



C.R.P.(PD)(MD)No.1824 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 17.07.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.(PD)(MD)No.1824 of 2026

and

C.M.P.(MD)No.4694 of 2023

1. Seenipappa
2. Annalakshmi
3. Ashokkumar, ... Petitioners

Vs

Bheemaraja ... Respondent

PRAYER: Civil revision petition filed under Article 227 of the constitution of India to call for the entire records, and set aside the Judgment and Decree dated 23.02.2026 made against I.A.No. 7 of 2025 in O.S.No. 36 of 2021 pending on the file of the District Munsif, Theni, within the stipulated time frame as fixed by this Court.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Vidhyaa Sagar



C.R.P.(PD)(MD)No.1824 of 2026

ORDER


WEB COPY

This Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the trial Court partly dismissing the application filed by the petitioners seeking permission of the Court to re-open the case and produce certain documents.

2. The respondent herein filed a suit for bare injunction against the petitioners claiming possession over the suit property and alleging illegal interference by the petitioners.

3. The petitioners filed a written statement and resisting the suit on the ground that they are in possession of the suit property. After closure of evidence, the petitioners filed the instant application seeking to reopen the case and to receive 39 documents, which were not filed along with the written statement.

4. By the impugned order, the trial Court allowed the re-open application and permitted reception of 15 documents. However, the trial Court rejected 24 documents filed by the petitioners and aggrieved by the same, the present revision petition has been filed.



C.R.P.(PD)(MD)No.1824 of 2026

5. Though the revision was filed aggrieved by rejection of 24 documents by the trial court, at the time of arguments, the learned counsel for the petitioners confined his argument to rejection of four documents namely, Document Nos.13, 25, 27 and 19.

6. A perusal of document No.13 unregistered agreement allegedly entered between the husband of the first defendant and the plaintiff would indicate that there is no reference about the delivery of possession in the said agreement. In such circumstances, the reception of the said document will not help the petitioners in any way to substantiate their defence in the suit. Document Nos.25 and 27 are receipts issued by the shops for purchase of certain goods by the petitioners. The mentioning of the survey number and the extent of the property in the receipts issued to the petitioners for purchase of goods/services appear to be very unnatural and the same will not help them in any way to prove their physical possession over the property. Document No.19 is also a sale agreement between the husband of the first defendant and one Annamaraja. In the said document, there is no reference about the delivery of possession of the property. Therefore, the same is also not helpful to prove the alleged physical possession of the petitioners over the suit property. Since all these four documents relied on by the



C.R.P.(PD)(MD)No.1824 of 2026

petitioners are not useful to decide the controversy involved in the lis, I don't find anything to interfere with the impugned order passed by the trial Court.

7. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed.

No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

17.07.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
vsm



C.R.P.(PD)(MD)No.1824 of 2026

WEB COPY To

1. The District Munsif, Theni.
2. The Section Officer,
VR Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(PD)(MD)No.1824 of 2026

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

vsm

C.R.P.(PD)(MD)No.1824 of 2026

17.07.2026