



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON : 31.07.2026

PRONOUNCED ON : 19.08.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

and

C.M.P.(MD)No.8823 of 2026

Chinnammal (Died)

Dharmaraj (Died)

1.Muthulakshmi

2.Sudhakar

3.Mathankumar

... Petitioners

(Cause title is accepted vide Court order

dated 08.07.2026 made in C.M.P.(MD)

No.969/2026 in C.R.P.(MD)No.SR.101614/2025)

Vs.

1. S.Eswari

2. Karuppathal

3. Kaliathal

4.Vellathai

... Respondents

Prayer: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the Non Speaking and Cryptic Judgment and Decree made in O.S.No.408 of 2001 on the file of the learned Subordinate Court, Palani now redesignated as Principal Subordinate Court, Palani, dated



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

08.03.2005 and to order for restoration of the suit for conducting de-nova fresh trial of the same.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Meenakshi Sundaram,
Senior Counsel for
Mr.R.Thangapandian

For Respondents : Mr.S.Anand Chandrasekar for
Mr.C.M.Mari Chelliah Prabu for R1

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed seeking to set aside the judgment and decree passed in O.S.No.408 of 2001 on the file of the learned Subordinate Judge, Palani now redesignated as Principal Sub Court, Palani dated 08.03.2005 and to order restoration of the suit for conducting de-nova fresh trial.

2. The first respondent herein filed a suit seeking specific performance of the agreement dated 05.06.2000 against the mother-in-law of the first petitioner and the grandmother of petitioners 2 and 3 viz., Chinnammal, the husband of the first petitioner and father of the petitioners 2 and 3 viz., Dharmaraj, the first petitioner viz., Muthulakshmi and also



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

respondents 2 to 4. The said suit was decreed *ex parte* on 08.03.2005.

Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners have come before this Court.

3. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the impugned judgment and decree passed by the trial Court is a non-speaking one and hence, the same is liable to be set aside. The learned Senior Counsel by relying on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Balraj Taneja and Another Vs. Sunil Madan and another*** reported in ***(1999) 8 SCC 396*** would submit that impugned judgment does not satisfy the ingredients of Order 20 Rule 4(2) of C.P.C. Further, the learned Senior Counsel submitted that when the judgment passed by the trial Court does not contain any reasons, the same cannot be sustained. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners also relied on a judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***C.N.Ramappa Gowda Vs. C.C.Chandregowda (Dead) By L.Rs. & another*** reported in 2013 (4) CTC 865 and a judgment of this Court in ***S.Baskar Vs. Ranjithkumar*** reported in ***2024 (6) CTC 819*** in support of his contentions.



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the contesting first respondent/plaintiff in the suit would submit that challenging the impugned judgment and decree, which was passed *ex parte*, the above mentioned Dharmaraj, predecessors in interest of petitioners and the 1st petitioner Muthulakshmi filed an application to set aside the *ex parte* decree under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., along with a petition to condone the delay of 1239 days and the said petition was dismissed by the trial Court, by order dated 05.09.2017 and in view of the same, the petitioners are not entitled to invoke supervisory jurisdiction of this Court without challenging the said dismissal order. The learned counsel also submitted that pursuant to the *ex parte* decree passed in the suit, the trial Court also executed a sale deed in favour of the first respondent/plaintiff on 03.09.2007, as the predecessors in interest of the petitioners and the 1st petitioner, who were arrayed as defendants in the suit remained *ex parte* in the execution proceedings also. The learned counsel also submitted that the petitioners, after keeping quite for several years, filed an application to set aside the *ex parte* decree and the same was also dismissed in the year 2017. Thereafter, the petitioners waited for nearly 9 years and then filed the present Revision Petition.



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

Therefore, according to learned counsel appearing for the 1st respondent, the revision is liable to be dismissed on the ground of laches.

5. Order 20 Rule 4(2) of C.P.C., lays down the ingredients of the judgment passed by the Courts other than Court of small causes. The same reads as follows:

“Order 20: Judgment and Decree

1.... 2.... 3....

4. Judgments of Small Cause Courts:

(1)

(2) Judgments of other Courts- Judgments of other Courts shall contain a concise statement of the case, the points for determination, the decision thereon, and the reasons for such decision.”

6. In ***Balraj Taneja's case*** (cited supra), while explaining the necessary ingredients of a judgment, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as follows:

“42. "Judgment" as defined in Section 2(9) of the Code of Civil Procedure means the statement given by the Judge of the grounds for a decree or order. What a judgment should contain is indicated in Order 20, Rule 4 (2) which says that a judgment :



"shall contain a concise statement of the case, the points for determination, the decision thereon and the reasons for such decision."

It should be a self-contained document from which it should appear as to what were the facts of the case and what was the controversy which was tried to be settled by the Court and in what manner. The process of reasoning by which the Court came to the ultimate conclusion and decreed the suit should be reflected clearly in the judgment.

43. In an old case, namely, Nanhe vs. Saiyad Tasadduq Husain (1912) 15 Oudh Cases 78, it was held that passing of a mere decree was a material irregularity within the meaning of Section 115 of the Code and that even if the judgment was passed on the basis of the admission made by the defendant, other requirements which go to constitute "judgment" should be complied with.

44. In Thippaiah and others vs. Kuri Obaiah, ILR 1980 (2) Karnataka 1028, it was laid down that the Court must state the grounds for its conclusion in the judgment and the judgment should be in conformity with the provisions of Section 2(9) of the Code of Civil Procedure. In Dineshwar Prasad Bakshi vs. Parmeshwar Prasad Sinha, AIR 1989 Patna 139, it was held that the judgment pronounced under Order 8 Rule 10 must satisfy the requirements of "judgment" as defined in Section 2(9) of the Code.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

45. *Learned counsel for respondent No. 1 contended that the provisions of Order 20, Rule 4 (2) would apply only to contested cases as it is only in those cases that "the points for determination" as mentioned in this Rule will have to be indicated, and not in a case in which the written statement has not been filed by the defendants and the facts set out in the plaint are deemed to have been admitted. We do not agree. Whether it is a case which is contested by the defendants by filing a written statement, or a case which proceeds ex-parte and is ultimately decided as an ex-parte case, or is a case in which the written statement is not filed and the case is decided under Order 8 Rule 10, the Court has to write a judgment which must be in conformity with the provisions of the Code or at least set out the reasoning by which the controversy is resolved."*

7. The law laid down in ***Balraj Taneja's case*** was reaffirmed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***C.N.Ramappa Gowda Vs. C.C.Chandregowda (Dead) By L.Rs. & another*** reported in **2013 (4) CTC 865**. The relevant observation of the Hon'ble Apex Court reads as follows:

“....

14. *We find sufficient assistance from the apt observations of this Court extracted hereinabove which has held that the effect of non-filing of the written statement and proceeding*



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

to try the suit is clearly to expedite the disposal of the suit and is not penal in nature wherein the defendant has to be penalised for non filing of the written statement by trying the suit in a mechanical manner by passing a decree. We wish to reiterate that in a case where written statement has not been filed, the Court should be a little more cautious in proceeding under Order 8 Rule 10 CPC and before passing a judgement, it must ensure that even if the facts set out in the plaint are treated to have been admitted, a judgement and decree could not possibly be passed without requiring him to prove the fact pleaded in the plaint. It is only when the Court for recorded reasons is fully satisfied that there is no fact which needs to be proved at the instance of the plaintiff in view of the deemed admission by the defendant, the Court can conveniently pass a judgement and decree against the defendant who has not filed the written statement. But, if the plaint itself indicates that there are disputed questions of fact involved in the case arising from the plaint itself giving rise to two versions, it would not be safe for the Court to record an ex parte judgement without directing the plaintiff to prove the facts so as to settle the factual controversy. In that event, the ex parte judgement although may appear to have decided the suit expeditiously, it ultimately gives rise to several layers of appeal after appeal which ultimately compounds the delay in finally disposing of the suit giving rise to multiplicity of proceeding which hardly promotes the cause of speedy trial. However, if the Court is clearly of the view that the plaintiff's case even without any evidence is prima facie unimpeachable and the defendant's approach is clearly a dilatory tactic to delay the passing of a decree, it would be justified in appropriate cases to



pass even an uncontested decree. What would be the nature of such a case ultimately will have to be left to the wisdom and just exercise of discretion by the trial court who is seized of the trial of the suit.”

8. In *Meenakshisundaram Textiles Vs. Valliammal Textiles Ltd., Tiruppur* reported in **(2011) 7 MLJ 652**, a Division Bench of this Court, while dealing with the ingredients of *ex parte* judgment, observed as follows:

“21.....In this context, it may also be mentioned that though a detailed judgment is required in a contested matter, an ex parte judgment should show the application of the minimum requirement of consideration of the pleadings, issues, evidence and the relief sought for rendering such judgment.”

9. A close scanning of above mentioned judgment would make it clear that even in cases where the defendant is set *ex parte*, the trial Court is required to consider the averment in the plaint, necessity of leading evidence to prove the same, sufficiency of evidence let in by the plaintiff and thereafter, determine the points arising for consideration. If the Court ultimately satisfied with the assertion made by the plaintiff and the tenability of the prayer, can pass an *ex parte* decree granting relief to the



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

plaintiff. Therefore, the *ex parte* judgment should necessarily reflect application of mind by the trial Court on the pleadings of the plaintiff, evidence etc.

10. In the case on hand, it is not in dispute that the judgment and decree impugned in the revision does not contain any reasons or discussions for decreeing the suit. Therefore, on the face of it, the ingredients as contained in Order 20 Rule 4(2) of C.P.C., are not satisfied. Now we have to see whether it is a fit case to set aside the *ex parte* decree by exercising the supervisory power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

11. As far as supervisory power of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is concerned, being a constitutional remedy, there is no time limit for invoking the same. Even without formal petition, this Court can *suo motu* exercise the power. Even if there is no limitation for invoking the revisional power of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, a person seeking exercise of supervisory power must approach this Court within reasonable time. A person approaching the



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

Court with long delay must explain the reasons for laches. In case, the laches on the part of the petitioners has not been explained, this Court can very well refuse to exercise its supervisory power. Hence, power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is circumscribed by doctrine of laches.

12. In the case on hand, the *ex parte* decree was passed against the petitioners on 08.03.2005. They approached this Court to set aside the *ex parte* decree by invoking supervisory jurisdiction after 21 years. In the meantime, the *ex parte* decree had been put into execution and in the execution proceedings also, the defendants in the suit, the predecessors in interest of the petitioners and the 1st petitioner remained *ex parte* and as a consequence, the sale deed was executed by Court in favour of the first respondent/decreed holder pursuant to the *ex parte* decree for specific performance as early as 03.09.2007. Therefore, the decree for specific performance was also executed as early as 03.09.2007.

13. The predecessors in interest of the present petitioners namely Dharmaraj and the 1st petitioner, who suffered *ex parte* decree, filed



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

an application to set aside the *ex parte* decree under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., along with a petition to condone the delay of 1239 days in filing such application in I.A.No.34 of 2009. The said application was filed only in the year 2009 nearly after two years from the date of execution of the sale deed in favour of decree holder. The said application was dismissed on 05.09.2017. Neither the petitioners nor the predecessors in interest, who filed I.A.No.34 of 2009, pursued the matter further by challenging the said dismissal order. Hence, the said order had attained finality. Therefore, it is clear that the petitioners' predecessors in interest and the 1st petitioner acquired knowledge about the *ex parte* decree as early as 2009 and filed an application seeking to set aside the same with delay. The delay petition was dismissed. The proceedings initiated by the petitioners' predecessors in interest to set aside the *ex parte* decree has not been pursued further. Therefore, the decree had attained finality long back. After waiting for nearly 9 years, the petitioners want to invoke supervisory jurisdiction of this Court to set aside the *ex parte* decree. Absolutely, there is no justification for the petitioners to wait for nearly 21 years to invoke the supervisory jurisdiction. In fact, they attempted to get the *ex parte* decree set aside by filing Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., petition and that proceedings



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

also ended against them and attained finality. After dismissal of the condone delay petition as aforesaid, the petitioners waited for further period of 9 years and filed the present revision. Therefore, there is a long delay on the part of the petitioners in invoking supervisory jurisdiction of this Court and the long delay has not been explained properly.

14. In *Virudhunagar Hindu Nadargal Dharma Paribalana Sabai & Ors. Vs. Tuticorin Educational Society & Ors.* reported in 2019 INSC 1117, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that when alternative remedy is available before the regular civil Court, the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court shall not be normally exercised and an existence of alternative remedy before the regular civil Court is near total bar for exercise of supervisory jurisdiction. A person aggrieved by the *ex parte* decree has got the remedy of filing a petition under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., to set aside the *ex parte* decree or he can file an appeal challenging the *ex parte* decree under Section 96 of C.P.C., or he can file a review application under Section 114 of C.P.C. In case, *ex parte* decree was obtained by fraud, he can even challenge the same by way of separate suit. Therefore, multiple remedies are available to the person aggrieved by the *ex parte* decree before



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

the regular civil Court under C.P.C. In fact one of such remedy was already availed by the petitioners by filing an application under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., along with condone delay petition and that the said proceedings ended against the petitioners. The order passed by the trial Court dismissing the condone delay petition was not challenged and the same had attained finality. The other remedies like filing an appeal or review application have not been availed by the petitioners. It is not the case of the petitioners that *ex parte* decree was obtained by fraud. Therefore, there is no scope for filing a separate suit. Having availed the alternate remedy under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., the petitioners are not entitled to invoke supervisory jurisdiction of this Court, in the light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Virudhunagar's case* cited supra. Further as explained earlier, there is enormous delay on the part of the petitioners in challenging the *ex parte* decree by invoking the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court and the same has not been satisfactorily explained. Hence, the revision filed by the petitioners is liable to be dismissed on the ground of laches.



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

15. In *Chennichi Alias Parikkal Vs D.A. Srinivasan Chettiar*

reported in (1970) 1 MLJ 234, this Court held that even though the order impugned in the revision is erroneous, this Court is not bound to interfere in revision, if it is shown such interference will result in injustice or miscarriage of justice. The relevant observation reads as follows:

".....The exercise of the revisional powers of the High Court under Section 115, Civil Procedure Code, is purely discretionary. The High Court will not take a technical view and necessarily interfere in every case, where an order is wrong and even improper, if such interference will produce hardship or injustice. The revisional jurisdiction of the Court is intended to secure and subserve and ends of Justice and not to deny or defect it. If interference in a particular case will result in hardship or injustice to a party, the High Court will be justified in refusing to interfere in the exercise of its revisional jurisdiction, even if the order is found to be one without jurisdiction....."

16. In the case on hand, *ex parte* decree was passed in the year 2005. The petitioners made an attempt to set aside the *ex parte* decree by availing alternative remedy available before the civil Court under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., and the order passed by the trial Court dismissing the condone delay petition was not at all challenged. After waiting for several



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

years, the petitioners have chosen to file the revision before this Court.

After passing of *ex parte* decree much water has flown under the bridge.

The *ex parte* decree was put into execution, a registered sale deed was executed in favour of the decree holder by the executing Court due to default of the petitioners even in the execution proceedings. Now after 21 years, the petitioners want to question the *ex parte* decree, which had attained finality long back. If the petitioners are very serious about their alleged rights, they should have invoked supervisory jurisdiction of this Court, at least when they decided to file an application under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C. Having filed an application under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., to set aside the *ex parte* decree, the petitioners are not entitled to invoke supervisory jurisdiction after several years as mentioned earlier. Therefore, this Court feels that interfering with the *ex parte* decree passed by the trial Court, which is impugned in the revision, will cause serious prejudice to the first respondent and it will result in unsettling the settled matters. Since the petitioners failed to approach this Court within reasonable time and also failed to explain the delay of 21 years in invoking supervisory jurisdiction of this Court, I feel that this Civil Revision Petition is liable to be dismissed on the ground of laches.



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

17. In *Balraj Taneja' case* cited by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners an *ex parte* decree was passed by the trial Court. The same was challenged by an aggrieved party by way of a first appeal before the High Court and the same was also dismissed. Challenging the said dismissal order, the aggrieved party approached the Hon'ble Apex Court. In the appeal filed against an *ex parte* decree, the Hon'ble Apex Court interfered with the same on the ground that it failed to satisfy the ingredients of Order 20 Rule 4(2) of C.P.C. In the case on hand, *ex parte* decree was allowed to attain finality. The attempt made by the petitioners to set aside the *ex parte* decree by invoking Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., ended against them. The said order also attained finality. After several years, the petitioners want to invoke supervisory power of this Court to set aside the *ex parte* decree without challenging the decree by filing a regular appeal. Hence, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the *ex parte* decree which was passed long back.

18. In *C.N.Ramappa Gowda's case* cited by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners an *ex parte* decree was passed by the



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

trial Court and the same was challenged by way of a regular appeal. The first appellate Court, having noted that the ingredients of Order 20 Rule 4(2) have not been satisfied, set aside the trial Court's *ex parte* judgment and decree and remanded the matter. The said remand order was questioned before the Hon'ble Apex Court. In such circumstances, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the order passed by the first appellate Court setting aside the *ex parte* decree for its failure to satisfy necessary ingredients of Order 20 Rule 4(2) of C.P.C., was justified. In the case on hand, as mentioned earlier, the *ex parte* decree has not been questioned by filing a regular appeal. The attempt made by the petitioners to set it aside by invoking Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., failed long back. After allowing the decree to attain finality, the petitioners want to set aside the *ex parte* decree after several years. Therefore, the facts of the case are different from the facts in ***C.N.Ramappa Gowda's case***.

19. In ***Meenakshisundaram Textiles' case*** cited supra, an *ex parte* decree was passed by the trial Court. Then the aggrieved defendant filed an application to set aside the *ex parte* decree under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C. The said application was dismissed by the trial Court on



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

the ground that the defendant failed to make out a ground to set aside the *ex parte* decree. The said dismissal order was questioned in an appeal before the regular first appellate Court viz., this Court. In the regular appeal against the order dismissing the petition under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., this Court was inclined to interfere with the judgment and decree and set aside the same as it failed to satisfy the ingredients of Order 20 Rule 4(2) of C.P.C. The distinguishing feature of the case on hand is that the petitioners failed in their attempt to set aside the *ex parte* decree by filing petition under Order 9 Rule 13 of C.P.C., with delay. They allowed the *ex parte* decree to attain finality. After very long time, they questioned it by invoking supervisory jurisdiction. Therefore, the facts of the case in ***Meenakshisundaram Textiles' case*** is different from the facts of the present case.

20. In ***Baskar's case*** relied on by the learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioners, this Court set aside the *ex parte* decree by invoking supervisory jurisdiction. However, in the said case, the laches on the part of petitioners therein has not been considered. Further in the case on hand, *ex parte* decree was put into execution and the same was also



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

executed by execution of sale deed by the Court in favour of the decree holder. The execution of the sale in favour of the decree holder was done on 03.09.2007. After more than 19 years, the petitioners want to set aside the *ex parte* decree. Therefore, this is a fit and proper case to dismiss the revision filed by the petitioners on the ground of laches. Hence, in the peculiar facts of the present case, this Court does not want to interfere with the decree passed against the petitioners.

21. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners relied on a judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Krishna Kumar Ojha and others Vs. Jitendra Chaudhary & Ors*** reported in **2026 INSC 662** for the proposition that delay or law of limitation cannot be used as a means to defeat the substantive rights of the parties. A close scrutiny of the facts of the said case would indicate that a compromise decree was questioned by 5th defendant in that suit after several years on the ground of fraud. It was the case of the 5th defendant that he did not sign the compromise alleged to have entered between the parties, based on which compromise decree was passed. Having satisfied with the plea of fraud alleged, the trial Court set aside the compromise decree. The appeal filed by the plaintiff therein



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

before the High Court was also dismissed. In further appeal to the Hon'ble Apex Court, it was argued that there was long delay in challenging the compromise decree. However, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the compromise decree was not signed by the 5th defendant and hence, the same could not be allowed to stand and set aside it. On the facts of the said case, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that the 5th defendant did not sign the compromise decree and his counsel acted without his instructions. Since the party, who questioned the compromise decree, not even signed it, the Hon'ble Apex Court was pleased to affirm the order passed by the trial Court as well as the High Court allowing the petition to set aside the compromise decree.

22. In the case on hand, absolutely there is no plea of fraud. There is no fault on the part of the first respondent/decree holder. She promptly examined the witnesses and produced documents in support of her case. There is a fault on the part of the Court in not writing the judgment satisfying the ingredients of Order 20 Rule 4(2) of C.P.C. It is settled law that the act of the Court shall not prejudice anybody. The fault on the part of the trial Court cannot be put against the first respondent-



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

plaintiff, who examined witnesses and produced document in support of her claim. The petitioners herein, having allowed the decree to attain finality, are not entitled to invoke the supervisory jurisdiction after several years. Since there is no allegation of fraud against the first respondent, the above mentioned case law relied on by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners is also not useful to them.

23. In *S.Nagaraj and Ors. Vs. State of Karnataka and Ors.* reported in *1993 Supp (4) SCC 595 equivalent to MANU/SC/0797/1993*, while explaining the anxiety of the Court to undo injustice or prevent miscarriage of justice, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as follows:

"18. Justice is a virtue which transcends all barriers. Neither the Rules of procedure nor technicalities of law can stand in its way. The order of the Court should not be prejudicial to anyone...."

24. In the case on hand, the trial court has committed an error in not delivering the judgment by adhering to the ingredients as contained in Order 20 Rule 4(2) of CPC. The object behind the said provision is that the judgment shall contain reasonings for the conclusions to enable the



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

superior forum to understand the justifiable reasons for conclusions reached by the trial Court. In the absence of reasoning in the judgment, the correctness of the same cannot be tested before the superior forum. Therefore, the procedural law mandates, the judgment shall contain a concise statement of the case, the points for determination, the decision there on and the reasons for such decision. In case the said mandate under Order 20 Rule 4(2) of C.P.C., has not been adhered to, the appellate or superior forum will not be in a position to test the correctness of the conclusions and it will cause prejudice to the party filing an appeal. In the case on hand, the petitioners herein, for the reasons well known to them, failed to file any appeal challenging the *ex parte* judgment and decree passed against them. Therefore, absolutely there was no occasion for the superior forum to test the correctness of the same and the *ex parte* judgment has been allowed to attain finality. In the absence of any appeal filed by the petitioners challenging the *ex parte* decree, the *ex parte* judgment passed by the trial Court without adhering to the ingredients of the above said Rule will not cause any prejudice to the petitioners. On the other hand, as I mentioned earlier much water has flown under the bridge, after the *ex parte* decree. In fact, pursuant to the the *ex parte* decree for specific



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

performance, a sale deed was executed in favour of the first respondent/decree holder as early as 03.09.2007. After waiting for 19 years, the petitioners want to take advantage of the technicalities, rules of procedure and attempts to challenge the decree by invoking supervisory power. If this Court chooses to interfere in revision, in the present case, it will certainly result in grave injustice to the first respondent/decree holder, who got the sale deed executed pursuant to the decree long back. Therefore, I feel that it is not a fit case to invoke the revisional jurisdiction on the technical points raised by the petitioners.

25. In the light of the above discussions, I am not inclined to exercise the supervisory jurisdiction in favour of the petitioners and accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected civil miscellaneous petition is also closed.

19.08.2026

Index : Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes

vsm



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

To

1. The Principal Subordinate Court, Palani.
2. The Section Officer

VR Section, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

vsm

Order made in
C.R.P.(MD)No.1821 of 2026

19.08.2026