

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30.01.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA

C.R.P.(PD).Nos.3900, 3906 and 3907 of 2016 and 134 of 2017
and
C.M.P.Nos.19857, 19864, 19865 of 2016 and 621 of 2017

Mr.Jethmal	.. Petitioner in C.R.P.Nos.3900 and 3906 of 2016
Mr.Velaram Chaudry	.. Petitioner in C.R.P.3907 of 2016
Mrs.Kamana	.. Petitioner in C.R.P.134 of 2017
Vs.	
Mr.Baba Prasad	.. Respondent in all C.R.Ps.

Civil Revision Petition No.3900 of 2016 filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the fair and decretal order dated 19.10.2016 made in M.P.No.280 of 2016 in R.C.O.P.No.820 of 2013 on the file of the XII Small Causes Court, Chennai.

Civil Revision Petition No.3906 of 2016 filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the fair and decretal order dated 19.10.2016 made in M.P.No.279 of 2016 in R.C.O.P.No.830 of 2013 on the file of the XII Small Causes Court, Chennai.

Civil Revision Petition No.3907 of 2016 filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the fair and decretal order dated 19.10.2016 made in M.P.No.282 of 2016 in R.C.O.P.No.823 of 2013 on the file of the

XII Small Causes Court, Chennai.

Civil Revision Petition No.134 of 2017 filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the fair and decretal order dated 19.10.2016 made in M.P.No.281 of 2016 in R.C.O.P.No.821 of 2013 on the file of the XII Small Causes Court, Chennai.

For petitioners : Ms.C.Sangamithirai

ORDER

These revision petitions are filed against the orders passed in the respective M.Ps. seeking dismissal of the respective R.C.O.Ps. on the ground that the revision petitioners who have filed the R.C.O.Ps. are not the owners of the properties and that the respondent/landlord have filed fabricated documents purported to have been issued by the Government authorities, thereby played fraud on the Court. The said petitions were dismissed by the Rent Controller, as the revision petitioners/tenants have admitted the jural relationship between them and the respondent/landlord and hence, the petitions cannot be maintained. Aggrieved by the same, it appears that the revision petitioners/tenants have preferred appeals in R.C.As. before the appellate authority, which were returned as not maintainable. Therefore, these revision petitions have been filed before this Court. Learned counsel for the revision petitioners also produced the

copies of the returned appeal memorandums, which were returned to her. Without going into the merits of the case, as the learned counsel for the revision petitioners submitted that the revision petitioners would agitate the issue before the appellate authority, the appeal memorandums shall be presented before the appellate authority and the R.C.As. be decided on merits and appropriate orders be passed. With these observations and directions, the Civil Revision Petitions are disposed of. No costs. C.M.Ps. are closed.

30.01.2017

CS

Copy to

The XII Judge,
Small Causes Court, Chennai.

PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA, J

CS

C.R.P.(PD).Nos.3900,
3906 and 3907 of 2016
and 134 of 2017

30.01.2017

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