



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 22.02.2022

CORAM:
THE HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN

A.S.No.21 of 2011


1.K.M.Kadirvel
2.T.M.Krishnavel
3.M.Pappuammal

.. Appellants

Vs.

T.N.Arthanari Mudaliar (died)

1.A.Rajavel
2.B.Irusappa Raja
3.M.Vijayarani
4.B.Govindarajan
5.Nagammal
6.C.Pavayammal
7.R.Samporनावलि
8.Ramalingam
9.S.Chitra
10.A.Bhanureka
11.S.Umadevi
12.M.Vidyalakshmi
13.A.Velayutham
14.A.Poongodi
15.V.Sivakumar
16.Balamurugan
17.M.Kandasami
18.P.K.Sekar
19.K.Madesan
20.T.S.Annamalai
22.T.K.Arunachalam
23.Y.C.Ayyavoo
24.T.R.Muniappan
25.Y.M.A.Subramani
26.Y.T.K.Kuppusamy
27.S.Arthanari
28.P.Ariyaputhiran
29.K.Ramalingam
30.Thiyagarajan
31.S.Dharmalinga
32.M.Muniappan
33.A.Vanitha
34.S.Sivagami
35.T.Saravanan
36.K.Marimuthu
37.K.Mani
38.A.Thangavelu
39.A.Manickam
40.P.Kumaravel



41.R.Sekar
42.M.Kanimozhi
43.Santhi
44.M.Dhanalakshmi
45.G.Gopal
46.M.Kandasamy
47.M.Murugavel
48.K.Senthilkumar
49.T.Santhi
50.M.Baby
51.A.Chandiran
52.K.Vedeeswaran
53.K.Devaki
54.K.Kalyani
55.M.Kumaravel
56.M.Selvi
57.S.Venkisamy
58.V.Rajendran
59.L.Ranganayaki
60.R.Kanmani
61.K.Venkatachalam
62.V.Vijaya
63.M.Thangamani
64.M.Velumani
65.M.Nagarajan
66.K.Janaki
67.K.Arthanari
68.K.Balamurugan
69.K.Mariappan
70.K.Srinivasan
71.K.Gomathi
72.K.Dhanalakshmi
73.R.Vijaya
74.R.Ravi
75.R.Selvi
76.M.Savithri
77.M.Mohan
78.M.Santhi
79.M.Chandra
80.M.Uma

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Appeal Suit is filed under Section 96 of C.P.C, against the judgment and decree dated 29.06.2010 passed by the Additional District Judge/ Fast Track Court No.2, Salem in partly allowing the O.S.No.132 of 2006.

For Appellant : Mr.P.Sathish
For R2, 5, 51, 56,
63 to 67, 69 to 75 : Mr.B.Shyam
For R4 : Mr.R.Nalliyappan

For R12, 17, 18, 22
25 to 27, 29, 31 to
33, 42, 57 and 68 : Not ready notice



J U D G M E N T

In this appeal totally there are 80 respondents. The appellants have not taken steps to serve some of the respondents. When the matter was listed on 17.02.2022, there was no representation on behalf of the appellants. Hence the matter was posted today for dismissal.

2. The learned counsel for the appellants stated that the matter has been listed for the first time and seeks adjournment. This reason is contrary to the facts. Therefore, it appears that the appellants are not interested in pursuing the matter in serving notice on the respondents to proceed. Since the appeal is of the year 2011, the appellants are not ready and take steps to serve notice on the unserved respondents, this Court has no other option except to dismiss the appeal for default.

3. In view of above, the Appeal Suit is dismissed for default. No costs.

Sd/-
Deputy Registrar (CS)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rpl
To
The Additional District Judge/ Fast Track Court No.2, Salem.

+1 cc to Mr.P.Sathish, Advocate Sr.NO. 12166

A.S.No.21 of 2011

bp (CO)
A.SK(10/03/2022)