

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-01-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.No.27651 of 2025

P.Balasubramaniyam,
S/o. Pavadai,
No.164 HIG NH-I,
Rajiv Gandhi Street,
Marimalai Nagar,
Chengalpattu Taluk,
Chengalpattu District

Petitioner

Vs

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Health And Family Welfare Department,
Fort St. George,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Chennai 600 009.

2.The Dean, Government Stanley Medical College
No.1 Old Jail Road,
Chennai 600 001.

3.The Director of Medical Education,
No.162 EVR Periyar Salai,
Kilpauk, Chennai 600 010.

4.The Director of Public Health And Preventive Medicine,
No.359 Anna Salai,
Chennai-600 006.

5.Dr.Monika, S.
7/4, 3rd Cross Street,
Collectorate Colony,
Aminjikarai, Chennai 600 029.

Respondents

PRAYER

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 4 to take action against the 5th respondent to recover the amount of Rs.40 lakhs as per the letter of the 2nd respondent dated 23.06.2025 made in Na.Ka.No. 4699/MaKa2/2025 within a time fixed by this Honourable Court.

For Petitioner: Mr.P.Krishnan

For Respondents: Mr. E.Sundaram, GA
for R1 to R4
Mrs.N.Kavitha Rameswar for R5

ORDER

The Writ Petition is filed for a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 4 to take action against the 5th respondent to recover the amount of Rs.40 lakhs as per the letter of the 2nd respondent dated 23.06.2025 made in Na.Ka.No.4699/Maka2/2025, within the time fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

2. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the particulars about the 5th respondent that she is a non-service PG candidate, who was selected under the state quota for M.S.(General Surgery) Post Graduate Degree Course during the

PG Session 2016-2017 in a Tamil Nadu Government Medical College and the fact that she completed the course in April 2019 and she has not done the bond service, and therefore, she is liable to pay Rs.40,00,000/-. It is also seen that number of queries were also made under the Right to Information Act and inspite thereof, the Authorities are not taking any action and therefore, the petitioner has made a representation and come before this Court with the above prayer.

3. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the official respondents 1 to 4 would submit that it is true that the 5th respondent was a non-service candidate and the action is being taken with reference to her non-compliance of the bond period, however the petitioner has no *locus standi* to file the writ petition.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 5th respondent would submit that the petitioner is none other than the father-in-law of the 5th respondent and suppressing the said fact, the writ petition is filed. The divorce proceedings are pending between the 5th respondent and the petitioner's son. Already, the petitioner lodged a complaint before the Tamil Nadu Medical Council and an elaborate enquiry was also conducted and an order running up to eight pages was passed on 22.12.2025 dismissing the complaint of the petitioner.

5. I have considered the rival submissions made and perused the material records of the case.

6. There is no end to docket multiplication, when it comes to family disputes. From the Family Courts, it is expanded to Criminal Courts and the other jurisdictions and now, slowly, all subjects under Article 226 of the Constitution of India are also being occupied for the dispute. If a family conflict arises between the husband and wife, the law enjoins that the parties should amicably try to discuss the issue, go for counselling before the Family Court and the Family Court may also refer the parties to Mediation to try to settle the issue. If the issue is not settled, they are supposed to go for trial and if a prayer is made for divorce or restitution of conjugal rights or maintenance, as the case may be, the Court will grant or refuse the relief depending on whether the grounds are made out or not. But, unfortunately, variety of litigations are filed for the family dispute.

7. In this case also, a disgruntled father-in-law, by completely suppressing the fact that the 5th respondent is his own daughter-in-law, has filed the writ petition. It is not even averred, how the petitioner is personally aggrieved in the writ petition. If the petitioner is not personally aggrieved, then the petition should have been filed as a public interest litigation and that is also not done.

Only to wreak vengeance, the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, cannot be invoked. Therefore, finding no merits, the Writ Petition is dismissed, with costs of Rs.2000/- to be paid to the 3rd respondent by the petitioner.

12-01-2026

Neutral Citation: Yes
ari

To

1. The Principal Secretary,
to Government, Health and Family Welfare
Department, Fort St. George,
Government of Tamil Nadu, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Dean Government Stanley Medical College
No. 1 Old Jail Road, Chennai
3. The Director of Medical Education
No. 162 EVR Periyar Salai,
Kilpauk Chennai 600 010.
4. The Director Of Public Health And Preventive
Medicine,
No. 359 Anna Salai, Chennai
5. Monika, S.
7/4 3rd Cross Street, Collectorate Colony,
Aminjikarai, Chennai 600 029.

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

ari

W.P.No.27651 of 2025

12-01-2026