



WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 02.07.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

C.M.P(MD)Nos.2450 and 2451 of 2026

in

Rev.Aplc.(MD).SR.Nos.104106 and 104107 of 2025

1.Ashika Mariam Beevi (died)

2.Syed Raja Mohamed

3.Regumathu Nishar

4.Fathima Rahana

... Petitioners
in both petitions

Vs

1.M.I.Sultan Syed Murdha Khan

M.I.Syed Abubakkar (Died)

2.Sirin Fathima

3.Fathima Jumana

4.Mamamootha Beevi

1/5



WEB COPY

5.Jahira Banu

... Respondents
in both petitions

PRAYER in Review Petition (MD).SR.No.104106 and 104107 of 2025:

Petitions filed under Section 114 and Order 47 Rules 1 and 2 of CPC as against the order passed by his Lordship the Hon'ble Mr.Justice M.Dhandapani in CRP.(MD).Nos.2136 and 2137 of 2022, dated 11.08.2025 on the file of this Court.

PRAYER in CMP.(MD).Nos.2450 and 2451 of 2026: Petitions filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act to condone the delay in filing 42 days in the above review petition.

For Petitioner : Mr.H.Thayumanasamy
(In both petitions)

COMMON ORDER

These Petitions have been filed to condone the delay of 42 days in filing the above review applications against the order passed in C.R.P. (MD).Nos.2136 and 2137 of 2022 dated 11.08.2025.



WEB COPY 2. The petitioners are the plaintiffs in O.S. No.16 of 2025 on the file of the Additional District Court, Ramanathapuram. The suit has been instituted for partition. After completion of the trial, when the matter was posted for arguments, the petitioners filed I.A.Nos.153 and 155 of 2022 seeking to reopen the case and to amend the plaint by incorporating a prayer for declaration that the settlement deed in question is null and void. The Trial Court allowed the said interlocutory applications. Aggrieved by the same, the first respondent preferred C.R.P.(MD) Nos.2136 and 2137 of 2022 before this Court. By a common order dated 11.08.2025, this Court allowed the above Civil Revision Petitions. The present Review Applications have been presented with a delay of 42 days seeking review of the order dated 11.08.2025. A review petition is maintainable only on the grounds contemplated under Order XLVII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, namely, discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within the knowledge of the applicant or could not be produced at the time when the order was passed, mistake or error apparent on the face of the record, or for any other sufficient



WEB COPY

reason. A review cannot be entertained merely because another view is possible or for re-arguing the matter already decided.

3. In the present cases, no error apparent on the face of the record, nor any discovery of new and important evidence, nor any other ground warranting exercise of the review jurisdiction has been made out. The applicants seek only a re-appreciation of the issues already considered by this Court, which is impermissible in review jurisdiction.

4. Accordingly, there is no merit in the Review Applications. Since no ground is made out even for numbering the Review Applications, the same is liable to be rejected at the S.R. stage.

5. In view of the above, these Review Applications stand dismissed. Consequently, Rev. Aplc.(MD) S.R. Nos.104106 and 104107 of 2025 stand dismissed at the S.R. stage itself.

02.07.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
TSG



WEB COPY



M.DHANDAPANI, J.

TSG

C.M.P(MD)Nos.2450 and 2451 of 2026
in
Rev.Applc.(MD).SR.Nos.104106 and 104107 of 2025

02.07.2026