



C.R.P(MD)No.2219 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 11.08.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

C.R.P(MD)No.2219 of 2026

and

C.M.P(MD)No.10602 of 2026

1.Manthiri Kumar

2.Rajasekaran

3.Karthick

4.Chinnappa

5.Muthukamatchi

... Petitioner(s)

- Vs. -

1.Arumugam (Died)

1.Padma

2.Gomathi

3. Karikalan

4. Revathy

5. Adhavan

6. Amutharani

Page 1 of 5



C.R.P(MD)No.2219 of 2026

7. Bharsha Beevi

8. N. Yakat Ali

9. N. Mansoor Ali

10. N. Thajudeen

11. S. Kalandar Beevi

12. N. Shakila Bani

... Respondent(s)

Prayer : Civil Revision Petition filed under Section 115 of Civil Procedure Code, to call for the records relating with the fair and decreetal order 28.04.2026 made in E.A. No. 08/2026 in E.A. No. 05/2024 in E.P. No. 23/2023 in O.S. No. 371/1993 on the file of the Sub Court, Aranthangi and set aside the same and thus render justice.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Suriya Narayanan

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioners, who are the third parties to the proceedings in E.A.No.05 of 2024, filed for taking delivery of the suit property. The petitioner claims to be the owner of the property situated in Survey No.101/4 and has filed an obstruction petition in E.A.No.08 of 2026, objecting to the delivery of possession of the said property.



C.R.P(MD)No.2219 of 2026

2.At the stage of admission, notice need not be issued to the other side, as no adverse order is going to be passed against the respondents. Hence, the petition is taken up for consideration at the admission stage itself.

3.It is the contention of the petitioners that the respondents 2 to 7 and 8 to 14 have obtained a collusive decree and during the pendency of the execution proceedings, they sought permission to produce certain documents. The Trial Court, without assigning any sufficient or substantial reason, allowed the said petition after a considerable lapse of time. Therefore, according to the petitioner, the respondents are not entitled to rely upon the documents sought to be produced pursuant to the order passed in E.A.No.8 of 2026. Hence, the petitioner has filed the present petition.

4.On perusal of the petition and the order passed in E.A.No.8 of 2025 in E.A.No.5 of 2024 in E.P.No.23 of 2023 in O.S.No.371 of 1993, it is seen that the petitioners, who are the defendants in the original suit, filed a petition seeking permission to mark certain documents. The list of documents reveals that they sought to produce only certified copies of certain documents, viz., Adangal, Chitta, Encumbrance Certificate, etc., which are either Government records or registered document. The learned Trial Court, considering the nature of the documents, permitted the petitioners to mark the same. It is well settled that mere



C.R.P(MD)No.2219 of 2026

marking of a document does not, by itself, amount to proof of its contents. The petitioner ought to have appeared before the Trial Court and contested the said petition by raising all permissible objections, including with regard to the belated production of the documents, and sought to establish that the documents were irrelevant or otherwise inadmissible. Therefore, the reasons stated in the present revision petition do not disclose any valid or substantial ground warranting interference with the order passed by the Trial Court. This Court finds no merit in the present revision petition. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is not maintainable and is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

11.08.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
NS

To

1. The Sub Court, Aranthangi.

R.POORNIMA, J.

Page 4 of 5



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.2219 of 2026

Ns

C.R.P(MD)No.2219 of 2026
and
C.M.P(MD)No.10602 of 2026

11.08.2026