



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Civil Appellate Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the Seventeenth day of September Two Thousand Nineteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mrs.Justice J.NISHA BANU

CMP(MD) No.7721 of 2019

IN

SA(MD) No.245 of 2013

1 SULOCHANA
2 NAGARAJ
3 NANTHINI

... PETITIONERS/RESPONDENTS

Vs

CHINNAMMAL

... RESPONDENT/APPELLANT


Petition praying that in the circumstances stated therein and in the affidavit filed therewith the High Court will be pleased to pass an order of interim injunction restraining the respondent, his men and agents from making any further constructions to enclose the balcony protrusions that was demolished during the execution proceedings in E.P.No.548/2010 in O.S.No.3042/1989 in the month of January 2012 and pass such further or other orders that this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the nature and circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

PRAYER IN SA(MD) .NO.245 OF 2013:-

To prefer this memorandum of second appeal against the judgment and decree passed in A.S.No.47/06 dated 16.07.2009 on the file of the 1st Additional Sub-Court, Trichy confirming the judgment and decree passed in O.S.No.3042 of 89 dated 24.10.05 on the file of the 1st Additional District Munsif Court, Trichy.

ORDER : This petition coming on for orders upon perusing the petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and upon hearing the arguments of M/S.J.MARIA ROSELINE, Advocate for the petitioners and of MR.G.ETHIRAJULU, Advocate on behalf of the Respondent, the court made the following order:-

This petition has been filed by the petitioners / respondents for interim injunction restraining the respondent / appellant from making any further constructions to enclose the balcony protrusions, which was demolished during the execution proceedings in E.P.No.548 of 2010 in O.S.No.3042 of 1989.



2. When the matter came up for hearing today, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent/appellant submitted that though the respondent started to do repairing work in the property in dispute, in view of the objections raised by the petitioners herein, she stopped the work and that the respondent assures that she will not do any repairing work in the property in dispute till the disposal of the appeal.

3. Recording the above submission, this petition is closed.

sd/-
17/09/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

TO

1. THE IST ADDITIONAL SUBORDINATE JUDGE, TIRUCHY.

2. THE IST ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MUNSIF,
TIRUCHY.

+1 CC to M/s. J. MARIA ROSELINE, Advocate (SR-15550[I] dated
17/09/2019)

ORDER
IN
CMP(MD) No.7721 of 2019
IN
SA(MD) No.245 of 2013
Date : 17/09/2019

gcg
AE/SKN/SAR-III (20.09.2019) 2P 4C