



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **24.03.2026**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR**  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN**

C.M.P.(MD)No.20464 of 2025, 66 & 90 of 2026

and

W.A.(MD)No. SR 109327, 110928 and 110828 of 2025

C.M.P.(MD)No.20464 of 2025:

- 1.The State rep by its,  
Secretary Public Works Department,  
St.George Fort, Chennai.
- 2.The Assistant Engineer,  
Water Resources Organisation,  
Public Works Department,  
Ramanathi Basin Sub Division,  
Ambasamudram, Tirunelveli Disrict.
- 3.The Assistant Executive Engineer,  
Water Resource Organization,  
Public Works Department,  
Ramnathi Basin Sub Division,  
Ambasamudram

... Petitioners

Vs.

Arulmigu Kasi Viswanathar Kovil Temple,  
Kizhambur Through its,  
Assistant Commissioner/Executive Officer,  
Kizhambur, Ambasamudram Taluk,  
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondent



C.M.P.(MD)No.66 of 2026:

WEB COPY

1.The Secretary to Government,  
Public Works Department,  
St.George Fort, Chennai.

2.The Assistant Engineer,  
Water Resources Organisation,  
Public Works Department,  
Ramanathi Basin Sub Division,  
Ambasamudram,  
Tirunelveli District.

... Petitioners

Vs.

Arulmigu Rajagopala Kulasekara Alwar Temple,  
Manarkovil rep by its  
Executive Officer,  
Mannarkovil,  
Ambasamudram Taluk,  
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondent

PRAYER in C.M.P.(MD)Nos.15948 of 2025, 66 and 90 of 2026:-  
Petitions filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, to condone the delay of 778, 782 and 781 days, respectively in filing the writ appeal against the order dated 29.09.2023 made in W.P.(MD)No.9663 of 2014, 9431 & 9183 of 2015.

COMMON PRAYER in W.A.(MD)Nos.SR 20464, 110928 of 2025:-  
Appeals filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent Act, to set aside the order dated 29.09.2023 passed in W.P.(MD)No.9663 of 2014, 9431 & 9183 of 2015.



WEB COPY



In C.M.P.(MD)No.20464 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.P.T.Thiraviam  
Government Advocate  
For Respondents : Mr.S.Chellapandian

In C.M.P.(MD)Nos.66 and 90 of 2026

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Sasikumar  
Additional Government Pleader

**COMMON ORDER**

(Order of the Court was made by **N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.**)

These petitions are filed seeking to condone the delay of 778, 782 and 781 days, respectively in filing the above writ appeals.

2.The reasons assigned in the application for the delay of 778, 781 and 782 days, respectively are that the petitioners were engaged in monsoon related work such as maintenance of all tanks, supply channels, sluice gates, monitoring storage level. Further in the month of December, 2023, there was unprecedented monsoon rains, flood in Tamirabarani river, which caused severe damage to nearly all tanks, feeder channels and river bunds maintained by the petitioner Department. Hence, the petitioners were compelled to undertake temporary restoration work. Owing to these exceptional and continuous official exigencies, the



WEB COPY

appeals could not be filed within the stipulated time. Hence, they seek to condone the delay in filing the writ appeal.

3. This Court is of the view that the reasons mentioned in the affidavits are bereft of details. The reasons to condone the delay must be bona fide. Simply on the ground of administrative delay, as a matter of right, the Court cannot presume sufficient cause.

4. In this regard it is useful to refer the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in ***State of Tamil Nadu and Ors Vs. Melvisharam Muslim Educational Society*** reported in **2018 [3] CTC 420**, wherein the Division Bench of this has held as follows:

*“... Though the delay is condoned by the Court normally in a liberal manner, the said approach cannot be extended mechanically without any plausible explanation. What is pitted against an ordinary litigant is also pitted against the Government before Court of law to establish a particular fact. Though the word ? sufficient cause? has to be given a liberal approach, to exercise discretion ? for such liberal approach, there must be necessary facts in the affidavit filed in support of the same. But, on a perusal of the affidavit, we do not find plausible explanation for such delay except stating that there is an administrative delay. Such vague and bald explanation cannot be accepted mechanically. When Courts are extending such liberal*



WEB COPY

*approach mechanically, it has become a routine affairs of the Government Departments to file the appeals against every order passed by the Court. The present day scenario in filing the appeal, challenging every order by the Government Departments, clearly exhibits shirking responsibility of the Department Heads. In fact, now the tendency has developed among the Department Heads, not to take any risk and to avoid any question relate to the litigant and only in order to avoid any query, the administrative side files these types of appeals, though there is no merit in the appeal.”*

5. When the law mandates that a particular activity shall be performed within a stipulated time, the same cannot be diluted. What is pitted against the common man is equally apply against the Government. They cannot sit over the files and come to the Court belatedly with some flimsy reasons. A Court granting indulgence must be satisfied that there was diligence on the part of the appellants. When there is no sufficient cause for condoning the delay, the said delay cannot be condoned as a matter of right.

6. The Court, in exercising discretion, particularly in these types of petitions, has to see the conduct, behaviour and attitude of a party relating to its inaction or negligence. The above factors are relevant



WEB COPY

to be taken into consideration as the fundamental principle is that the Courts are required to weigh the scale of balance of justice in respect of both parties and the said principle cannot be given a total go-by in the name of liberal approach. There is an increasing tendency to perceive delay even in a non-serious matter. Hence, the delay due to nonchalant attitude should be curbed at the initial stage itself. It is for them to be very vigilant from the very inception and they cannot sit over the files and come up with unacceptable reasons to condone the delay.

7. We are not satisfied with the reasons for condoning the delay. Hence, these petitions are dismissed. Consequently, the Writ Appeals are also rejected at the S.R. stage itself. No costs.

**[N.S.K., J.] & [M.J.R., J.]**  
**24.03.2026**

Index : Yes/No  
Internet : Yes  
ta



WEB COPY



**N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.  
AND  
M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.**

ta

C.M.P.(MD)No.20464 of 2025, 66 & 90 of 2026  
and  
W.A.(MD)No. SR 109327, 110928 and 110828 of 2025

24.03.2026