



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 23.03.2026

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P(MD)No.33287 of 2025

and

W.M.P(MD)Nos.26269 and 26270 of 2025

Nayagam

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai.

2.The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Thoothukudi.

3.R.Subburaj
(R3 is impleaded vide Court order dated
30.01.2026 in W.M.P(MD)No.1222/26)

... Respondents

Writ Petition is filed under article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned confirmed scheme order of the 2nd respondent dated 09.07/2025 in O.A.No.02 of 2022 quash the same as illegal and arbitrary and consequently direct the 1st respondent to consider and dispose of the petitioner's appeal dated 28.04.2025 filed under Section 69(1) of the Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1959 as



against the draft scheme dated 13.02.2025 in O.A.No.02 of 2022 on the file of the 2nd respondent on merits and in accordance with law within a stipulated period as may be fixed by this Court.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner	:Mr.VR.Shanmuganathan
For R1 & R2	:Mr.M.Sarangan Additional Government Pleader
For R3	:Mr.K.Navaneetha Raja

ORDER

This writ petition is filed challenging the scheme that is finalized in O.A.No.02 of 2022 dated 13.02.2025 on the file of the first respondent.

2.When the matter came up for hearing, the learned Additional Government Pleader would submit that already an appeal has been filled by the petitioner, as against the said order, and the same is now taken on file as A.P.No.19 of 2026. As such, the writ petition need not be entertained, and all the matters can be canvassed in the appeal that is filed by the petitioner.

3.In reply thereof, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it must be noted that the impugned draft scheme is framed on caste lines. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the third respondent would submit that everything should be left open for the first respondent to decide in the appeal.



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

WEB COPY

5. When the appeal is pending, the first respondent can decide the appeal in the manner known to law after hearing both sides. Needless to mention that this Court has passed several orders not to grant of caste-based rights in the matter of administration of the Temple, and the same shall be duly taken into account by the first respondent while considering the Appeal.

6. Let the appeal be disposed of as expeditiously as possible in any event, not later than 6 months from the date of receipt of the web copy of the order without waiting for the certified copy of the order. Since it is stated that the above appeal is only as against the draft scheme, let another appeal can be filed as against the final scheme also. It will be open for the petitioner to pray for such interim direction in this said appeal.

23.03.2026

NCC:Yes/No
Ns



W.P(MD)No.33287 of 2



D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

Ns

WEB COPY

To

1.The Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Nungambakkam,
Chennai.

2.The Joint Commissioner,
Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department,
Thoothukudi.

W.P(MD)No.33287 of 2025
and
W.M.P(MD)Nos.26269 and 26270 of 2025

23.03.2026