

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **01.02.2017**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. **JUSTICE K.K.SASIDHARAN**

Review Application No.1 OF 2017

1.Manirajan
2.Punithavathi
3.Kuppan : petitioners
versus

S.Rose Violet : respondent

Petition filed to review the order passed in C.R.P. PD No.490 of 2016 dated 2.11.2016.

For petitioners : Mrs.C.R.Rukmani

For respondent : Mr.N.Manokaran

ORDER

This review petition is filed to review the order dated 2 November 2016 in C.R.P. PD No.490 of 2016 primarily on the ground that the idea of the respondent is to measure the adjacent property through Advocate Commissioner for the purpose of obtaining a decree of declaration.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel for the respondent.

3. This Court allowed the civil revision petition with a direction to the lower Court to appoint an Advocate Commissioner to inspect the property after completion of evidence. Now that the petitioners have come up with a

K.K.SASIDHARAN, J.

grievance that the intention of the respondent is primarily to measure the adjacent property, I consider it deem and fit to clarify the order.

4. The learned Trial Judge is directed to appoint an Advocate Commissioner to inspect the plaint "A" and "B" schedule property on the basis of the patta issued by the Government to the respondent/ plaintiff. In short, inspection should be confined to the property owned and possessed by the respondent as indicated in Plaint "A" and "B" Schedule.

5. The review petition is disposed of with the above clarification. No costs. Consequently, C.M.P.No.217 of 2017 is closed.

01.02.2017

tar

Review Appl No.1 of 2017

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