



CRP(MD)No.296 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 11/08/2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA

CRP(MD)No.296 of 2024

and

CMP(MD)No.1347 of 2024

K.Rajangam : Petitioner/Appellant/Respondent/
Respondent

Vs.

1.Mahadoom Bahrudeen
2.Kalaikabeevi Bahrudeen
3.Aysha Fathima Bahrudeen
4.Bilal Abdullah
5.Kathija Rahima Bahrudeen : Respondents/Respondents/
Petitioners/Petitioners

PRAYER: This Civil Revision has been filed under Section 25 of the Tamil Nadu Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1960, against the fair and decreetal order, dated 13/03/2023 made in RCA No.4 of 2017 on the file of the Sub Court, Ramanathapuram, confirming the fair and decreetal order, dated 19/06/2017 made in I.A No.34 of 2014 in RCOP No.5 of 2014 on the file of the Rent Controller/District Munsif Court, Ramanathapuram.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Vakeeswaran

For Respondents : Mr.V.Geroge Raja



CRP(MD)No.296 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed against the fair and decreetal order, dated 13/03/2023, made in RCA No.4 of 2017 on the file of the Sub Court, Ramanathapuram, confirming the fair and decreetal order, dated 19.06.2017 made in I.A.No.34 of 2014 in RCOP No.5 of 2014 on the file of the Rent Controller/District Munsif Court, Ramanathapuram.

2.The contention of the petitioner is that the respondents filed the RCOP for arrears of rent and, while the matter was pending, I.A.No.34 of 2014 under Sections 11(3) and 11(4) of the Tamil Nadu Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act has been filed seeking payment of the arrears of rent. The same was allowed by the trial Court with a direction to the petitioner/tenant to deposit the entire arrears of rent. The petitioner further stated that aggrieved by the said order, he filed an RCA, which came to be dismissed. Hence, the present Civil Revision Petition has been filed.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is not a tenant under the respondents and that his original



CRP(MD)No.296 of 2024

owner is one Brama Krishna Raja Rajeswari. He further submitted that there was a title dispute between the respondents and his erstwhile owner and that the respondents filed O.S.No.1 of 2008 before the Sub Court, Ramanathapuram. In view of the above circumstances, he prayed for allowing the revision.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the respondents contended that the order of the Rent Controller is only to direct the petitioner to deposit the entire arrears of rent before the Court and that the deposited amount can be withdrawn by the person in whose favour the suit is ultimately decreed. He further stated that O.S.No.1 of 2008, on the file of the Sub Court, Ramanathapuram, has now ended in their favour. He further submitted that the order of the trial Court is in order and does not require any interference by this Court.

5.This Court finds no error in the order of the trial Court. The trial Court has only directed the petitioner to deposit the arrears of rent before the Court, as he has admitted that he is a tenant. It is his duty to deposit the rent and he cannot wait till the title dispute is decided by the competent Civil Court. Now, the suit has also ended in favour of the



CRP(MD)No.296 of 2024

respondents. Hence, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the order of the trial Court.

6.In the result, this Civil Revision Petition is **dismissed**. The petitioner is directed to deposit the entire arrears of rent from July 2002 till the date of the petition, within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, failing which, the eviction order passed by the trial Court shall stand confirmed. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

11.08.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
NCC : Yes / No
er

To,

- 1.The Sub Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
- 2.The District Munsif,
Ramanathapuram.



CRP(MD)No.296 of 2024

R.POORNIMA, J.

er

CRP(MD)No.296 of 2024

11/08/2026