

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (C) NO(S).17191-17194/2025

[ARISING OUT OF IMPUGNED FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 23-06-2025 IN REV.APLW(MD) NO. 81/2025 23-06-2025 IN REV.APLW(MD) NO. 82/2025 21-05-2025 IN WPMD NO. 14567/2025 21-05-2025 IN WPMD NO. 14654/2025 PASSED BY THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS AT MADURAI]

R.SIVARAMA SUBRAMANIYA SASTHIRIGAL

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF TAMIL NADU & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

(IA NO. 150047/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA NO. 150770/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA NO. 150768/2025 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Date : 01-07-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. K. Parameshwar, Sr. Adv.

Mr. A. Karthik, AOR

Ms. Smrithi Suresh, Adv.

Mr. Sugam Agrawal, Adv.

Mr. Ujjwal Sharma, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Ms. Misha Rohatgi, AOR

Mr. R.Shunmugasundaram, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Nakul Mohta, Adv.

Ms. Sneha Menan, Adv.

Ms. Shakeena, A.G., Adv.

Mr. M Sathyanaryanan, Sr. Adv.

Mr. M Muthugeethayan, Adv.

Mr. B. Karunakaran, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties at

length.

Admittedly, the petitioner herein is the Vidhayahar of the temple concerned. In respect of a ceremony to be performed on 07.07.2025, he filed a writ petition before the High Court for mandating the time for the ceremony as determined by him. Since there was some confusion as regards the auspicious time, the High Court appointed an expert committee of five priests in which the petitioner was also a member. The appointment of the Committee was challenged before this Court. This Court disposed of the matter by giving liberty to file a review and to challenge the order, if required. The High Court consequently entertained the review and passed the second impugned order.

The case of the petitioner is that as per practice and age-old custom it is his opinion in respect of timing of the ceremonies which must prevail and, therefore, appointment of the Committee and seeking its opinion is not at all justified.

Per contra, on behalf the respondents it is submitted that the rights are subject to adjudication in regular suit, which is pending. In so far as the issue regarding timing of ceremonies for 7th July 2025 is concerned, there was confusion as there were multiple opinions and even the petitioner earlier was not clear in respect of the time for the ceremonies, hence the High Court in its wisdom constituted a committee of five priests to recommend the time schedule. The time schedule now recommended is based

on 4:1 opinion of the Committee members including the petitioner, therefore, no interference with the High Court's order is called for.

In response to the above submission, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there was no confusion in petitioner's opinion. Whatever confusion was there got removed by the astrological calendar published later, whereafter the petitioner gave a fresh opinion.

Be that as it may, having regard to the nature of the cause espoused in the writ petition filed before the High Court, we are of the view that the orders impugned do not call for any interference particularly, when, as per the second impugned order, it has been directed that temples shall follow the earlier practice of seeking opinion from the Vidhayahar through written communications alone, subject to Vidhyahar indicating whether it is draft or final Pattolia, in respect of date and timing of the ceremonies. We, therefore, decline to exercise our jurisdiction under Article 136 of the Constitution of India.

The Special Leave Petition stands disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(B. LAKSHMI MANIKYA VALLI)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(AVGV RAMU)
COURT MASTER (NSH)