



Rev.Aplc.No.41 of 2022

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.03.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Ms. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

Rev.Aplc.No.41 of 2022

1.Lakshmi

2.Minor Akash

3.Minor Harish

Minors are represented by their
natural Guardian Lakshmi

...Petitioner

Vs

1.Suriyaganthi

2.Ayyappan

3.Rajamanickam

4.Parandhaman

... Respondents

1/5



Rev.Aplc.No.41 of 2022

WEB COPY

Prayer: Review Application is filed under Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure to review the Judgement dated 09.07.2021 made in S.A.No.50 of 2009.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Vadivel

ORDER

The defendants have filed this review application seeking to review the Judgement of this Court in S.A.No.50 of 2009. The grounds on which the review is sought for are as follows:

(a)The plaintiffs who are respondents 1 and 2 in the review application have pleaded adverse possession and was therefore not entitled to seek declaration.

(b)The plaintiffs have not challenged the cancellation of the settlement deed and therefore the suit is not maintainable.



WEB COPY



Rev.Aplc.No.41 of 2022

(c)The 2nd appellant had attained majority even on the date of the original decree and the act of not discharging the guardian and recording the majority has to be reconsidered.

(d)The evidence of P.W.2 has not been analysed and appreciated properly by this Court and the non joinder of one, Muthu is fatal to the suit.

2. A mere perusal of the above grounds would clearly show that the same does not come within the grounds for seeking a review of the Judgement as per Order XLVII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The petitioners had not made out if there is an error apparent on the face of the record or they have discovered a new and important matter or the evidence which despite due diligence was not within their knowledge and neither as they shown any other sufficient reasons for seeking review of the Judgement in S.A.No.50 of 2009. That apart



Rev.Aplc.No.41 of 2022

WEB COPY

these are matters which ought to have been raised at the time of argument of the Second Appeal.

3. Since the scope of interference is very limited in a review application and as the grounds raised by the petitioners for review is merely grounds for filing further appeal, this Court is not inclined to entertain the review, accordingly, the Review Application is dismissed.

No costs.

03.03.2022

kan

Index : Yes/No

Speaking order/non-speaking order



WEB COPY



Rev.Aplc.No.41 of 2022

P.T.ASHA, J.,

kan

Rev.Aplc.No.41 of 2022

03.03.2022