



C.R.P(MD)No.2148 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 06.08.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.(MD)No.2148 of 2026

and

C.M.P(MD)No.10280 of 2026

1.Saraswathi
2.Parvathy

.. Petitioners

Vs.

1.M/s Suchi Agro Private Ltd.
rep. by its Managing Director,
Mr.T.Thiyagarajan
No.9/4, 2nd Main Road,
Nehru Nagar, Adayar,
Chennai.

2.Jeyamuniyandi
3.V.Muruganandam
4.R.V.Rengaraj
5.J.Mahesh

6.The Tahsildar,
Taluk Office,
Kodaikanal,
Dindigul District.

7.Vasanthi

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the fair and decreetal order in I.A.No. 2 of 2024 in O.S.No.150 of 2007 dated 04.03.2026 on the file of District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate No.1, Kodaikanal.



C.R.P(MD)No.2148 of 2026

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Muniyandi

For Respondents : Mr.L.Siva
Govt. Advocate (Civil) for R6

ORDER

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the trial Court allowing the application filed by the first respondent company seeking its impleadment as a party defendant in the suit.

2.The petitioners herein filed a suit for declaration of title, permanent injunction and mandatory injunction against the respondents 2 to 7. Pending the suit, the first respondent herein filed an application seeking to implead themselves as a party defendant, claiming right over certain items of the suit properties, namely the properties situated in Survey Nos.1022/5, 1022/7 and 1021/2.

3.According to the first respondent, the subject properties originally belonged to one Balasundara Iyer, who sold the same in favour of Raja Chidambara Reddiar. Thereafter, Raja Chidambara Reddiar settled the properties in favour of Mooka Reddiar under a registered settlement deed dated 06.04.1969. After the demise of Mooka Reddiar, his legal representatives, Chandrasekaran and



C.R.P(MD)No.2148 of 2026

WEB COPY

Selvarani, represented through their Power of Attorney Agent, Devaraj, sold the properties in favour of the first respondent company. It was further stated that the petitioners/plaintiffs claim right over the suit properties through their father, who is said to have acquired the same under an oral partition. Therefore, according to the first respondent, they are the true owner of the properties comprised in the above survey numbers. It was also contended that, without impleading the first respondent, the petitioners are attempting to obtain a decree against the other respondents. Accepting the said contention, the trial Court allowed the impleading application. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners have come before this Court.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners vehemently contended that the first respondent claims right over the suit properties under the settlement deed dated 06.04.1969 executed in favour of Mooka Reddiar and that the said claim of the first respondent was negated by judgment and decree passed in O.S. No. 241 of 1996 by the District Munsif Court, Kodaikanal.

5.A perusal of the judgment in O.S. No.241 of 1996 would indicate that the present impleading petitioner was not a party to the said suit. Therefore, the findings rendered therein cannot



WEB COPY

automatically bind them. Further, the survey numbers in respect of which the first respondent now claims title were not at all included in the above mentioned suit.

6. When this point was referred to, the learned counsel for the petitioners attempted to contend that only the old survey numbers were mentioned in the earlier suit and that the first respondent has now referred to the corresponding new survey numbers. However, no correlation register or any other material has been produced by the petitioners to substantiate the said contention. In any event, since the first respondent was not a party to the earlier suit, the findings rendered therein cannot be held to be binding on him. Hence, this Court is unable to accept the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

7. Further, the first respondent claims title over certain items of the suit properties under registered documents. If the petitioners seek to impeach the validity of those documents, it is for them to adduce appropriate evidence and establish their case. Such an exercise can be undertaken only in the course of a full-fledged trial. Therefore, this Court finds no error or infirmity in the order passed by the trial Court allowing the impleading application filed by the first respondent.



C.R.P(MD)No.2148 of 2026

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

06.08.2026

Index :Yes / No
Internet :Yes / No
NCC :Yes / No
skn

To

1. The District Munsif-cum-
Judicial Magistrate No.1, Kodaikanal.

2. The Section Officer,
VR Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2148 of 2026

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

skn

C.R.P.(MD)No.2148 of 2026
and
C.M.P(MD)No.10280 of 2026

06.08.2026