

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.11.2016

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE **PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA**

Original Application Nos.283 to 285 of 2011
in C.S.No.196 of 2011

1. Dr.Geetha Hari Priya @ Geetha Gopalaswamy
 2. E.Raghava Rao
 3. G.Kamala
 4. EVK Prasad
 5. Jamuna Chandraya
- ...Applicants

Vs

1. N.Shyamala Devi
 2. N.R.Hemalatha Shree
 3. N.Khanna
 4. Narravula Rukmuni Venkama Trust
Represented by N.Shyamala
 5. Rukmani Matriculation School
 6. N.Raghavulu Naidu
 - 7.S.Raghuvaran
 - 8.The Sub Registrar
Kodambakkam Sub Registrar Office,
Chennai 600 106
 - 9.Maruthi Educational Trust
Represented by Board of Trustees
- ...Respondents

These applications are taken out by the applicants to pass an order of interim injunction restraining the respondents / defendants 1 to 6 or any persons through them or under them either directly or

indirectly claiming any rights pursuant to the lease deed dated 25.09.2010 registered as Document No.179 of 2010 of Book 1 on the file of the 8th respondent / defendant; to pass an order of interim injunction restraining the respondents/defendants in running the school in any manner other than the Maruthi Matriculation School in the suit property and; to appoint a receiver to run the school namely, Maruthi Matriculation School with the assistance of the applicant / plaintiff trustees and for maintaining accounts in the suit property pending disposal of the suit.

For Applicants : Mr.Anand Sashidharan

For defendants-1 to 6 : Mr.K.Sudalai Kannu

For Defendant 7 : M/s.DUA Associates

ORDER

These applications are filed by the applicants for interim injunction restraining the respondents / defendants 1 to 6 claiming any rights pursuant to the lease deed dated 25.09.2010; restraining the respondents/defendants in running the school in any manner other than the Maruthi Matriculation School in the suit property and; to appoint a receiver to run the school namely, Maruthi Matriculation School with the assistance of the applicant / plaintiff trustees and for maintaining accounts in the suit property pending disposal of the suit.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the applicants and learned counsel for the defendants.

3. From the records, it is seen that no interim order was granted. It is stated that the school is also not functioning. As it is stated that the School itself is not functioning, no orders are required in these applications. Hence, these applications are closed.

4. It is stated by the learned counsel for defendants 1 to 6 that they are filing the written statement with delay petition and requested time for filing the same.

5. Post the suit after two weeks under the caption 'for framing issues'

28.11.2016

srn

PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA, J
srn

Original Application Nos.283 to 285 of 2011
in C.S.No.196 of 2011

28.11.2016

<http://www.judis.nic.in>