

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

INHERENT JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION (C) NO.65 OF 2026

THIRU. PADMANABAN

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

P.N.SRIDHAR & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. In view of the order passed in the above Special Leave Petition, this Contempt Petition stands closed.
2. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
[M.M. SUNDRESH]

....., J.
[NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH]

NEW DELHI;
17th FEBRUARY 2026

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) DIARY NO(S). 40527/2025

[ARISING OUT OF IMPUGNED FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 24-06-2024
IN WP NO. 16126/2024 PASSED BY THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
MADRAS]

THIRU. PADMANABAN

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

TMT. A. KAVITHA & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

IA NO. 189039/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

WITH

CONMT.PET.(C) NO. 65/2026 (XII)

FOR ADMISSION

IA NO. 21302/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 17-02-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Rashmi Nandakumar, AOR
Ms. Yashmita Pandey, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rahul Shyam Bhandari, AOR
Ms. G Priyadarshini, Adv.
Ms. Jasleen Kaur, Adv.
Mr. Satyam Pathak, Adv.

Mr. M Sathyanaryanan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. B. Karunakaran, AOR

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

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) DIARY NO(S). 40527/2025:

Delay condoned.

1. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the respondents.
2. The sum and substance as per the submission of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is that he has not been heard by the High Court before passing the impugned order, which directed the administration of the temple to be handed over to the Joint Commissioner (HRCE).
3. The fact remains that more than *prima facie* evidence of encroachment exists and the administration of the temple was taken over by the fit person appointed as early as on 25.10.2024. There is also an allegation of malfeasance by the petitioner.
4. Accordingly, we dispose of this Special Leave Petition by directing the official respondents to conduct a detailed enquiry after hearing both the parties, including the petitioner concerned.
5. The final decision would be made after the consideration of the contentions of the fit person as against the right of the petitioner to administer the temple. Appropriate orders will have to be passed within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
6. We make it clear that the observation(s) made by the High Court being *prima facie* in nature will have no bearing in the aforesaid proceedings.
7. The statement made by the counsel for the petitioner that the construction put up would be removed stands recorded.

8. The Special Leave Petition is disposed of, accordingly, with the aforesaid directions.

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

CONMT.PET.(C) NO. 65/2026:

Contempt Petition is closed in terms of the signed order, which is placed on file.

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

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

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR