



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 19.07.2018

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.V.MURALIDARAN

C.R.P.(MD)No.88 of 2015 and
M.P.(MD)No.1 of 2015

S. Rajapandi ... Petitioner/Petitioner/Appellant

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
Thirunelveli.

2.The Tahsildar,
Palayamkottai,
Thirunelveli District. ... Respondents/Respondents/Respondents

Prayer : Civil Revision Petition filed under Section 115 CPC against the fair and decreetal order in I.A.No.78 of 2014 in A.S.No.104 of 2012 dated 08.08.2014 on the file of the Additional Sub Court, Thirunelveli.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.P.T. Ramesh Raja
For respondents	:	Mr. Aayiram K. Selvakumar Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

This civil revision petition has been filed challenging the fair and decreetal order passed by the learned Additional Subordinate Judge, Thirunelveli, in I.A.No.78 of 2014 in A.S.No.104 of 2012 dated 08.08.2014, in and by which, the learned Additional Subordinate Judge, Thirunelveli has dismissed the interlocutory application filed by the petitioner /appellant seeking appointment of Advocate Commissioner.

2. I have heard Mr.P.T. Ramesh Raja, learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Aayiram K. Selvakumar, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents and also perused the records carefully.

3. It is my absolute view that Advocate Commissioner can be appointed even in a bare injunction suit, as has been held by me in several cases. In one such case, reported in 2017 (2) MWN (Civil) 319 in the case of (Shanmugathai vs. Kamalammal and another), I have passed the following order:-




"11. Admittedly the present petition for appointment of an Advocate Commissioner was filed only at the stage of arguments, however the relief sought for in the suit is one for mandatory injunction and recovery of possession after declaration of the title. When the respective defendant deny the lie and location of disputed construction and specifically assert that the construction is within their property and there is no encroachment, the nature of dispute could be resolved only if the exact location of construction is brought to the knowledge of court, which cannot be done except by appointment of advocate commissioner. Thus mere delay in filing the application after the case was posted for arguments is not a ground for dismissal of application and substantial justice requires that the appointment of commissioner is very much necessary to decide the lis.

12. At this juncture, it is useful to refer the Judgment of this Honble Court in the case of Panjavarnam and others Vs- Visuvasam Jeyaseeli (CRP(NPD) (MD) No.2192 of 2012) wherein it was held that the advocate commissioner if appointed would be able to visit the suit property with the help of a surveyor, measure the same and locate it and also note down as to what are all in existence in the suit property. Noting down the physical features would not amount to culling out the evidence. Further this court enunciated the importance of the maxim that A Picture is worth a thousand words. Further it was held by this Honble Court in the said Judgment that it is mandate on the part of Lower court to appoint an advocate commissioner with a mission to visit the suit property with the help of surveyor and measure the same by referring to the survey map and documents of both sides and note down the physical features.

13. In yet another decision of this Court in the case of Vaithinattar and another v. Sakkubal Ammal reported in AIR 2004 Madras 419 it is held that in a suit for Declaration and Permanent Injunction, the dispute pertaining to portion of adjoining lands allegedly encroached by the defendants and the defendants denying that there was no such encroachment. This Honble Court held that the best evidence in such case could be obtained only by the Appointment of advocate commissioner. Therefore in my considered view, no prejudice will be caused to the respondent herein by appointing the advocate commissioner to visit the suit property along with the surveyor and note down the physical features. In fact, the advocate commissioners report and plan would enable the court for the purpose of throwing more light or enlighten to arrive at a fair decision. Thus the appointment of commissioner is necessary and therefore the order of court below is liable to be set-aside."

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/> All of records would show that the suit in A.S.No.78 of 2014 was filed by the petitioner / appellant for the relief of declaration and permanent injunction; and therefore, learned



Additional Subordinate Judge, Thirunelveli, ought to have allowed the impugned application seeking appointment of Advocate Commissioner.

5. Therefore, I am inclined to pass the following order:-

- this Civil Revision Petition is allowed and the order passed by learned Additional Subordinate Judge, Thirunelveli, in I.A.No.78 of 2014 in A.S.No.104 of 2012, dated 08.08.2014, is set aside;
- the trial Court is directed to appoint an Advocate Commissioner within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, by directing the Advocate Commissioner to inspect and file a report within a period of four weeks thereafter;
- on filing of such report, the trial Court shall dispose of the appeal suit within a further period of four months;
- there shall be no order as to costs and consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS-II)

To

1. The Additional Subordinate Judge, Thirunelveli,
2. The District Collector,
Thirunelveli.
3. The Tahsildar,
Palayamkottai,
Thirunelveli District.

C.R.P. (MD) No.88 of 2015 and
M.P. (MD) No.1 of 2015
19.07.2018

trp
JM/SKN RSK/SAR 2/30.07.2018/3P/4C