

P.Saravanan vs District Manager

P.Saravanan vs District Manager

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1426697

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Mar-03-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice Mohammed Shaffiq

Appeal No. : WP/8268/2026

Appellant : P.Saravanan

Respondent : District Manager

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MOHAMMED SHAFFIQ P.Saravanan
S/o.Periyayya, No.78, Canal Bank Road, Indira Nagar, Adyar, Chennai-
600020. ..Petitioner(s) Vs

1. The District Manager Kancheepuram South District, TASMACHARI, Orikai,
2. The Assistant Commissioner,

Excise Department, ..Respondent(s) PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the 2nd respondent to consider the representation dated 23.11.2025 and to return the deposit amount of Rs.2,74,230/- to my bank account in SBI bank Shastri Nagar Branch, Account No.10019573603, IFSC SBIN0007106. For Petitioner(s): Mr.J.Franklin For Respondent(s): Mr.K.Balakrishnan (for R1) Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan Special Government Pleader (for R2)

ORDER

By consent of learned counsel on both sides, this writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. The present writ petition is filed praying for a writ of Mandamus to

direct the respondents to return the deposit amount of Rs.2,74,230/- to the petitioner's bank account in SBI Bank, Shastri Nagar Branch, account No.10019573603, IFSC: SBIN0007106.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner would submit that the petitioner

participated in public auction for TASMACH Shop No.4549 as a H1 contractor for TASMACH. It is further stated that in terms of the tender, petitioner was required to make a security deposit to the tune of Rs.2,74,230/-, which was also duly submitted, however, petitioner would submit that he did not bid in the auction. Learned counsel for petitioner would therefore submit that respondents ought to have refunded the said deposit.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that he submitted representations on

22.04.2024, 07.06.2024, 09.02.2025, another representation dated 09.02.2025 in person, followed by a representation dated 23.11.2025 by Speed Post, however, no orders have been passed by the respondents till date.

5. Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan, learned counsel for the 2nd respondent would

submit that the representations submitted by petitioner would be considered and appropriate orders would be passed after affording the petitioner a reasonable opportunity of hearing, in accordance with law within the time period to be fixed by this Court.

6. In view of the same, taking into consideration the facts and

circumstances of the case and the limited relief sought for in this Writ Petition, there shall be a direction to the Respondents to consider the petitioner's representations, on its own merits and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, after affording reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and other interested persons, within a period of six (6) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any views with regard to the merits of the representation and it is open to the concerned respondent to consider the representations on its own merits and in accordance with law.

7. With the above directions, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs. 03-03-2026 Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No MKA To:

1. The District Manager Kancheepuram South District, TASMAL Orikai,

2. The Assistant Commissioner, Excise Department, MOHAMMED SHAFFIQ J.
MKA 03-03-2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com