



CRP.No.5117 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21-08-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

Civil Revision Petition No. 5117 of 2026
& CMP No. 22355 of 2026

N.Paramasivam (Died)
N.Sivalingam(Died)

1. P.Krishnkumari,
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram Taluk.
2. P.Rajaganapathy
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram Taluk.
3. P.Sudhagar
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram Taluk.

P.Govardhanan(Died)

4. P.Priya
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,



CRP.No.5117 of 2026

WEB COPY

Kanchipuram Taluk.

Vs

...Petitioners

1. Arulmighu Ekambaranathar Temple
Rep.by its Executive Officer,
Sri Ekambranathar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram Town and District.
2. S.Vanaja
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram Taluk.
3. S.Mala
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram Taluk.
4. S.Bhavani
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram Taluk.
5. S.Saravanan
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram Taluk.
6. S.Senthil
No.145/61, M/1,
Ekambarar North Mada Street,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram Taluk.

...Respondents



CRP.No.5117 of 2026

WEB COPY

PETITION under Article 227 of The Constitution of India against the fair and decretal order dated 04.8.2026 passed in I.A. No.17 of 2026 in O.S.No.420 of 2010 on the file of the Additional District Munsif Court at Kanchipuram and set aside the same by directing the impleadment of the respondents 2 to 6 herein as defendants 8 to 12 in O.S.No.420 of 2010.

For Petitioners: Ms.T.Dharani

ORDER

This civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of The Constitution of India against the order dated 04.8.2026 passed in I.A.No.17 of 2026 in O.S.No.420 of 2010 on the file of the Additional District Munsif Court at Kanchipuram (for short, the Court below) wherein the application filed by the defendants under Order I Rule 10(2) of the Civil Procedure Code (CPC) to implead the proposed defendants namely defendants 8 to 12 in the said suit came to be dismissed.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners.



CRP.No.5117 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. This Court has carefully considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the materials available on record and more particularly the impugned order.

4. The first respondent herein, who is the plaintiff, filed the said suit seeking for the relief of delivery of possession and mandatory injunction for removal of the superstructure.

5. In the said suit, I.A.No.17 of 2026 came to be filed by the defendants for impleading the proposed parties as defendants 8 to 12 on the ground that they were necessary parties to the proceedings and that they were the co-owners of the suit property. However, the Court below dismissed the said application by the impugned order. Aggrieved by that, the above civil revision petition has been filed before this Court.

6. The main ground that has been raised on the side of the petitioners is that the petitioners' predecessor in interest namely one Mr.Paramasivam was served with notice only in 2014, that the petitioners were brought on record in the year 2025, that the



CRP.No.5117 of 2026

WEB COPY

proposed defendants are the co-owners of the suit property, that they are necessary parties to the proceedings and that therefore, there is no reason for the Court below to dismiss the said application.

7. The Court below has taken into consideration the facts that the suit is of the year 2010, that the existing defendants are already prosecuting the said suit and that nearly after 16 years, the said application has been filed seeking to implead the other defendants on the ground that they were co-owners of the suit property. The Court below found that the said application has been filed only to drag on the proceedings and that the proposed defendants were not necessary parties to the said suit.

8. In the considered view of this Court, the impugned order passed by the Court below does not suffer from any perversity warranting the interference of this Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 227 of The Constitution of India. The petitioners are already defending the said suit. When they defend their case, they can also do so for the other co-owners. The said suit



CRP.No.5117 of 2026

WEB COPY

was filed in 2010 and nearly after 16 years if new parties are going to be impleaded in the said suit on one ground or the other, there is no chance for the disposal of the said suit in the near future. When it comes to delay in civil proceedings, a time has come where the Courts will have to be very stringent and should not pass orders as a matter of course unless there are sufficient reasons explaining the delay.

9. In the light of the above discussions, the above civil revision petition is dismissed. The Court below is directed to dispose of O.S.No.420 of 2010 within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Consequently, the connected CMP is also dismissed.

21-08-2026

To
The Additional District Munsif
Court, Kancheepuram.

RS



WEB COPY



CRP.No.5117 of 2026

N.ANAND VENKATESH,J

RS

**CRP.No.5117 of 2026&
CMP.No.22355 of 2026**

21-08-2026

Page 7 of 7