



WP(MD). Nos.31956 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : **24.02.2026**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **KRISHNAN RAMASAMY**

WP(MD).No.31956 of 2025
and W.M.P.(MD)Nos.25142 & 25143 of 2025

Aulmigu Ayyanar Pidari Temple,
Malvai Village,
Lalkudi Taluk,
Trichy District,
Rep. By its Hereditary Trustee,
K.Baskaran,
S/o.Karuppu Udayar.

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Joint Commissioner,
HR and CE Department,
Tiruchirappallai.
2. The Assistant Commissioner,
HR and CE Department,
Perambalur.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Lalgudi,
Trichy District.
4. C.Dhanapal
5. C.Suresh



WP(MD). Nos.31956 of 2025

6. A.Soundarapandian

7. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Lalgudi,
Trichy District.

8. Arumigu Ayyanar (Boomibalagan) Pidari,
Karuppanna Swamy Temples,
Malvai represented by its Executive Officer,
Office at:
Arulmighu Sutharathineshwarar Temple,
Oottathur, Lalgudi,
Trichy District.
(R8 is impleaded vide order of this Court
dated 24.02.2026 in W.M.P.(MD)No.3501/2026)

... Respondents

PRAYER :-

Writ Petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the proceedings of the 3rd respondent made in Na.Ka.No.A1/3501/2025 dated 24.09.2025 and consequential proceedings of 2nd respondent made in Na.Ka.No.4086-2/2022, A4 dated 24.09.2025 and quash the same and consequently permit the petitioner to do the Poosari work at Temple.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Murali

For Respondents : Mr.K.Balasubramani,
Spl. Govt. Pleader for R1 to R3
Mr.R.G.Shankar Ganesh for R4
No Appearance for R5
Mr.T.Leninkumar for R6



WP(MD). Nos.31956 of 2025

Mr.A.Albert James,
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side) for R7
Mr.Ramesh Mahadev for R8

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the proceedings of the 3rd respondent made in Na.Ka.No.A1/3501/2025 dated 24.09.2025 and also the consequential proceedings of 2nd respondent made in Na.Ka.No.4086-2/2022, A4 dated 24.09.2025 and further seeking for a consequential direction to permit the petitioner to do the Poosari work at Temple.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the 3rd respondent, viz., the Revenue Divisional Officer, has no power to conduct a peace committee meeting and make a recommendation to the 2nd respondent viz., the Assistant Commissioner of the HR & CE Department for the appointment of a Poosari. However, the 2nd respondent, based on the proceedings of the 3rd respondent, appointed a third party as the Poosari of the temple by proceedings dated



WP(MD). Nos.31956 of 2025

24.09.2025. According to the petitioner, the said appointment is contrary to the scheme framed by the Civil Court in O.S. No. 471 of 1986, dated 27.07.1999. In the said scheme, it is stated that a person belonging to the Udayar community is to be appointed as the Poosari. However, through the impugned order, the 2nd respondent appointed a person belonging to another community as the Poosari of the temple. Hence, he prays for setting aside the impugned orders and for the issuance of an appropriate direction to appoint the petitioner as Poosari in terms of the judgment and decree passed by the civil Court in O.S. No. 471 of 1986, dated 27.07.1999.

3. This Court heard the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

4. Considering the submissions made by both sides, this Court is of the view that even assuming that the Revenue Divisional Officer (RDO), in order to resolve the dispute, conducted a peace committee meeting and made a recommendation for the appointment of a Poosari, the Assistant Commissioner ought to have followed the scheme



WP(MD). Nos.31956 of 2025

framed by the civil Court in O.S. No. 471 of 1986, dated 27.07.1999 and appointed a Poosari from the Udayar community. However, in the present case, a person belonging to a different community has been appointed. Therefore, the said appointment is contrary to the scheme framed by the Civil Court. Hence, the impugned orders are liable to be set aside.

5. Accordingly, the impugned orders are set aside and the matter is remanded to the 2nd respondent for fresh consideration. The 2nd respondent is directed to appoint a Poosari strictly in accordance with the scheme framed by the Civil Court in O.S. No. 471 of 1986, dated 27.07.1999 within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. With the above observations, this writ petition is allowed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are also closed.

vsm
Index : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No

24.02.2026



WEB COPY



WP(MD). Nos.31956 of 2025

KRISHNAN RAMASAMY, J.

vsm

TO

1. The Joint Commissioner,
HR and CE Department,
Tiruchirappallai.
2. The Assistant Commissioner,
HR and CE Department,
Perambalur.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Lalgudi,
Trichy District.
4. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Lalgudi,
Trichy District.

WP(MD) No.31956 of 2025

Date : 24.02.2026