



WEB COPY



CRP No. 1475 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 1475 of 2026 and CMP No.7039 of 2026

1. R.Perumal

S/o. Late. Rajavel No. 343, Melandai Street
Kamakkor Village and Post Arni Taluk
Tiruvannamalai Dist.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. K.T.Rajagopal

S/o. Late. Thulasi Chettiyar Devanga-
Chettiyar Manufacturers of Handloom Silk
Sarees Under the name and style of
K.T.RAJAGOPAL having off at No. 2/72A,
Amman Koil St, Onnupuram 632315 Arni
Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.

Respondent(s)

Civil Revision filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to set aside the order and decreetal order dated 07.01.2026 made in I.A.No.2 of 2024 in O.S.No.132 of 2020 on the file of Subordinate Court, Arni, Tiruvannamalai District.



CRP No. 1475 of 2020

For Petitioner(s): Mr.N.Saravanan
For M/s Arulselvam Associates

For Respondent(s): M/s.P.Satheesh Kumar

ORDER

Challenging the order passed in I.A.No.2 of 2024, the defendant has filed the present revision.

2. Before the trial Court, the defendant has filed an application in I.A.No.2 of 2024 seeking for production of bank statements of the plaintiff and his wife Santha from 01.01.2016 till the date of filing of the petition. The trial Court dismissed the application. Aggrieved by the same, the defendant has preferred the above revision.

3. Learned counsel for the revision petitioner/defendant submits that the labourers belonging to the revision petitioner/defendant were abused by the plaintiff and the plaintiff straight away dealt with the defendant's labourers, continued their weaving work and paid labour charges to them who are originally belong to the revision petitioner/defendant and therefore, only to prove the same the revision petitioner/defendant seeks production of the bank statement of the respondent/plaintiff



CRP No. 1475 of 2020

and his wife Santha from 01.01.2016 till the date of filing of the petition. But, the trial Court failed to give such opportunity and dismissed the application. Aggrieved by the same, the defendant has filed the above revision.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff submits that the revision petitioner/defendant in the written statement has not raised any such objection stating that the plaintiff has straight away dealt with the defendant's labourers and paid labour charges to them. Learned counsel also submits that the defendant has not specifically stated about the bank statement. Therefore, the trial court has rightly dismissed the application, which requires no interference.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. The plaintiff filed a suit in O.S.No.132 of 2020, in which. the respondent/plaintiff is claiming a sum of Rs.3,79,300/- being the balance under the first, third, fourth, sixth, seventh, ninth and tenth weaving accounts from the revision petitioner/defendant. According to the revision petitioner/defendant, labourers belong to



CRP No. 1475 of 2020

the revision petitioner/defendant were taken by the plaintiff and the plaintiff straight away dealt with the defendant's labourers, continued their weaving work and paid labour charges to them and amount is transferred to their account and only to prove that, the revision petitioner/defendant seeks production of bank statement. If opportunity is not given to the revision petitioner/defendant, the valuable right to defend the case will be defeated.

7. Further, in the affidavit, the revision petitioner/defendant has categorically stated that the plaintiff and his wife Santha have sent money to the individuals viz., Rajkumar, Sivaperumal, Kumar, Ashok and Suresh, who are labourers and to prove the transaction, the revision petitioner/defendant sought for production of bank statement. In order to prove the same, the bank statement is necessary. But, the trial Court failed to give such opportunity.

8. In the light of the above, the order passed by the trial Court in I.A.No.2 of 2024 is set aside and the civil revision petition is allowed. The revision petitioner/defendant is directed to give notice to the plaintiff to produce the documents/bank statements. If documents/bank statements are not produced, then,



CRP No. 1475 of 2020

adverse inference can be drawn in the manner known to law.

WEB COPY

9. The trial court is directed to dispose of O.S.No.132 of 2020 on merits and in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.04.2026

sr

Index:yes/no

Website:yes/no

Speaking Order/Non-speaking Order

To

The Subordinate Court, Arni, Tiruvannamalai District.



WEB COPY



CRP No. 1475 of 2026

T.V.THAMILSELVI.,J

sr

CRP No. 1475 of 2026

27.04.2026