



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-07-2026

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

CRP No. 2931 of 2025

&

C.M.P. No. 16523 of 2025

1. G. Rani

G. Kathiravan (Died)

2. G. Mahendran

G. Saravanan (Died)

3. G. Vezhavendhan

4. Mrs. K. Bala @ Boologam

5. Ms. Keerthika

6. Mrs.S. Hemalatha

7. Ms.S. Padmapriya

8. Ms.S. Kaviya

..Petitioners

Vs.

1. Mr.V. Srinivasan

Smt. V. Kamala (Died)

2. Mr.V.Manoharan

3. Mr.G. Gnani

4. Smt. V. Malliga



5. Smt. V. Vasantha

6. Smt. V. Ezhilarasi

7. Smt. V. Vijayalakshmi

8. Smt. V. Radha

9. Smt. R. Uma Maheswari

10. Smt. V. Malathi

..Respondents

Prayer: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the order dated 25.06.2025 passed in I.A. No. 12 of 2025 in O.S. No. 192 of 2009 by the District Munsif Court at Chengalpattu.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.T.Paranthaman

For Respondent(s): Mr.T.Thiyagarajan

ORDER

This civil revision petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 25.06.2025 passed by the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu in I.A. No. 12 of 2025 in O.S. No. 192 of 2009.

2. By the aforesaid order, the application filed by the respondents/defendants in I.A. No. 12 of 2025 seeking leave of the Trial Court to file documents has been allowed. While allowing the said application, the Trial Court has made it clear that the objections of the petitioners/plaintiffs with regard to the receipt of documents filed by the respondents/defendants have to be noted at the time of marking of documents and the validity of the objection




will be decided at the time of judgment. However, aggrieved by the said order, the petitioners/plaintiffs have filed this civil revision petition.

WEB COPY

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that contrary to the pleadings in the written statement filed by the respondents/defendants, the respondents/defendants have sought leave to file documents, which alter the character of the defence of respondents/defendants in the suit, which is not legally permissible. The suit has been filed for specific performance, re-conveyance of possession and for permanent injunction by the petitioners/plaintiffs. The respondents/defendants have disputed the contentions of the petitioners/plaintiffs through their written statement filed before the Trial Court. After the examination of witnesses on the side of the petitioners, namely, P.W.s 1 and 2, the respondents/defendants had filed I.A. No. 12 of 2025 seeking leave of the Trial Court to file documents on their behalf since according to them, the said documents got misplaced at the time of filing of the written statement. The petitioners/plaintiffs filed their counter to the said I.A.. By the impugned order dated 25.06.2025, the Trial Court has allowed I.A. No. 12 of 2025 granting leave to the respondents/defendants to file documents and has also protected the interest of the petitioners/plaintiffs by making it very clear that the documents are allowed to be received and marked as exhibits only subject to their proof and relevancy.

4. This Court does not find any infirmity in the reasons given by the learned District Munsif, Chengalpattu, while allowing the application in I.A.



No. 12 of 2025 filed by the respondents/defendants as the interest of the petitioners/plaintiffs has been adequately protected.


WEB COPY

5. When this Court expressed its view that this Court is not going to interfere with the impugned order, learned counsel for the petitioners/plaintiffs would submit that at the time of marking of documents produced by the respondents/defendant as exhibits, through their witnesses, the objections of petitioners/plaintiffs must be recorded by the Trial Court and thereafter, the trial could be proceeded with.

6. No prejudice will be caused if the request of the learned counsel for the petitioners/plaintiffs is acceded to, by this Court.

7. Learned counsel for respondents/defendants has also not raised any serious objection for issuing such a direction without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the respondents/defendants in the main suit.

8. Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, this Court is not interfering with the impugned order. But, at the same time, this Court directs the Trial Court, namely, the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu, to record the objections of the petitioners/plaintiffs when the documents produced by the respondents/defendants are marked as exhibits on their side and thereafter, proceed with the trial and dispose of the suit on merits and in accordance with law, after giving due consideration to the contentions of both parties. Since the suit is of the year 2009 and it is at the stage of defendants' side evidence, this Court directs the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu, to dispose of the suit in



O.S. No. 192 of 2009 within a period of 8 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

WEB COPY

9. The civil revision petition is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

Connected C.M.P. is closed.

16-07-2026

nv

To
The District Munsif Court,
Chengalpattu.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 2931 of 2025



ABDUL QUDDHOSE J.

nv

CRP No. 2931 of 2025

16-07-2026