



A.Nos.4813 & 4814 of 2022

in

O.P.No.719 of 2011

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.

These applications have been filed by the applicants / respondents 6 & 7, in the original petition seeking to reopen the evidence of PW-1 and recall him for the purpose of cross-examination.

2.It has been stated by the learned counsel for the respondents herein that several opportunities had been given to the applicants but that PW-1 was not cross-examined and therefore, these applications lack bonafide and should not be considered in its true merits.

3.Counter affidavit has also filed in the same lines.

4.It is also stated that the learned Master, had an occasion to impose costs on the respondents. There is a dispute whether costs had been paid or not paid. It is contended by the present applicants / respondents 6 and 7, in the original petition that costs has been paid. I would leave that aspect to be examined by the learned Master since it is consequent to an order passed by



C.V.KARTHIKEYAN,J.

smv

5.In the counter affidavit it had been stated that the present applicants has an habit of filing one or the other application to protract the proceedings.

6.In view of the reasoning, that opportunity has to be granted to conduct trial to the satisfaction of the parties, the present Applications are allowed.

15.11.2022
(1/2)

smv

A.Nos.4813 & 4814 of 2022
in
O.P.No.719 of 2011