



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated: 16.06.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

Arumugam

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner,
TN HR and CE Department,
Nungampakkam,
Chennai.

2. The Joint Commissioner/Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Aranganathaswamy Thirukovil,
Srirangam,
Tiruchirappalli.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this court to issue a Writ of Mandamus by directing the 2nd respondent to conclude the investigation by considering the petitioners representation dated 26.05.2026 within the time stipulation as prescribed by this Honble Court and pass such further or other orders as this Honble court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of this case and thus render justice.

.



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

WEB COPY

For Petitioner	: Mr.R.L.Dhilipan Pandian
For R1	: Mr.S.Vashik Ali Government Standing Counsel
For R2	: Mr.M.Saravanan Standing Counsel

ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed for the following relief:-

“Writ Petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this court to issue a Writ of Mandamus by directing the 2nd respondent to conclude the investigation by considering the petitioners representation dated 26.05.2026 within the time stipulation as prescribed by this Honble Court and pass such further or other orders as this Honble court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of this case and thus render justice.”

2. Heard Mr.R.Dhilipan Pandian, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Mr.S.Vashik Ali, learned Government Standing Counsel, who takes notice on behalf of the 1st respondent and Mr.M.Saravanan, learned Standing Counsel, who takes notice on behalf of the 2nd respondent.



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

WEB COPY

3.The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has made a representation dated 26.05.2026, bringing to the notice of the temple that the property in question belongs to the temple. He would further submit that the petitioner is willing to continue as a tenant under the temple and is ready to pay rent to the temple. Therefore, the petitioner seeks a direction to the temple to consider his representation and take appropriate action in accordance with law.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would further submit that the petitioner had earlier submitted a similar representation and, although proceedings were initiated thereon, the same have not been concluded. Aggrieved by the inaction, the petitioner is before this Court.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

WEB COPY

6. Upon consideration of the records, it is seen that the petitioner himself has enclosed the relevant documents pertaining to the dispute. The petitioner's landlord, namely, Thavasumani, had initiated R.C.O.P. No.79 of 1999 on the file of the Principal District Munsif, Tiruchirappalli, seeking eviction of the petitioner.

7. The said R.C.O.P., however, came to be dismissed on 31.07.2006. Thereafter, the landlord preferred an appeal in R.C.A. No.3 of 2007, which is stated to have attained finality on 21.03.2012. An execution petition is also stated to be pending. It is at this stage that the petitioner seeks to alter his stand.

8. As far as the petitioner is concerned, although he has made a passing reference to the temple's claim, his primary contention appears to be that his mother-in-law was inducted as a tenant only in respect of the land and not the superstructure, and therefore, the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act are not applicable.



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

WEB COPY

9. In the considered view of this Court, the present prayer appears to have been made only with a view to avoid eviction proceedings being pursued in accordance with law. Such a prayer cannot be entertained at the instance of the petitioner.

10. This Court is not adjudicating upon the rights of the temple. If the temple has any claim in respect of the subject property, it is always open to the temple to take appropriate steps in the manner known to law. Equally, it is for the landlord to defend any such proceedings in accordance with law. The relief sought cannot be granted at the instance of the petitioner, who is admittedly only a tenant under the landlord.

11. Further, the judgment rendered inter-partes in the aforesaid rent control proceedings is binding on the petitioner and recognizes the said third party as the landlord in relation to the tenancy.



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

WEB COPY

12. In view of the above, finding no merit in the writ petition, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

16.06.2026

Neutral Citation: No
rgm



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

To

1. The Commissioner,
TN HR and CE Department,
Nungampakkam,
Chennai.
2. The Joint Commissioner/Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Aranganathaswamy Thirukovil,
Srirangam,
Tiruchirappalli.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

rgm

W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.16349 of 2026

16.06.2026