



drag on the proceedings, the application had been filed, seeking expert opinion and that as there is no merit in the application, the same had been rightly dismissed by the court below. He would rely on the decisions reported in 2010 1 CTC 424 (R.Jagadeesan Vs. N.Ayyasamy) and the unreported judgement dated 27.01.2021, made in Crl.OP.No.27520 of 2018 of the Madras High Court.

5.This court heard the learned counsel on either side and considered their submissions and also carefully perused the materials placed on record.

6.The suit was filed for recovery of money based on a promissory note, which was denied by the Defendant, as it was relating to earlier transaction. The Defendant had sought to send the promissory note to an expert to find out the age of the ink of the Petitioner's signature. Further, the application had been filed without giving the details of the Forum, to which, the documents are to be sent for expert opinion. It is also the contention of the Petitioner that the earlier transaction was completed on the complaint given by the Respondent before the Police concerned and the complaint is in the custody of the Petitioner. Considering the said stand of the Petitioner, this Court is of the view that when the documents relating to the earlier transaction are available with him, he can substantiate his contentions, by producing the said documents and that the application had been filed only to protract the proceedings and accordingly, the court below had rightly dismissed the application, as devoid of merits, by the impugned order, which does not suffer from any irregularity or infirmity.

7.In fine, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected MP is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AE)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Srcm

To

1.The Subordinate Judge, Uthamapalayam

+1 CC to M/s.H.VELAVADHAS, Advocate (SR-69167[F] dated 17/06/2019)

CRP(MD)No.424 of 2014
19.07.2021

SVM(CO)

KB(29.07.2021) 2P 3C