

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :: 24-11-2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.GOVINDARAJ

C.R.P.PD.No.3789 OF 2016

1.P.Rajeswari
2.P.Venkatesan

Petitioners


...
-VS-

1.K.Veerammal
2.P.Sumathi
3.D.Chandramohan
4.P.Gunasekaran
5.The Secretary,
T-1518, Kandithampettai Primary
Agricultural Co-operative Bank Ltd.,
Kandithampettai,
Mannargudi Taluk,
Tiruvarur District.

6.The Tahsildar,
Mannargudi Taluk,
Mannargudi,
Tiruvarur District.

7.The Sub-Registrar,
Ullikottai,
Mannargudi Taluk,
Tiruvarur Disitriect.

8.The Sub-Registrar,
Mannargudi,
Tiruvarur Disitriect.



WEB COPY

9.The Manager,
Indian Bank,
Mannargudi,
Tiruvarur District.

...

Respondents

Petition against the order, dated 26.08.2016, passed in I.A.No.38 of 2015 in O.S.No.2 of 2014, on the file of Principal District Judge, Tiruvarur.

For petitioner : Mr.S.Baskaran

For respondents 1 and 2 : Mrs.P.T.Ramadevi

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is directed against the order of dismissal of the application, filed under Order 14 Rule 4 of the Code of Civil Procedure, for production of documents for the purpose of framing of issues.

सत्यमेव जयते

2. The petitioners have sought for production of fixed deposit receipts standing in the name of the father of the second petitioner and the other connected documents, containing the numbers that are changed in the name of the first respondent in February,2013. However, they have not given any specific details, as to which fixed deposit receipts they want, and the numbers of the same. There is a vague prayer to produce the fixed deposit receipts standing in the names of the second petitioner and the

first respondent. The trial Court, holding that the prayer in the application is totally vague, has dismissed the application.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

4. The submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners would reveal that there were certain fixed deposits standing in the name of father of the second petitioner and the first respondent and later they were transferred to the name of the first respondent. Though the petitioners claimed that they had photostat copies of those discharged fixed deposit receipts, they did not give any specific particulars as to their numbers and other details. Without specifying the particulars in the petition, the petitioners sought production of the documents.

5. Since the petitioners have not asked for any specific documents to be produced and have made vague statement that the fixed deposit receipts standing in the name of the parties should be produced, the application filed before the Court below is not sustainable. Therefore, the trial Court has rightly rejected the same.

6. Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected C.M.P.No.19313 of 2016 is closed.


Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No

24-11-2017

dixit

To


The Principal District Judge,
Tiruvarur.



WEB COPY

M.GOVINDARAJ,J.

dixit



C.R.P.PD.No.3789 OF 2016

WEB COPY

24-11-2017