

(2025) 12 MAD CK 0028

Madras HC

Case No: Writ Petition No. 47010 Of 2025

Sakthivel

APPELLANT

Vs

Commissioner, Hindu Religious
& Charitable Endowment Board
And OthersRESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 4, 2025**Hon'ble Judges:** P.B. Balaji, J**Bench:** Single Bench**Advocate:** M.Mariappan, K.Karthekeiyan, R.Subramanian**Final Decision:** Dismissed

Judgement

P.B. Balaji, J

1. The petitioner, claiming to be a resident of Kannakurukkai Village, Poachal Post, Chengam Taluk, Tiruvannamalai District, where Arulmighu Dharmaraja Draupadi Amman Temple is situate, states that his family and ancestors are worshipping the Deity for decades together. The temple is an unlisted temple under the control of Hindu Religious & Charitable Endowments Board, owing lands in Survey Nos.105/11, 12 and 116/3 measuring 95 cents.

2. The fourth respondent A.Manavalan, who was originally shown as respondent in the writ petition, but, subsequently has been omitted from the array of parties. The grievance of the petitioner is that the said A.Manavalan has encroached upon the temple lands and therefore, the petitioner has given a representation to the respondents 1 to 3 on 08.05.2025, complaining that no action has been taken upon the said complaint. The present writ petition has been filed seeking issuance of writ of mandamus seeking for the above said relief.

3. Mr.K.Karthekeiyan, learned Government Advocate would bring to my notice that the writ petitioner had earlier challenged the very appointment of the said A.Manavalan as hereditary trustee of the Temple and the Division Bench of this Court by order dated 28.07.2025 in WP No.21664 of 2025, dismissed the writ petition directing the petitioner to avail of remedy as per the

law under the provisions of Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1959.

4. Mr.R.Subramanian, learned counsel appearing for A.Manavalan, who was originally arrayed as fourth respondent, would submit that the petitioner is unnecessarily creating hurdles for smooth administration and management of the temple and when the petitioner wanted to install idols within the temple premises, the Hereditary Trustee A. Manavalan informed the petitioner that it can be done only with the prior permission of the officials of the HR & CE Department. As a counter blast, the present writ petition has been filed falsely alleging that the petitioner has encroached the temple land.

5. It is clear from the above discussions that the petitioner is trying to settle a personal score against the present Trustee A.Manavalan and if at all there is any real encroachment that has been made by the hereditary trustee, it is always open to the authorities to take suitable action, if it is brought to their notice and they are satisfied that there is any encroachment committed by not only A.Manavalan, but any other person.

6. With the above observation, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

7. A.Manavalan, though initially shown as fourth respondent, is suo-motu impleaded in this writ petition as fourth respondent.