

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

**Dated : 06.02.2017**

**CORAM**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.V.MURALIDARAN**

**CRP(PD)No.1781 of 2012**

**and**

**M.P.No.1 of 2012**

Anitha

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.Mohan

2.Kandasamy

3.The District Collector,  
Kanchipuram.

4.The Tahsildar,  
Chengalpattu Taluk,  
Chengalpattu.

.. Respondents

(The respondents 3 and 4 are only formal parties  
and no relief is claimed against them in the above CRP)

**Prayer:** Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to call for the records and strike off the suit in O.S.No.195 of 2011, on the file of the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Anand Venkatesh

For Respondents : Mr.S.Sathish Rajan (for R1 and R2)

Mr.Venugopal (for R3 and R4)  
Government Advocate

**ORDER**

The defendant in O.S.No.195 of 2011 is the Civil Revision Petitioner, filing this civil revision petition before this Court.

2.The present petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for strike off the suit in O.S.No.195 of 2011, on the file of the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu, filed by the respondents/plaintiffs.

3.The case of the plaintiffs is that he has filed a civil suit in O.S.No.195 of 2011, on the file of the learned District Munsif, Chengalpattu, (i) for permanent injunction to restrain the defendants 1 to 3 from any way cancelling or altering the patta No.346 stands in the name of plaintiffs; (ii)for permanent injunction restrain the defendants 1 to 3 from any way acting on the basis of the order dated 26.07.2011 passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant ; (iii) for permanent injunction to restrain the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant her principal their men, agents, servants and representatives from any way interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property; and (iv) for permanent injunction to restrain the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant, her principal

from any way alienating or encumbering the suit property on the basis of the order dated 26.07.2011 passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant.

4.The further case of the respondents/plaintiffs is that the property morefully described hereunder in the schedule belongs to the plaintiffs. They have purchased the same under a registered sale deed dated 25.11.1986, the said sale deed was executed, registered and acted upon. The sale deed was executed by one Mehrunnisa W/o Hayat Basha and her son Sadiq Basha for valuable consideration. Previously the property was in possession and enjoyment of the vendors without any let or hindrance and their enjoyment was open and hostile to the entire villagers.

5.The plaintiffs further state that after the purchase, the plaintiffs are in possession and enjoyment of the property and they have changed the patta in their name and enjoyed the same. The entire property is situated in one block. Hence, the plaintiffs fenced the entire property and raising crops such as paddy and other crops. Now the surrounding area was left vacant. Hence, the plaintiffs also could not raise crops. There is no separate water source to the land.

6.The respondents/plaintiffs also state that the first defendant

is an utter stranger to the property and her principal Mr.C.A.Cabeer is also an utter stranger. He is no way connected with the property of the vendors of the plaintiffs. The plaintiffs also states that on 08.07.2011 the plaintiffs received a letter from the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant namely the Tahsildar, Chengalpattu, calling the plaintiffs to produce the documents related to the suit schedule of property. Therefore, the plaintiffs were appeared before the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant and described about the matter as the document was pledged with Marwadi on a hand loan. Therefore, they seek 3 months time to produce the document, but the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant refused to give time and sent a second letter on 14.07.2011 by stating the very same direction to produce the said document in respect of the suit schedule of property. Therefore, again on 25.07.2011, the plaintiffs were went to the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent office and waited till 1.00 p.m., but the office was closed, nobody turned up. Subsequently, the plaintiffs were came to know on 25.07.2011, there was a local holiday for the Aadi Kiruthigai as ordered by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent/District Collector, Kancheepuram. Next enquiry date was not fixed and no further enquiry was conducted. But on 23.08.2011, the plaintiffs were received a letter as the patta No.346 issued in the name of the plaintiffs during 1999 was cancelled and the first defendant name will be entered in the said place. Therefore, it is

made clear that the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant without any opportunity given to the plaintiffs and without applying his mind with biased manner and one sided has passed the said order dated 26.07.2011 and received on 23.08.2011.

7.The respondents/plaintiffs also come forward by saying that even before receiving the order, the plaintiffs sent a registered post to the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant to consider their views also. The request was not taken into consideration. Hence, it understood that the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant acted on one side by acting as a party. Just to satisfy the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and her principal the order was passed in a hurried manner. The plaintiffs also stated that neither the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant nor her principal is having any valid document to prove their title to the property. From the order, the plaintiffs came to know that the said Mr.C.A.Cabeer filed some suits on the file of the City Civil Court and obtained a decree.

8.The plaintiff also states that taking advantage of the order dated 26.07.2011 received by the plaintiffs on 23.08.2011 making attempts to disturb the possession of the plaintiffs and the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant had passed the order to changed the patta in the name of

the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and her principal name. Therefore, they approached the learned District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu and filed the above suit for the prayer cited supra and for granting the same.

9.Challenging the said civil suit filed by the plaintiffs, the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant, who is the civil revision petitioner has filed this civil revision petition before this Court by invoking the jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for strike off the suit in O.S.No.195 of 2011, on the file of the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu. The peititoner, who is the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant in the suit have raised several grounds for strike off the suit from the file of the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu.

10.This Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court in various cases very categorically held that if the defendant wants to strike off or reject the plaint, the defendant should invoke the jurisdiction under Order 7 Rule 11 C.P.C. But, without invoking the said provision, this petitioner/defendant has filed this civil revision petition by invoking Article 227 of the Constitution of India for striking of the suit in O.S.No.195of 2011, on the file of the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu is not at all maintainable. But, in a judgment in

(i) ***Renuka Devi v. D.Manoharan*** reported in **1997 (III) CTC 567** while dealing with the powers conferred on the High Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has held that :

“...The person coming to the Court with false case, with the aid of false and fraudulent document, is not entitled to any equity, nor he is entitled to get any order in his favour. The law is settled that such cases should be thrown out even at the threshold. The court also has a duty to see that as far as possible, litigation is avoided and multiplicity of proceedings are avoided, and when the court has such a power to grant relief, it should not close its eyes on technicalities.”

ii) Again this Court in a case of ***Ranipet Municipality Rep. By Its Comer. and Special Officer, Ranipet v. M.Shamsheerkhan*** reported in **1998 (1) C.T.C. 66** while dealing with the powers conferred on the High Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has held that : the power under Article 227 can be exercised when a proceeding is an abuse of process of court.

iii) This Court in the case of ***S.Viswanathan v. M/s.Sri Muruga Agencies, represented by its Partner, R.V.Ramasamy and two others*** reported in **2002 (1) CTC 277** while dealing with

the powers conferred on the High Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has held that :

“if the parties are allowed to play hide and seek and hoodwink the process of law, the people will lose in the courts” and in such circumstances such suit would make mockery of justice and the same can be struck off.

Therefore, if the plaintiff clearly abused the process of the Court, the defendant can invoke the jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for strike off the plaint.

11. In the case on hand, this revision petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant has stated that the suit ought to be rejected at the threshold since the suit is a clear abuse of process of Court and the plaintiffs are attempting to raise the same issue before various forums to ensure that the petitioner/defendant does not enjoy the fruits of the decree.

12. The petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant also states that the suit in O.S.No.195 of 2011 should not be entertained since the issue involved in the suit is the entry made in the patta pertaining to the suit property under the Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1983, Section 14, since, no suit shall lie in respect of a claim of an entry made or



omitted or amended in any patta passbook.

13.The petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant also states that the suit itself is infructuous since the then 4<sup>th</sup> defendant/Tahsildar had passed an order dated 26.07.2011 cancelling the patta granted in favour of the plaintiffs and directed to grant of patta in the name of the petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant.

14.Apart from this, the plaintiffs while pendency of the civil suit were parallelly proceeded to file an appeal against the above Tahsildar order before the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengalpattu on 05.09.2011 and the said appeal also dismissed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengalpattu on 10.11.2011, hence this would show that the plaintiffs are aware about the rights available to them under the Patta Passbook Act and they have filed the above suit only with an intention to harass the petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant. Therefore, it will amounts to abuse of process of law.

15.This petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant also come forward by saying that Section 15 of Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, specifically provides that the plaintiff in every suit or application relating to a land

situated in any area to which the Act applies shall annex a certified copy of an entry in the Register of Patta Passbook or the Patta Passbook relevant to such land and in the absence of the same, the plaint or application shall be rejected. Therefore, in the instant case, the land in question is an agricultural land to which the Act applies and the relief claimed by the plaintiffs pertains to entry in the patta and in the absence of a requirement of Section 15, the Court below ought to have rejected the plaint at the threshold stage itself.

16.The petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant also come forward by saying that as per the Judgments of this Court in:

(1) ***1.Suguna Poultry Farm Limited, Jaya Enclave, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, 1057, Avanashi Road, Coimbatore – 641 018 and others v. 1.Arul Mariamman Textiles Limited, No.23, Kamaraj Road, Mahalingapuram, Pollachi, rep. By its Managing Director, R.V.S.marimuthu and others*** reported in ***(2004) 4 LW 571.***

(2) ***Aruvipuram Dharma Paripalan Yogam and Others v. K.Karunakaran*** reported in ***(2012) 2 MLJ 657.***

17.This Court categorically held that where there is a bar of Civil Courts jurisdiction to entertain a suit, this Court can exercise of

its Constitutional power under Article 227 and strike off the suit since under its power of superintendence such suits entertained by any Subordinate Court is liable to be struck off and the parties should not be directed to approach the Court concerned for appropriate remedy since it would amount to vesting the jurisdiction upon a Court which does not have such a power.

18. Therefore, the petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant also states that this Court has repeatedly come down heavily in entertaining such frivolous suits which are clear abuse of process of law and this Court while exercising its power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has struck off such suits and have ensured that due process of law is not abused by unscrupulous litigants. Therefore, all the above grounds, this petitioner/1<sup>st</sup> defendant had sought for this Court for strike off the suit.

19. I heard Mr. N. Anand Venkatesh, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr. S. Sathish Rajan, learned counsel appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and Mr. Venugopal, learned Government Advocate, appearing for the respondents 3 and 4. I carefully perused all the relevant records and judgments rendered by this Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court.

20.First we should referred the case of the plaintiffs, which were filed by them with a prayer in O.S.No.195 of 2011 as follows:

(i) for permanent injunction to restrain the defendants 1 to 3 from any way cancelling or altering the patta No.346 stands in the name of plaintiffs;

(ii)for permanent injunction restrain the defendants 1 to 3 from any way acting on the basis of the order dated 26.07.2011 passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant;

(iii) for permanent injunction to restrain the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant her principal their men, agents, servants and representatives from any way interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property; and

(iv) for permanent injunction to restrain the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant, her principal from any way alienating of encumbering the suit property on the basis of the order dated 26.07.2011 passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant.

21.When the plaintiffs have filed the suit before the learned District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu, in the plaint, they avered in para-

5 as follows:

“5.The plaintiffs submit that the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is an utter stranger to the property. Her principal C.A.Cabeer is also an utter stranger. He is no way connected with the property of the vendors of the plaintiffs. On 08.07.2011 the plaintiffs received a letter from the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant calling them to produce the documents related to the property. Hence the plaintiffs appeared before the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant and described about the matter as the document was pledged with Marwari on a hand loan. They seek 3 months time to produce the document. But the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant refused to give time and sent a second letter on 14.07.2011 to produce the document. Again the plaintiffs attended the office on 25.07.2011 and waited till 1.00 p.m. But the office was closed nobody turned up. Subsequently the plaintiffs came to know on 25.07.2011 was a local declared holiday (Aadikiruthigai) by the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant. Next enquiry date was not fixed and no further enquiry was conducted. But on 23.08.2011 the plaintiffs received a letter as the patta No.346 issued in the name plaintiffs during 1999 was cancelled and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant

name will be entered in that place. The 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant has not given proper opportunity to explain the matter. The 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant hastily passed an order without applying his mind. The order is biased and one sided. It is not binding on the plaintiffs, moreover the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant had not furnished copy of the document as requested by the plaintiffs."

22.As per the above version, it is made clear that the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant by sending notice to the first respondent/plaintiff for appearance on 08.07.2011 before the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent calling them to produce the document in relating to the property, subsequently on 14.07.2011 to produce the document. The plaintiffs also states that as stated in his plaint that on 23.08.2011, the plaintiffs received a letter as the patta No.346 issued in the name of the plaintiffs during 1999 was cancelled and the first defendant name is entered in that place. When the plaintiffs themselves admitted that the patta is stand in the name of the plaintiffs were cancelled and subsequently the order dated 26.07.2011 passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant was communicated to the plaintiffs on 23.08.2011, it makes clear that already the patta was cancelled. Thus being the case a common man having knowledge that

once the patta was cancelled, they should not invoke any civil jurisdiction for mandatory injunction and to restrain the defendants 1 to 3 from any way cancelling or altering the patta No.346 stands in the name of plaintiffs. But knowing fully well, the plaintiffs have filed the suit for the above said prayer, which abstract total abuse of process of law.

23.Apart from this, as per the patta passbook act it is made clear that as per Section 14 of the Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1983, no suit shall lie in respect of a claim of an entry made or omitted or amended in any patta passbook. As per Section 14 of the Tamilnadu Patta Passbook Act, it is stated as follows:

“14.Bar of suits.- No suit shall lie against the Government or any officer of the Government in respect of a claim to have an entry made in any patta pass book that is maintained under this Act or to have any such entry omitted or amended:

Provided that if any person is aggrieved as to any right of which he is in possession, by an entry made in the patta pass book under this Act, he may institute a suit against any person denying or interested to deny his title to such right, for a declaration of his rights under

Chapter VI of the Specific Relief Act, 1963 (Central Act 47 of 1963); and the entry in the patta pass book shall be amended in accordance with any such declaration.”

24.As per Section 15 of the Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act that the plaintiff in every suit or application relating to a land situated in any area to which the Act applies shall annex a certified copy of an entry in the Register of Patta Passbook or the Patta Passbook relevant to such land and in the absence of the same, the plaint or application shall be rejected. Therefore, in the absence of a requirement of Section 15 of the Tamilnadu Patta Passbook Act is as follows:

“15.Certified copies of records to be annexed to plaint or application.-(1) The plaintiff or applicant in every suit or application, as hereinafter defined relating to land situated in any area to which this Act applies shall annex to the plaint or application a certified copy of an entry in the Register of Patta Pass-Book or the patta pass book relevant to such land.

(2) If the plaintiff or applicant fails to do so, for any cause which the Court deems sufficient, he shall produce such certified copy within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Court and if such certified copy is not so annexed or produced, the plaint or application shall be rejected, but the rejection thereof shall not



of its own force preclude the presentation of a fresh plaint in respect of the same cause of action or of a fresh application in respect of the same subject-matter with a certified copy annexed.

(3) In this section,-

(a) "suit" means a suit to which the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act V of 1908) apply;

(b) "application" means an application,-

(i) for the execution of a decree or order in a suit;

(ii) for the filing of an agreement stating a case for the opinion of the Court under the said Code of Civil Procedure;

(iii) for the filing of an agreement to refer to arbitration under section 20 of the Arbitration Act, 1940 (Central Act X of 1940);

(iv) for the filing of an award under section 14 of the said Arbitration Act;

(v) of any other kind to which the Government may, by notification, direct that this section shall apply;

(c) an application shall be deemed to relate to land, if the decree or other matter with respect to which an application is made, relates to land."

25. Therefore, in the absence of the requirement of Section 15 since the case in hand, the land in question is an agricultural land to which the Act applies and the relief claimed by the respondents 1 and 2 pertains to entry in the patta, the suit should be rejected.

26. To support his case, the petitioners/defendants were produced the judgment passed by this Court, when the alternative remedy is available for strike off the plaint not a bar to invoke jurisdiction of High Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. This Court held as follows:

***(Aruviuram Dharma Paripalan Yogam and Others v. K. Karunakaran)*** reported in ***(2012) 2 MLJ 657***

“(B) Code of Civil Procedure (5 of 1908) –  
Alternative remedy – Grant of interim injunction –  
Availability of alternative remedy – Maintainability  
of revision – Scope of – Relief sought by petitioners  
to strike off plaint – Not against order of interim  
injunction – Plea of jurisdiction and other issues  
raised – Alternative remedy under CPC not a bar to  
invoke jurisdiction of High Court under Article 227  
of Constitution – Revision petition maintainable.”

27. Apart from this, during the course of arguments, the respondents/plaintiffs were filed a lengthy counter, which contain 19 pages in which he has narrated the entire things happened earlier and he has also 3 bunch of typed set before this Court by producing the documents. The plaintiffs themselves had produced the order passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengaloattu in Na.Ka.No.2823/2011/M dated 10.11.2011, which was filed against the order passed by the Tahsildar dated 26.07.2011 cancelling the patta already issued in the name of the plaintiffs and issued patta in the name of the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and the order dated 10.11.2011, the Revenue Divisional Officer has confirmed the order passed by the Tahsildar dated 26.07.2011.

28. Apart from this, the learned counsel appearing for the defendants namely respondents 1 and 2 have also produced one another order in which the District Revenue Officer, Kancheepuram has passed an order in Na.Ka.No.21395/2012/No.4 dated 29.01.2014, confirming the order passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, dated 10.11.2011. The District Revenue Officer, Kancheepuram also states that challenging the said order dated 29.01.2014, the person, who aggrieved have right to file a civil suit, challenging the orders of the

Revenue authorities as per G.O.Ms.No.409 Revenue (SS/1(2)) dated 02.07.2008.

29. Therefore, as per the above statement, it is made clear that the plaintiffs themselves have agreed that the order passed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent Tahsildar in Na.Ka.No.1533/2011/M1, dated 26.07.2011 was challenged by way of an appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengalpattu has also passed the order in Na.Ka.No.2833/2011 M, dated 10.11.2011, confirming the order passed by the Tahsildar, order dated 26.07.2011, against which, the plaintiffs also filed on further appeal before the District Revenue Officer, Kancheepuram, in which the learned District Revenue Officer, Kancheepuram also confirmed the order passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chengalpattu, dated 10.11.2011 by in his order in Na.Ka.No.21395/2012/No.4 dated 29.01.2014. In respect of patta, the Government has passed order in G.O.Ms.No.409 Revenue (SS/1(2)) Department dated 02.07.2008 in which after the order of the District Revenue Officer, the party who suffered orders of the Revenue official ought to have challenge the orders by way of Civil Suit.

30. Therefore, once the order transferring the patta in the name of the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant was passed and the plaintiff wants to questioning the said order, they should act upon as per the order of the Government passed in G.O.Ms.No.409 dated 02.07.2008. In fact the plaintiff also exercised all the remedies before the Revenue Appellate Authorities as per the G.O.Ms.No.409 dated 02.07.2008.

31. When the plaintiffs knowing fully well as per G.O.Ms.No.409 dated 02.07.2008, they should approach only the appellate forum, not the Civil Court, how they filed the suit even for the prayer, restraining the defendants 3 and 4, who are the District Collector and Tahsildar, not to cancelling the patta No.346 stand in the name of the plaintiffs, since no change of patta was already taken place earlier. Therefore, it is made clear that it is totally abuse of process of law.

32. Apart from this, as per the judgments reported in cited supra, no civil suit lie against the issuance of patta. As per Section 14 of the Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1987, no suit will lie in respect of the claim of an entry made or omitted or amended in any Patta Passbook, Section 14 of the Patta Pass Book Act 1983 read as follows:

“No suit shall lie against the Government or any officer of the Government in respect of claim to have an

entry made in any Patta passbook that is maintained under this Act to have any such entry omitted or amended”

“Provided that if any person is aggrieved as to any right of which he is in possession, by an entry made in the Patta pass book under this Act, he may institute a suit against any person denying or interested to deny his title to such right, for a declaration of his right under Chapter VI of the Specific Relief Act, 1963 and the entry in the Patta pass book shall be amended in accordance with any such declaration.”

33.As per the above provision, it is made clear that no suit lie against any officer of the Government in respect of the claim to have entry made in the patta passbook. But the Section provided that if any person is aggrieved as to any right of which he is in possession, by an entry made in the patta passbook under this Act, he may institute a suit against any person denying or interested to deny his title to such right, for a declaration of his right under Chapter VI of the Specific Relief Act, 1963. Therefore, it is made clear that in respect of title only the plaintiffs can approach the civil Court for appropriate relief, but no suit will lie in respect of the claim to entry made in the patta passbook. Knowing fully well that the suit will not

lie in the Civil Court, the plaintiffs purposely filed the suit. Therefore, it is totally amounts to abuse of process of law.

34.As per the counter affidavit and the document filed and produced by the respondents/plaintiffs before this Court, it is made clear that in respect of title and possession of the property, there are so many proceedings filed between the plaintiffs and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant, but in respect of the claim of entry to be made in the patta passbook cannot be entertained by the Civil Court.

35.This case is an example that the Civil Courts were exceed their jurisdiction since as per Section 14 of the Patta Passbook Act, 1983, no suit will lie in respect of a claim of an entry made or omitted or amended in any patta passbook. Knowing fully well by the plaintiffs filed the suit and therefore, it is appropriate to issue suitable direction that the Civil Courts shall not entertain any civil suits in the State of Tamil Nadu in respect of claim of an entry made or omitted or amended in any patta passbook, since the invoking of the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts against the above said provision of Section 14 of the Tamil Nadu Patta Passbook Act, 1983 is totally abuse of process of law.

36.The case in hand is absolutely abuse of process of law, the plaintiffs are very well known that no civil suit will lie against the suit in respect of an entry made or omitted or amended in any patta passbook and they can only invoke the jurisdiction before the Revenue Authorities as per G.O.Ms.No.409 dated 02.07.2008 and very act of filing the civil suit in O.S.No.195 of 2011 is totally abuse of process of law. Since having personal knowledge that the plaintiffs themselves were approached the Revenue Divisional Officer and the District Revenue Officer, challenging the transfer of patta from the name of the plaintiffs to the first defendant by the Tahsildar, the very filing of the suit in O.S.No.195 of 2011 abuse of process of law and hence this Court having invoking the jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to strike off the suit and accordingly, the suit is strike off.

37.In the result, this civil revision petition is allowed by strike off the civil suit in O.S.No.195 of 2011, from the file of the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

**06.02.2017**

Index:Yes

Internet:Yes

Note:Issue order copy on 22.03.2017



vs

To

The District Munsif Court,  
Chengalpattu.

**M.V.MURALIDARAN, J.**

VS

**Pre-Delivery order made in**  
**CRP(PD)No.1781 of 2012**  
**and**  
**M.P.No.1 of 2012**

**.02.2017**

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