



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 27.01.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.23564 of 2022

and

W.M.P(MD)Nos.17632 & 17633 of 2022

Jegadesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs

1. The District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.

2. The Sub-Collector,
Paramakudi Revenue Division,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.

3. The Tahsildar,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.

4. Kajendran

...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records relating to the impugned Tender Notification published by the 2nd respondent in his proceedings dated 05.09.2022 in Na.Ka. No.E1/26189/2022 and in pursuant to the order passed by the 1st respondent in his proceedings in Na.Ka.E1/26189/2022 dated 06.10.2022 for cutting the Prosopis Juliflora Trees (Kattu Karuvella Trees) in Survey Nos. 45/2, 55, 56, 57, 58/1, 59 and 135/1B situated at Vathavaneri Village, Ramanathapuram District and quash the same.



For Petitioner : M/s.S.Ramasamy
For Respondents : M/s.M.Gangadharan
Government Advocate
for R1 to R3
No appearance for R4

ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed seeking to quash the tender notification issued on 05.09.2022 for cutting and removal of the karuveta trees.

2. According to the learned Counsel appearing for the writ petitioner, the petitioner has participated in an earlier tender notification and he was the successful bidder. He had also deposited a sum of Rs.1,81,000/- and Rs.14,480/- on 07.03.2017. However, cutting order was not issued in his favour.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner further submits that without issuing a cutting order in favour of the writ petitioner, a second tender notification has been issued, which is under challenge in the present writ petition.



4. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 to 3, submitted that the petitioner has not completed the work in time and therefore, a second tender notification was issued in favour of the 4th respondent who had completed the work. In such circumstances, he has received written instructions to the effect that the amount deposited by the petitioner could be refunded to him after getting approval from the Government.

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

6. Considering the fact that already karuvella trees have been cut and removed by the 4th respondent, the respondents 1 to 3 are directed to refund the amount collected from the writ petitioner within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. With the above said observations, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

27.01.2026

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
RJR



WEB COPY



R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

RJR

To

1. The District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.
2. The Sub-Collector,
Paramakudi Revenue Division,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Tahsildar,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.

W.P.(MD)No.23564 of 2022

27.01.2026