
(2026) 01 MAD CK 1737

In the Madras High Court, Madurai Bench

Case No : Writ Petition Criminal (MD) No. 2754 Of 2025

M.Manickamoorthy

APPELLANT

Vs

District Collector And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 06-01-2026

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2026) 01 MAD CK 1737

Hon'ble Judges : S.Srimathy, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Niranjan S.Kumar, H.Velavadas, R.Baskaran, M.Muthumanikam, Veera Kathiravan, S.Ravi, S.Vanchinathan, Chandrasekaran

Judgement

S.Srimathy, J

1. This petition is listed under the caption "for clarification" at the instance of the learned Counsel appearing for the 5th respondent to clarify the interim order, dated 02.01.2026.

2. The learned Counsel appearing for the 5th respondent submitted that he is not aggrieved by the order, dated 02.01.2026, as far as the paragraph No.5 sub clauses (i), (iii), (iv) and (v) are concerned. However, he is aggrieved by the sub clause (ii) of paragraph No.5 wherein this Court has stated that the number of participants in the festival shall be restricted to 50 only. He further submitted that the said festival would be conducted yearly during Thai month wherein more than 1000 persons would be participating, hence restricting the same to 50 persons is incorrect.

3. The said condition was imposed based on the submission of the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for respondents 1 and 2 who would submit that the Revenue Administration would allow 30 to 50 people. Further submitted that the Urus festival if conducted at the top of the Thiruparankundram Hill in the Dargha, the place therein cannot accommodate huge crowd. Based on the above submission this Court restricted the number of

participants to 50, since more people could not be accommodated. Even when the festival was conducted in the year 2003, the number of participants were restricted since if allowed the crowd would occupying the space belonging to temple creating law and order problem. Further the same was allowed with heavy police protection. Therefore, based on the said submission as well as based on the earlier festival, this Court has restricted the number of participants to 50. Hence, the submission of the learned Counsel appearing for the 5th respondent that restriction cannot be imposed is rejected.

4. With the above said clarification, the order, dated 02.01.2026, is not modified.

5. Post the case on 21.01.2026.