

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF, TIRUCHENDUR**PRESENT: SELVI. K. PADMAPRIYA, B.A., B.L., (HONS.),****DISTRICT MUNSIF, TIRUCHENDUR.****THURSDAY THE 30TH DAY OF JULY 2026****O.S. No.112/2017****(CNR No.TNTT0E0001562017)***********

1. Arulmigu Ayirangkavu Ayyanar Temple Deity

2. Arulmigu Mutharamman Temple Deity

3. Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple Deity

4. Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple Deity

(At Kachanavilai Village, Idaiyanvilai)

through Vedhanayagam @ Gnanasingh,

the Dharmakartha of the above-mentioned temples)Plaintiff

/ Vs /

Mohan

.... Defendant

(After the demise of the previous Dharmakartha, (Late) Velayutham, Mr. Vedhanayagam @ Gnanasingh was substituted as the present Dharmakartha pursuant to the order passed in I.A. No.01/2023, dated 14.07.2025. The plaint has also been amended vide orders passed in I.A. Nos.720 & 721/2017 dated 29.01.2018 and in I.A. No.576/2018, dated 30.10.2018, and I.A. No.03/2025, dated 04.08.2025.)

This suit came up for final hearing before this court on 17th July 2026. Learned counsel Ms.Loganya appeared on behalf of the plaintiff, while learned counsel Mr.K.Murugan appeared on behalf of the defendant. Both sides heard, and on perusal of the records, this case is stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivers the following :-

JUDGMENT

This suit has been filed by the plaintiff seeking a permanent injunction restraining the Defendant, his men, or agents from in any manner interfering with the peaceful administration of the Plaintiff Temples by its Managing

Trustee, directing the Defendant to pay the costs of the suit to the Plaintiff and for other reliefs.

2. AVERMENTS IN THE PLAINT FILED BY THE PLAINTIFF IN BRIEF:-

2.1. It is stated that the Plaintiff Temples are situated on the land comprised in Old Survey No. 102/2A6, situated at Kachanavilai Village, Tiruchendur Taluk. The patta for the said land stands in the name of the 4th Plaintiff, Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple. The Plaintiff Temples are managed by the Managing Trustee and office bearers who are elected from time to time by the members of the five-share Nadar family belonging to Idaiyanvilai Village. Mr. Velayutham, the current Managing Trustee of the Plaintiff Temples, was unanimously elected as the Managing Trustee on 23.07.2017 by the family members of the Plaintiff Temples, and he has been managing the Plaintiff Temples ever since. The Managing Trustee of the Plaintiff Temples issued a due notice to the family members for conducting the Thiruvilakku Pooja at the 4th Plaintiff Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple on 01.09.2017. The Defendant belongs to Nalumavadi Village. The Defendant has no connection whatsoever with the five-share Nadar family belonging to Idaiyanvilai, who are the owners of the Plaintiff Temples. The Defendant had been engaged by the administrators and the Managing Trustee of the Plaintiff Temples to maintain the Plaintiff Temples. As the Defendant acted against the interests of the Plaintiff Temples and its devotees, the Managing Trustee of the Plaintiff Temples terminated him from maintenance duties on 02.08.2017, with the consent of the family members who are the rightful stakeholders of the Plaintiff Temples. Prior to such removal from service, the land revenue receipts and electricity charge receipts pertaining to the Plaintiff Temples were in the custody of the Defendant. The Defendant has failed to hand over the said receipts to the Plaintiff Temples till date.

2.2. It is further stated that while the Managing Trustee of the Plaintiff Temples was actively engaged in making arrangements for conducting the

Thiruvilakku Pooja of the four Plaintiff Temples on 01.09.2017 as decided by the Managing Trustee and the family members, the Defendant, having knowledge of the same, has been aggressively attempting to cause obstruction to the conduct of the Thiruvilakku Pooja of the four Plaintiff Temples and to the pujas and maintenance works of the other Plaintiff Temples since 28.08.2017. The acts of the Defendant are unlawful. By virtue of the Defendant's actions, a situation has arisen causing disturbance to the day-to-day pujas and administration of the Plaintiff Temples. Hence, this suit.

3. AVERMENTS IN THE WRITTEN STATEMENT FILED BY THE DEFENDANT IN BRIEF:-

3.1. It is contended by the defendant that the suit filed by the plaintiff is not maintainable under law or equity. It is false to state that the plaintiff temples are situated in Survey No.102/2A6 of Kachanavilai Village. The Pookkariamman Temple belonging to Vadalivilai is situated in Survey No.100/2A6, whereas the Pookkariamman Temple in Idaiyanvilai is situated in Survey No.38/A. Velayutham has fraudulently represented the patta of the Vadalivilai Temple as the patta of the plaintiff temples. The patta for Survey No. 102/2A6 does not belong to the four Plaintiff Temples. The assertion that Velayutham was elected as the trustee by the family members of the plaintiff temples on 23.07.2017 is absurd. Temples do not have family members. Therefore, Velayutham was not elected as the administrator. Legally, a valid election requires issuing notice to all 160 tax-paying members and convening a general meeting, which was not done as alleged in the plaint. The resolution filed along with the plaint and the claim that Velayutham was elected are false. There is no proof of service of notice to the tax-paying members, and the allegation that notice was issued to members is false. Consequently, the alleged election mentioned in the plaint is void in law.

3.2. It is further stated that the defendant is not a resident of Nalumavadi; he belongs to Idaiyanvilai and currently resides at Nalumavadi. The assertion that the defendant has no connection with the five-share Nadar family of

Idaiyanvilai is false. It is equally false that the defendant was appointed to maintain the temples, that he acted against the interest of the temples, and that he was removed from service on 02.08.2017. Velayutham is not in management of the temples, and the defendant is under no obligation to hand over receipt books to anyone. It is false to state that a decision was made to conduct a Thiruvilakku Pooja on 01.09.2017. Velayutham never attempted to conduct the pooja, and the allegation that the defendant caused obstruction is false. No such incident as alleged in the plaint took place on 28.08.2017, and the claim that the defendant caused disturbance to the temple is untrue. The temples cannot file a suit seeking a declaration as to who their trustee is. The prayer in the plaint does not specify who the trustee is; hence, the allegation that the defendant obstructed the administration of the trustee is untenable. Seeking a permanent injunction without a prayer for declaration is legally unsustainable.

3.3. The plaintiff temples belong to the five-share Nadars, and the defendant is one among them. The native place of the defendant is Idaiyanvilai, and he currently resides at Nalumavadi. The temples constructed by the plaintiff belong to all 160 tax-paying members. Since 2002, one P.A. Paulraj Nadar has been functioning as the president and the defendant as the administrator of the temple management, and neither has been removed from office. Paulraj Nadar and the defendant are jointly constructing a marriage hall for the Pookkariamman Temple at Idaiyanvilai on the land belonging to the temple situated on the eastern side. Velayutham has filed this suit with mala fide intent to obstruct the said construction. Stone inscriptions exist to substantiate the construction and consecration of the Pookkariamman Temple and the Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, in which the defendant and Paulraj are recorded as administrators. Paulraj and the defendant continue to manage the temples as administrators, and Velayutham is not an administrator of the temples. Furthermore, the suit is bad in law as no leave was obtained under Order I Rule 8 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Hence, the defendant prays that the suit of the plaintiff be dismissed with costs.

4. AVERMENTS IN THE ADDITIONAL WRITTEN STATEMENT FILED BY THE DEFENDANT IN BRIEF:-

4.1. In the additional written statement filed by the defendant, it is submitted that the allegation that Gnansingh was elected as the trustee of the plaintiff temples is false. The post of trustee never existed for the plaintiff temples. Out of the four temples mentioned in the plaint, the defendant has been serving as the administrator for two temples, namely Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple and Arulmigu Pookkariamman Temple. The plaintiff Gnansingh was functioning only as the General Secretary for the remaining two temples, namely Arulmigu Aayirangkavu Ayyanar Temple and Arulmigu Mutharamman Temple. Therefore, the assertion that the plaintiff is a trustee is a blatant falsehood. The plaintiff Gnansingh was removed from the post of General Secretary of the said Arulmigu Aayirangkavu Ayyanar Temple and Arulmigu Mutharamman Temple pursuant to a resolution passed in the village meeting held on 25.07.2025. At present, Gnansingh holds no post or responsibility in any of the plaintiff temples. In the village meeting held on 25.07.2025, one P. Gnanapon was elected to the post of General Secretary of Arulmigu Aayirangkavu Ayyanar Temple and Arulmigu Mutharamman Temple.

5. ISSUES:

1. Whether Mr. Vedha Nayagam @ Gnana Singh is the Dharmakartha of the plaintiff temples?
2. Whether Mr. P. Gnanapon is the General Secretary of the plaintiff temples?
3. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to the relief of permanent injunction against the defendant as prayed for?
4. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to the costs of the suit?
5. To what other relief, if any, are the plaintiffs entitled?

This Court, by exercising the power under Order XIV Rule 5 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, since Issue No.2 is not claimed by the defendants and

not a matter in issue, this court strikes out the second issue and recasts the series of issues as follows;

1. Whether Mr. Vedha Nayagam @ Gnana Singh is the Dharmakartha of the plaintiff temples?
2. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to the relief of permanent injunction against the defendant as prayed for?
3. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to the costs of the suit?
4. To what other relief, if any, are the plaintiffs entitled?

6. EVIDENCES:

On the side of the plaintiff, the plaintiff, Mr. Vedhanayagam @ Gnanasingh, was examined as P.W.1, and through him, documents were produced and marked as Exs.A1 to A6 during his chief-examination. On the side of the defendant, the defendant, Mr. Mohan, was examined as D.W.1, and Exs.B1 to B26 were marked through him during his chief-examination. Subsequently, upon the recall of D.W.1, Exs.B27 to B29 were marked through him during his further chief-examination, and Ex.B30 was marked through him during the continuation of his further chief-examination.

7. Arguments of Both Parties Heard. Case Records Perused.

8. DISCUSSION WITH REGARD TO ISSUES No.1 & 2:

1. Whether Mr. Vedha Nayagam @ Gnana Singh is the Dharmakartha of the plaintiff temples?
2. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to the relief of permanent injunction against the defendant as prayed for?

8.1. It is the case of the plaintiffs that the plaintiff temples situated at Sy.No.102/2A6 are being managed by the family members of "ஐந்து பங்கு நாடார்" and are administered by the Dharmakartha and office bearers elected by the members of the "ஐந்து பங்கு நாடார்" family. It is further stated that on 23.07.2017 one Mr. Velayutham was selected as Dharmakartha and he has been in management of the four plaintiff temples. It is stated that the

defendant was engaged by the Dharmakartha of the plaintiff temples to maintain the temples. However, as the defendant acted against the interests of the plaintiff temples and the devotees, he was removed from maintaining the temples. The defendant thereafter interfered with the pooja and maintenance works of the temples, particularly by obstructing the Dharmakartha and family members of the plaintiff temples from conducting the pooja scheduled on 01.09.2017. Hence, this suit has been filed seeking the relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendant from interfering with the administration by the Dharmakartha of the plaintiff temples. During the pendency of the suit, the said Dharmakartha Velayutham died, and Vedhanayagam alias Gnanasingh was impleaded as he is stated to be the Dharmakartha of the plaintiff temples.

8.2. Conversely, the defendant denied that the plaintiff temples are situated at Sy.No.102/2A6. It is further denied that there exists any post of Dharmakartha or that the temples are managed by the family members of "ஐந்து பங்கு நாடார்". It is stated that neither Velayutham nor Gnanasigh was selected as Dharmakartha. It is further stated that there are 160 tax-paying members of the plaintiff temples, and if any temple management is to be undertaken, it must be done by convening a General Body Meeting of all 160 members and passing a resolution. Therefore, the Plaintiffs averments are false. It is admitted that the plaintiff temples belong to "ஐந்து பங்கு நாடார்கள்". One Mr. P.A. Palraj Nadar is the Executive Chairman and the defendant is the managing person of the plaintiff temples. It is further contended that without seeking a declaration regarding the status of Dharmakartha, a mere prayer for injunction is not maintainable. Hence, the suit is not maintainable.

8.3. To prove the plaintiffs claim, the plaintiffs have filed Exs.A1 to A6. Ex.A1 is the account note. On perusing Ex.A1, it is a notebook with handwritten entries, and there are no substantive entries of financial

transactions relating to the plaintiff temples. With respect to Ex.A2, which is the patta passbook for Sy.No.102/2A6 standing in the name of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, since the suit does not involve any dispute regarding Ex.A2, it is not relevant to the Plaintiffs claim. Ex.A3 contains handwritten statements showing that a resolution was passed by the Plaintiffs managing committee, and page number 3 of Ex.A3 records that, "இடையன்விளை சார்ந்த வடலிவிளையில் இருக்கும் நமது குடும்ப முத்தவராகிய கணேச நாடார் குமாரர் G. வேலாயுதம் என்பவரை நமது குடும்பத்திற்கு தலைமுறையாக பாத்தியப்பட்ட நான்கு கோவில்களுக்கும் தர்மகர்த்தாவாக கூட்டத்தில் ஏக மனதாக தீர்மானிக்கப்பட்டு நியமிக்கப்படுகிறார். இப்படிக்கு V.V. செல்லதுரை" along with which ten other members signed. Ex.A3 is a mere handwritten note, and the defendant disputes its credibility. This Court also raises a doubt regarding the admissibility of Ex.A3. Ex.A4 produced by the plaintiffs is the invitation for the "திருவிளக்கு பூஜை" of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Thirukovil, which also lacks admissibility. Ex.A6, by which Gnanasingh claims that he was appointed as Dharmakartha, contains the following recital: "ஞானசேகர் என்பவரை நீக்கிவிட்டு அந்த இடத்தில் தொடர்ந்து துணை நிர்வாகியான V.V.C. ஞானசிங் என்பவரை நியமித்திட இந்தக் கூட்டத்தில் ஏக தர்மகர்த்தாவாக நியமித்து ஏக மனதாக அவரை தொடர்ந்து இந்த வழக்கை நடத்திட தேர்வு செய்யப்பட்டுள்ளார்." The learned counsel for the defendant strongly objected to the entry in Ex.A6, contending that the word "Dharmakartha" placed next to the name of Gnanasingh was fraudulently inserted only for the purpose of this suit. This Court also considers that the sentence, "துணை நிர்வாகியான V.V.C. ஞானசிங் என்பவரை நியமித்திட இந்தக் கூட்டத்தில் ஏக தர்மகர்த்தாவாக நியமித்து ஏக மனதாக அவரை தொடர்ந்து இந்த வழக்கை நடத்திட தேர்வு செய்யப்பட்டுள்ளார்," appears

to have been inserted. Moreover, in Ex.A6, the resolution pleaded by the plaintiffs as appointing Gnanasingh as Dharmakartha bears only six signatures, and the signatures of Chelladurai and T. Maharajan appears twice in the said resolution. It does not appear to be a document with credibility, and thus this Court is not inclined to consider Ex.A6.

8.4. It is further observed by this Court that during the cross-examination, the said Gnanasingh deposed as follows: "இந்த வழக்கை வேலாயுதம் என்பவர் தான் முதலில் தாக்கல் செய்தார் என்றால் சரிதான். வேலாயுதம் மேற்படி நான்கு கோவில்களுக்கும் தர்மகர்த்தாவாக தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டதாக நீங்கள் எந்த ஆவணமும் தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை என்றால் சரிதான்." Thus, without adducing any proof for the fact pleaded by the plaintiffs that Velayutham was appointed as Dharmakartha, the claim cannot be entertained by this Court.

8.5. Moreover, this Court also observes that in Ex.A5, the name of Gnanasingh is mentioned only as துணை நிர்வாகி and not as Dharmakartha. This Court has already decided that the resolution passed in Ex.A6 appointing Gnanasingh as Dharmakartha is not reliable, and this finding is corroborated by Ex.A5. This Court believes that the said Gnanasingh is not the Dharmakartha of the plaintiff temples. When the appointment of Gnanasingh as Dharmakartha was disputed by the learned counsel for the defendant, and during cross-examination, the said Gnanasingh deposed: "மேற்படி நான்கு கோவில்களுக்கும் எத்தனை வரிதாரர்கள் உள்ளார்கள் என்றால் 175 வரிதாரர்கள் உள்ளார்கள்." "வா.சா.ஆ.3 இல் உங்களை தர்மகர்த்தாவாக தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டதாக கூறியுள்ள தீர்மானத்தில் மொத்தம் 13 நபர்கள் மட்டும் தான் கையெழுத்திட்டார்கள் என்றால் சரிதான். எனது குடும்பத்து உறுப்பினர்களிடம் மட்டும் கையெழுத்து பெறவில்லை." Generally, when a resolution is passed, it must be acknowledged by the maximum number of

members. However, in Ex.A6, only very few members signed, and the double entries of Chelladurai and Maharajan render the resolution questionable. It is further deposed by P.W.1 that, "நிர்வாகிகள் எவ்வாறு தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப் படுவார்கள் என்றால் பரம்பரையாக தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்படுவார்கள். எனது தாத்தா வேதநாயகம் மற்றும் எனது தந்தை ஆகியோர் 40 வருடங்களுக்கு மேல் தர்மகர்த்தாவாக பதவி வகித்துள்ளார்கள்." "உங்கள் அப்பா செல்லத்துரை என்றால் சரிதான். நான்கு கோவில்களுக்கும் உங்கள் தந்தைக்கு முன்பு செல்லையா என்பவர் தான் நிர்வாகம் செய்து வந்தார் என்றால் சரிதான்." From these inconsistent admissions of P.W.1, it is clear that firstly he deposed that family members are appointed hereditarily to administer the temples, but subsequently he also admitted that one Chellaiah had administered the temples.

8.6. It is further admitted by P.W.1 that, "வா.சா.ஆ.6 தர்மகர்த்தாவாக ஏக இந்த வாசகம் மட்டும் இடைச்செருகலாக எழுதப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரியல்ல. இந்த ஆவணத்தில் உங்களை துணை நிர்வாகியாக V.V. ஞானசிங் என்று குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். மேற்படி 22.08.2022 இல் நடைபெற்ற கூட்டத்தில் எடுக்கப்பட்ட தீர்மானத்தில் மொத்தமே 7 நபர்கள் தான் கையெழுத்திட்டுள்ளார்கள் என்றால் சரிதான். அதில் P. மகாராஜன் என்று இரண்டு முறை கையெழுத்திடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான்." Moreover, this Court also notes that in Ex.A5 the name of Gnanasingh is mentioned as துணை நிர்வாகி and not as Dharmakartha, which is admitted by P.W.1 in his cross-examination.

8.7. Furthermore, on the side of the defendant, Exs.B1 to B29 were adduced. Though these documents are only invitations pertaining to festivals conducted in the plaintiff temples, in all the exhibits the defendant Mohan's name is mentioned respectfully as Akthar and managing person, and P.A.

Palraj Nadar's name is mentioned as Executive Chairman. In Exs.B1 to B29, it is also recorded that the festivals were conducted by விழாக் கமிட்டி. In view of Ex.B13, which contains photographs of inscriptions in the plaintiff temples, the said inscriptions mention the defendant's name as Akthar and P.A. Palraj Nadar's name as திருப்பணிக் குழு தலைவர். Even though Ex.B13 photographs are not highly admissible, there is no rebuttal evidence adduced by the plaintiffs to prove that Exs.B1 to B30 produced by the defendant are forged documents. Hence, this Court, by considering the fact that the preponderance of probability in the present suit, purely favours the defendant.

8.8. This Court is also of the considered view that the relief claimed by the plaintiffs, namely, “வாதி கோவில்களின் நிர்வாகத்தை அதன் தர்மகர்த்தா சுமுகமான முறையில் நடத்தி வருவதற்கு பிரதிவாதியோ, அவரது வகையாட்களோ எவ்வித இடைஞ்சலும் செய்யக்கூடாதென நிரந்தர உறுத்துக்கட்டளை உத்தரவு பிறப்பிக்கும் படிக்கும்,” cannot be granted. In the present suit, the plaintiffs have failed to establish the existence of a post called Dharmakartha for the plaintiff temples, and the said Gnanasingh has also failed to produce substantial evidence to prove that he is the Dharmakartha. Hence, the relief claimed by the plaintiffs is not established. Further, the plaintiffs stated that the defendant was involved in interfering activities to prevent the "திருவிளக்கு பூஜை" scheduled to be held on 01.09.2017 and in obstructing the maintenance works of the plaintiff temples. However, no proof has been adduced by the plaintiffs to establish the alleged interference caused by the defendant. Therefore, this Court holds that the plaintiffs have failed to prove the cause of action to file this suit.

8.9. On the basis of the above findings, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief of permanent injunction to the plaintiffs, since they have not even proved a prima facie case in their favour. Accordingly, Issues No.1 and 2 are answered against the plaintiffs.

9. DISCUSSION AND FINDING WITH REGARD TO ISSUES No 3 & 4 :**3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the costs of this suit?****4. To what other reliefs if any?**

Since the plaintiffs failed to establish their prima facie case , this Court is not inclined to grant any costs to the plaintiffs. With regard to further reliefs, no such reliefs have been specifically pleaded and no evidence has been adduced. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant any further reliefs. Accordingly, Issues No.3 and 4 are also answered against the plaintiffs.

10. In the result, this suit is dismissed. No costs.

Directly dictated to the Steno-Typist, Transcribed and Computerised by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 30th day of July, 2026.

District Munsif,
Tiruchendur.

(I) PLAINTIFF'S SIDE WITNESS :**P.W.1** Mr. Vedhanayagam @ Gnanasingh (Plaintiff)**(II) PLAINTIFF'S SIDE DOCUMENTS :**

Ex.A1 Notebook containing the income and expenditure accounts pertaining to the Plaintiff temples, along with the connected property tax receipts and electricity bill receipts - Original

Ex.A2 Patta Passbook standing in the name of the 4th Plaintiff temple - Original

Ex.A3 Notebook containing resolutions pertaining to the Plaintiff temples

Ex.A4 Invitation for the Thiruvilakku Pooja dated 01.09.2017 - Original

Ex.A5 Festival invitation pertaining to the Plaintiff temple - Original

Ex.A6 Resolution book pertaining to the Plaintiff temples - Original

(III) DEFENDANT'S SIDE WITNESS:-

D.W.1. Mr. Mohan (Defendant)

(IV) DEFENDANT'S SIDE DOCUMENTS:-

- Ex.B1** Invitation dated 16.04.2000 relating to the Paalaaya Maha Kumbabishekam of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B2** Invitation dated 08.03.2002 relating to the Mandala Pooja Completion Ceremony of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B3** Invitation dated 20.01.2002 relating to the Jeernodharana Ashtabandhana Maha Kumbabishekam of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B4** Invitation dated 26.07.2002 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B5** Invitation dated 25.07.2003 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B6** Invitation dated 07.02.2003 relating to the Varushabishekam Festival of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B7** Invitation dated 23.07.2004 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B8** Invitation dated 16.01.2005 relating to the 3rd Annual Varushabishekam Festival of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original

- Ex.B9** Invitation dated 29.07.2005 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B10** Invitation dated 03.02.2006 relating to the 4th Annual Varushabishekam Festival of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B11** Invitation dated 15.06.2007 relating to the Maha Kumbabishekam of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B12** Invitation dated 27.07.2007 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B13** Invitation dated 03.05.2008 relating to the 6th Annual Varushabishekam Festival of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B14** Invitation dated 24.04.2009 relating to the 7th Annual Varushabishekam Festival of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B15** Statement of Kumbabishekam accounts and receipts of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, dated 11.05.2010, maintained by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B16** Invitation dated 06.03.2011 relating to the Mandala Pooja of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B17** Invitation dated 21.12.2011 relating to the Sani Peyarchi Festival of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B18** Invitation dated 26.01.2013 relating to the Varushabishekam Festival of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original

- Ex.B19** Invitation dated 26.07.2013 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B20** Invitation dated 16.01.2014 relating to the Varushabishekam Festival of Arulmigu Pookkari Amman Temple, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B21** Invitation dated 24.07.2015 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B22** Invitation dated 29.07.2016 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B23** Invitation dated 28.07.2017 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arulmigu Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple, Vadalivilai Road, Idaiyanvilai, conducted by the Defendant - Original
- Ex.B24** Invitation dated 01.04.2026 relating to the Maha Kumbabishekam of Ariyankavu Ayyanar Temple - Original
- Ex.B25** Invitation dated 11.04.2025 relating to the Panguni Uthiram Festival and Varushabishekam Festival of Ariyankavu Ayyanar Temple - Original
- Ex.B26** Invitation dated 26.07.2019 relating to the Kodai Festival of Gnanakkarai Swamy Temple - Original
- Ex.B27** Invitation dated 17.03.2011 relating to the Jeernodharana Ashtabandhana Maha Kumbabishekam of Arulmigu Mutharamman Temple - Original
- Ex.B28** Invitation dated 30.04.2025 relating to the Jeernodharana Ashtabandhana Maha Kumbabishekam of Arultharum Mutharamman Temple - Original
- Ex.B29** Invitation dated 28.04.2026 relating to the Kodai Festival of Arultharum Mutharamman Temple - Original

Ex.B30 Photographs of the stone inscriptions installed in the Plaintiff's temples, together with a Pen Drive containing the photographs – Original (12 photos)

District Munsif,
Tiruchendur.

**DISTRICT MUNSIF COURT,
TIRUCHENDUR.
O.S. No.112/2017
DRAFT/FAIR JUDGMENT
DATED – 30.07.2026**
