032.

2.The District Forest Officer,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

3.The Forest Range Officer,
Sholavanthan Forest Range,
T.Aundipatti,
Madurai.

... Respondents



W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

WEB COPY

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to refund a sum of Rs.5,58,114/- (Rupees Five Lakhs Fifty Eight Thousand One Hundred and Fourteen only), together with applicable interest, towards the unremoved quantity of 146 MT of Babul trees in respect of the 1983 Vadakarai Bit-III Plantation in Sholavandan Range, Madurai Division.

For Petitioner : Mr.Shri Abdul Saleem
Senior Counsel
for Mr.V.Sukumar

For Respondents : Mr.N.Ramesh Arumugam
Government Advocate

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed seeking a direction to refund a sum of Rs.5,58,114/- together with applicable interest towards the unremoved quantity of 146 metric tons of Babul trees in respect of the 1983 Vadakarai Bit-III Plantation in Sholavandan Range, Madurai Division.

2.Upon hearing the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf the petitioner and perusing the material records of the case, the grievance of



W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

WEB COPY

the petitioner is that he was originally the successful bidder for removal of the prescribed quantity of Babul trees from the water body mentioned above. However, initially on account of the Covid-19 pandemic and thereafter on account of the tank remaining brimming with water at all times, the petitioner could not carry out the task. Within the limited period available, the petitioner could remove only a portion of the quantity. Therefore, when the petitioner sought for an extension of time, though it was initially granted on deposit of 10%, further extension was ultimately refused.

3.The petitioner approached this Court by way of Writ Petitions in W.P(MD)Nos.21608 and 21609 of 2025 and by a common order dated 08.08.2025, the Writ Petitions were dismissed. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner preferred W.A(MD)Nos.2670 and 2671 of 2025. By order dated 16.09.2025, while permitting the petitioner to withdraw the Writ Appeals, liberty was granted to the petitioner to seek refund of the amount. It was further observed that based on the representation made, the petitioner would be at liberty to seek refund of the security deposit made by him and any such



W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

WEB COPY

request, if and when made, shall be disposed of by the authority in accordance with the prevailing guidelines.

4.Pursuant thereto, the petitioner made a detailed representation dated 08.01.2026. The same has not been disposed of and the amount has not been refunded. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court.

5.In reply thereof, the learned Special Government Pleader, taking notice on behalf of the respondents, would submit that while the petitioner is claiming all amounts before this Court, even before the Division Bench the relief sought was only with reference to the refund of the security deposit amount. In any event, the Division Bench has only directed the authorities to consider the request in accordance with the rules. The authorities will consider the request and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.



W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

WEB COPY

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

7.The rights inter parties have already been decided by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, as stated supra. Therefore, when liberty was granted to the petitioner to make a representation and the authorities were directed to consider the request in accordance with the applicable guidelines, the same is to be duly considered. Since the petitioner has made such a representation, orders have to be passed by the authority. The learned Senior Counsel also seeks an opportunity for a personal hearing.

8.In view thereof, this Writ Petition is disposed of on the following terms:

- i. The representation of the petitioner dated 08.01.2026 shall be taken up for consideration by the second respondent.
- ii. An opportunity of hearing shall be afforded to the petitioner.



W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

WEB COPY iii. Orders, as directed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, shall be passed in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and, in any event, not later than two months from the date of receipt of a web copy of this order.

No costs.

27.04.2026

NCC : Yes / No

ps



W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

WEB COPY

To

1.The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests,
(Head of Forest Force)
Forest Headquarters Building,
Near Kannikapuram Check Post,
Velacherry Main Road,
Guindy,
Chennai - 600 032.

2.The District Forest Officer,
Madurai District,
Madurai.

3.The Forest Range Officer,
Sholavanthan Forest Range,
T.Aundipatti,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

ps

W.P(MD)No.12380 of 2026

27.04.2026