



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.12.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

C.R.P.No. 4185 of 2022

T. Jayalakshmi

..Petitioner

Vs

Pachaiyammal (Died)

Kanniyappan (Died)

1. Krishna Moorthy

2. Kanniammal

3. Saroja

4. Sasirekha

5. Kumar

6. Gopal

7. Prakash

8. Gopi

9. Poonkodi

(Cause title accepted vide Court
Order dated 14.10.2022 made in
CMP.No. 13357 of 2022 in
CRP.Sr No. 21386 /2022 by SSJ)

...Respondents

Prayer : Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for a direction to dispose of the suit in O.S.No. 561 of 2006 on the file of the Principal District Munsif, Alandur within the stipulated time.

For Petitioners

: Mr. D. Ashok Kumar



ORDER

WEB COPY

The present Civil Revision Petition has been instituted to direct the learned Principal District Munsif, Alandur to dispose of the suit in O.S.No. 561 of 2006 within the time limit fixed by this Court.

2. The suit was filed for partition to direct the defendants to divide the suit property morefully as described in the Schedule by metes and bounds to put the plaintiff in a separate possession of her 1/5th share of the suit property and the said matter is now subjudiced before the learned Principal District Munsif, Alandur

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner mainly contended that the suit was adjourned on more than 50 occasions and not yet disposed of. The Principal District Munsif, Alandur is going on adjourning the cases and the petitioner having no other remedy approached this Court by filing the present Civil Revision Petition.



4. Unnecessary adjournments on flimsy grounds would cause prejudice to the parties to the litigation. Rule is to conduct the case on the date it is posted for hearing. Adjournment is an exception. Thus adjournments are to be granted only on genuine grounds and even in such circumstances, on commencement of trial long adjournments are to be avoided. The reason is to be recorded by the Courts, if it is genuine.

5. Long pendency of litigations causing untold mental agony to the litigants are to be considered by the Courts concerned, while granting adjournments in a routine manner. Any party seeking adjournment on flimsy grounds or attempting to prolong and protract the case, then heavy cost is to be awarded, which is to be paid to the other party, who is ready to conduct the case. If such adjournments are frequently sought for, then exemplary or maximum costs are to be awarded by the Court concerned. The endeavour of the Court is to ensure that the cases are disposed of as expeditiously as possible by avoiding unnecessary adjournments.

6. The High Court cannot issue directions to the District Judiciary for speedy disposal of cases in a routine manner. Frequent directions if issued, the same cannot be a practical solution. The trust on the District Judiciary due



to overburdening of litigation on Board is to be taken into consideration by the High Court. The routine directions for speedy disposal, if it is issued, it would further cause unnecessary pressure on the District Judiciary. In many such cases, wherein directions are issued, the District Judiciary has come out with administrative letter, seeking extension of time again and again and thus, the purpose for which such directions were issued by the High Court became defeated.

7. The longevity of the litigations are occurring at the instance of the parties on many occasions. The legal brains are adopting tactical approach to prolong and protract the cases for unjust gains and for Forum Shopping. Any party having an idea to achieve their goal in an indirect or illegal manner, then they are adopting all such tactics for the purpose of prolonging the case, which cannot be tolerated by the Courts. On some occasion, if any litigants feel that a particular Judicial Officer in the District Judiciary is inconvenient to them, they are seeking adjournments after adjournments or filing frivolous interlocutory applications through which they all are causing longevity to the litigation. Ill-motives of such litigants if allowed to succeed, then the same will result in miscarriage of justice and thus the Courts are expected to be cautious, while granting unnecessary adjournments on flimsy grounds. All



such attempts should be thwarted by the Courts and the Court cannot aid such ill-motive of the parties. The frivolous and unnecessary interlocutory applications are to be dealt with in accordance with law and if the Court formed an opinion that such interlocutory applications are filed with an idea to prolong and protract the issues or filed with ill-motives, then the Court would not hesitate in awarding exemplary or maximum cost on such applications. The cases are to be disposed of in consistent manner to avoid unnecessary allegations and to redress the grievances of the parties approaching the Court of Law.

8. The Courts concerned have to form a method for speedy disposal of the cases. The High Court cannot simply direct the District Judiciary to dispose of a particular case.

9. In the event of issuing direction in Civil Revision Petitions for speedy disposal without considering the number of cases pending in a particular Court on Board, it will result in discrimination against many other litigants, who all are waiting for disposal of their respective cases. There are allegations against the Courts that the cases are selectively picked up and disposed of. The plight of the poor and downtrodden are also to be taken into



consideration, while disposing of the cases. The Court cannot provide any room for such feeling to the litigants. The trust on the Judicial System is the Hallmark and any form of favouritism or otherwise even in the matter of hearing of cases will have larger repercussions on the system. No doubt certain cases are to be disposed of urgently if there is a public interest involved or the litigants are able to establish genuine urgency for early disposal of the cases. Such cases alone are to be given priority.

10. The practice of giving preference to any litigation without any justification at all circumstances to be avoided. Every litigant approaching the Court of Law is waiting for justice and thus, it must be done in a consistent manner and without discriminating the litigants. Therefore issuing directions indiscriminately for speedy disposal of cases by the District Judiciary would do no service to the cause of justice. The Court concerned is expected to regulate its own procedures in respect of the cases on Board for effective disposal and to ensure that the cases are disposed of within a reasonable period of time. However, the High Court cannot issue such directions for speedy disposal unless there is a justification or acceptable reason for issuing any such directions. Every urgency cannot be considered for issuing a direction for speedy disposal, the urgency, which is imminent to be



considered.

WEB COPY

11. There are many litigants waiting for relief, by filing civil suits.

Giving priority to one suit would cause prejudice to other cases, which all are also to be disposed of within a reasonable period of time.

12. In the present case, the petitioner has not established any urgency or public interest or otherwise and therefore, this Court is not inclined to consider the relief as such sought for in the present Civil Revision Petition.

13. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

15.12.2022

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order / Non-Speaking order
mrn

To
Principal District Munsif,
Alandur



WEB COPY

C.R.P.No. 4185 of 2



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

(mrn)

C.R.P.No. 4185 of 2022

19.12.2022