



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Reserved on : 04.09.2023

Pronounced on : 29.09.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.VADAMALAI

C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

and

C.M.P(MD)No.10009 of 2023

R.Benjamin Jayaraj

...Appellant/Plaintiff

Vs.

- 1.The Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church
represented by its Bishop/President,
Tranquebar House,
Tiruchirapalli – 620 001.
- 2.The Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church Council
represented by its Secretary,
Tranquebar House,
Tiruchirapalli – 620 001.
- 3.The Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church Synod
Continuation Committee represented by its
President/Bishop,
Tranquebar House,
Tiruchirapalli 620 001.
- 4.The Bishop,
The Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church,
Tranquebar House,
Tiruchirapalli 620 001.



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

5.TELC Christ Church
represented by its Chairman
TELCC Christ Church,
Raja Street,
Coimbatore – 641 001.

6.TELC Christ Church Pastorate Committee
represented by its Secretary,
TELCC Christ Church,
Raja Street,
Coimbatore – 641 001.

7.The Chairman,
TELCC Christ Church,
Raja Street,
Coimbatore – 641 001.

8.Justice Mr.N.Paul Vasanthakumar (Retired),
Administrator,
The Tamil Nadu Evangelical Lutheran Church,
Tranquebar House,
Tiruchirapalli – 620 001.

9.N.Retnaraj

10.G.Jayachandran ...Respondents/Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed under Order 43 Rule (I) of the Civil Procedure Code, to set aside the judgment and decree dated 01.06.2023 in I.A.No.2 of 2023 in O.S.No.133 of 2023 passed by the First Additional District Judge (PCR), Tiruchirappalli.

For Appellant : Mr.A.Immanual

For R5 to R7 : Ms.M.Nanthini Priyadharshni

For R1 to R4 &
R8 to R10 : No Appearance



JUDGMENT

WEB COPY

This Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed against the fair order and decretal order dated 01.06.2023 passed in I.A.No.2 of 2023 in O.S.No. 133 of 2023 on the file of the First Additional District Court (PCR), Tiruchirappalli.

2. The brief facts of the case:

The first respondent Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church is a protestant denomination, which was established in the year 1919. The first respondent Church consists of Pastorates. Each Pastorate is administered by a pastorate committee elected by eligible voting members of the congregation for a triennium. The congregation of the pastorate elect its committee members, members to represent the pastorate in the District Council and also members of the Synod Continuation Committee. The Synod Continuation Committee elects Church Council, the highest administrative body of the first respondent Church. The petitioner is a voting member of the 5th respondent TELC Christ Church, Coimbatore. The petitioner served the first respondent Church in various posts from the year 1979 to 2022. Since the Bishop of first respondent Church retired on 14.02.2021 and the tenure of second



respondent Church Council ended on 10.09.2022, the 8th respondent was appointed as administrator of TELC to conduct election of Bishop as well as Church Council by the Division Bench of Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in its order dated 08.08.2022 passed in Contempt Application(MD)Nos.3 to 10 of 2022. The 8th respondent took over the administration of first respondent Church. The 9th respondent was appointed as Secretary-cum-Election Officer and the 10th respondent was appointed as Finance-cum-Property Officer of the 1st respondent Church by the 8th respondent. While being the facts, the 10th respondent submitted a report to the 8th respondent on 27.09.2022 in respect of the allegations against the petitioner and one Nelson. The 8th respondent asked the petitioner to explain the allegations leveled against the petitioner. The petitioner appeared before him on 01.10.2022 and orally explained. The 9th respondent was also present along with 10th respondent. The petitioner did not submit any written submission. Based on report of the 9th respondent dated 20.10.2022, the 8th respondent vide his proceedings dated 25.10.2022 debarred the petitioner under Rule 182(A) of the first respondent Church Rules. The reports of the respondents 8 to 10 are leveling allegations of misappropriation of TELC



funds against the petitioner and also caused huge monetary loss to TELC under 9 heads. The petitioner submitted request letter dated 27.11.2022 to the 8th respondent to remove the debar order. There was no reply, but the 9th respondent sent reply letter dated 07.12.2022 informing the petitioner that he was not eligible for the church privileges. The statement of 9th respondent amounts to Ex.Communication of the petitioner from the first respondent Church and he has no authority and power to pass such an extreme order. Hence, the petitioner filed the main suit in O.S.No.133 of 2023 before the Trial Court seeking declaratory reliefs and also filed petition I.A.No.2 of 2023 in O.S.No.133 of 2022 for an ad-interim injunction restraining the respondents from implementing the order of the 8th respondent dated 25.10.2022. That petition was stoutly resisted by the respondents by filing detailed counter. After hearing both, the Trial Court has dismissed the petition in I.A.No.2 of 2023 in O.S.No.133 of 2023. Aggrieved by the order of the Trial Court, the appellant/plaintiff moved this Court by way of this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal.

3.Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.



4. The learned counsel petitioner has put forth his argument at length about the first respondent Church and its Governance and Doctrine. He also argued at length about the Catholic Pope and 4 kinds of Pastorates. He submits that TELC is one of Lutheran Church, having headquarters at Trichy and also role of Church Council. However, for the purpose of the main dispute, the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the 8th respondent has passed the order dated 25.10.2022 against the petitioner without any proper enquiry. The 8th respondent has not furnished the copies of documents and details of complaints relied on by the respondents 9 and 10. In the reports, there are no details of enquiry viz., where it was conducted and what are the documents considered for the leveled allegations and whether the documents were furnished to the petitioner and he was given opportunity to give reply. Nothing containing in the report and proceeding of the 8th respondent. The report of 10th respondent dated 27.09.2022 is only based on oral and also the report of the 9th respondent dated 20.10.2022 is also not supported with any documentary materials and they are only oral. Based on reports of the 9th and 10th respondents, the 8th respondent passed the proceeding dated 25.10.2022, which is not sustainable in law as it was not based on any substantial evidence and also it was passed against the



principal of natural justice without any proper enquiry conducted. There is no proof that the petitioner misappropriated the church funds. Without conducting proper enquiry as per the Church Rules, the 8th respondent passed the impugned proceedings. As the petitioner was debarred he could not take part in the election of Bishop of first respondent Church. As per Rule 182(A) Church Council alone can take action. The petitioner has given representation dated 27.11.2022 against the said proceedings, for which the 9th respondent sent reply dated 07.12.2022. From the reply of 9th respondent, the petitioner apprehends that his total privilege was taken away by way of excommunication, which is repealed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and High Court in various case laws. In an earlier litigation, this Court held that it is well settled that a litigant shall file any litigation against whom he has grievance or on whose action he is aggrieved. The 8th respondent was appointed to conduct election and he cannot pass any proceeding and under Rule 182(A) Church Council alone can take action. As per Constitution of India, the fundamental rights of the petitioner is affected. Article 25 guarantees a fundamental right to every citizen of his conscience, faith and belief, irrespective of caste, creed and sex, the infringement of which is enforceable in a Court of law and such court can be none else except the civil court. So, no one



can be prevented from going to Court, when an individual's right to freedom guaranteed under Article 25 and the rights emanates from Article 26 are infringed, civil suit is maintainable. So, the petitioner can file suit against excommunication and injunction can be granted if he seeks. In India, there is no separate Law for the Churches and so, the civil Court has jurisdiction. The trial Court has not considered these aspects and simply dismissed the petition for injunction against the respondents from implementing the proceeding of the 8th respondent. The trial Court has not made any discussion regarding the materials placed by the petitioner. The petitioner has *prima facie* case and the balance of convenience is in favour of the petitioner. Therefore, the order of Trial Court may be set aside and injunction may be granted to the petitioner as sought in the petition.

5. In support of his argument, the learned counsel for the appellant has relied on the following citations:

1) **(2019) 14 Supreme Court Cases 1 (Hammad Ahmed Vs. Abdul Majeed and Ors.)**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court held in paragraph No.58 as follows:

“58. The ad interim mandatory injunction, is to be granted not at the asking but on strong



WEB COPY



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

circumstance so that to protect the rights and interest of the parties so as not to frustrate their rights regarding mandatory injunction. In Deoraj v. State of Maharashtra this Court held that Court would grant such an interim relief only if it is satisfied that withholding of it would prick the conscience of the Court and do violence to the sense of justice, resulting in injustice being perpetuated throughout the hearing, and at the end the Court would not be able to vindicate the cause of justice. Therefore, in appropriate case, ad interim injunction in mandatory form can be granted.”

2. 1995-2 Law Weekly page 765 (Major J.Victor Vs. Rt.Rev.M.Azariah, Bhishop in Madras), wherein this Court held in paragraph No.8 as follows:

“8.....If the earlier order excommunicating the applicant is held to be invalid, the subsequent order will also become invalid since it has been passed only after the suit. Therefore, in view of the passing of a subsequent order by the first respondent, it cannot be stated that the plaintiff has no cause of action for the suit since ex-communication in Religious Order and that too, of a spiritual-head, entails serious consequences both religious and civil. It cannot be brushed aside



WEB COPY



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

lightly on the ground that it is only for a limited period since one of the effects of an action of ex-communication is that the person concerned is deprived of the right of Worship which is a fundamental right under the Constitution.....”.

3. 2023 SCC Online SC 129 (Central Board of Dawoodi Bohra

Community and Anr. Vs. State of Maharashtra and Anr.), wherein it is held in paragraph Nos.16 and 21 as follows:

“16. The Ex-communication Act has been repealed by the Social Boycott Act...”.

21. By a majority, the Constitution Bench held that the Excommunication Act was void being in violation of Article 26(b) of the Constitution. We must note here that considering the definition of 'community' under section 2(a) of the Excommunication Act, the applicability thereof was not confined only to the Dawoodi Bohra community. The provisions of the Excommunication Act were applicable to the practice of excommunication prevailing in different religions, castes or sub castes.....,while recording a finding regarding violation of Article 26(b) only in relation to Dwoodi Bohra community, the Ex-communication Act in its entirety could not have been declared void.



WEB COPY



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

Therefore, even assuming that the view taken by the Constitution Bench is correct, the question which certainly survives for consideration is whether the practice of ex-communication prevailing in other religions, castes or sub-castes is constitutionally valid.”

4. 1995 Supp (4) Supreme Court Cases 286 (Most Rev.P.M.A.Metropolitan and Ors. Vs. Moran Mar Marthoma and Anr.), wherein it is held in paragraph Nos.42, 43 and 45 as follows:

“42.....Admittedly no law in respect of Christian Churches has been framed, therefore, there is no statutory law...”

43.....After coming into force of the Constitution, Article 25 guarantees a fundamental right to every citizen of his conscience, faith and belief, irrespective of caste, creed and sex, the infringement of which is enforceable in a court of law and such court can be none else except the civil courts.

45..... It is further settled that discipline of a church cannot affect any person except by express sanction of the civil power or by the voluntary submission of the particular person'



6. Per contra, the counsel for the respondents 5 to 7 submitted that these respondents are not necessary parties to the proceedings and they have no role or say in the order passed by the 8th respondent.

7. For the sake of convenience the parties are arrayed as mentioned in I.A.No.2 of 2023 in O.S.No.133 of 2023 on the file of the I Additional District Court (PCR), Tiruchirappalli.

8. The arguments of both side considered. Records perused. The first respondent Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church is a protestant denomination, which was established in the year 1919. The first respondent has its own Rules and has several posts to administer the Church. There are number of Churches under the first respondent. The 5th respondent TELC Christ Church, Coimbatore is under the control of first respondent. The petitioner is one of the member to the 5th respondent and served the first respondent in various capacities from the year 1979 to 2022.

9. On perusal of records, it is clear that during election for the triennium 2019-2022 Bishop and other office bearers were elected. When



there is dispute arose between the then Bishop and the first respondent TELC, a suit in O.S.No.253 of 2020 was filed by the Bishop against the first respondent TELC before the learned First Additional District Judge, Tiruchirapalli and the same was rejected. Against the said rejection A.S(MD)No.18 of 2021 was preferred before this Court and the same was allowed granting injunction. While the injunction was not obeyed, contempt petitions in Cont.A.(MD) Nos.3 to 10 of 2022 were filed before this Court and pending consideration the triennium period 2019-2022 was over and hence, Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court after hearing both appointed the 8th respondent as Administrator to act as Administer to conduct the election of Bishop/President and the Church Council as per the Rules for triennium 2022-2025, and has also directed that the 8th respondent may appoint one or more secretarial staff to assist him in the administration. Accordingly, the respondents 9 and 10 were appointed by the 8th respondent. There is no dispute in it.

10. While the facts being so, it is the case of the 8th respondent that as it came to learn that the petitioner involved in acts against the affairs of the TELC and caused huge amount of loss to TELC as he occupied the properties of TELC with meager rents and also sold out properties of the



TELC against rules and thereby committed misappropriation of corers of rupees. It is the further case of the 8th respondent that the 10th respondent, who was appointed as Property Officer was directed for personal inspection of the properties, who made inspection and submitted report dated 27.09.2022 alleging that the petitioner Mr.Benjamin Jeyaraj and Dr.Nelson committed irregularities under 10 heads mentioned therein. Based on the report, the petitioner was called for explanation and since his explanation was not satisfactory, the 8th respondent ordered personal enquiry and 9th respondent was appointed as enquiry officer. The 9th respondent made personal enquiry and submitted report dated 20.10.2022. Considering the reports of the respondent 9 and 10, the 8th respondent has passed the impugned proceedings dated 25.10.2022 and the petitioner was debarred to hold any post and also not to continue as a voter and also debar from contesting for any of the elections of TELC Christ Church Coimbatore or TELC until the loss committed by him remitted to the TELC.

11. Being aggrieved by the order dated 25.10.2022, the petitioner has filed the main suit in O.S.No.133 of 2023 pending on the file of the I Additional District Court (PCR), Tiruchirappalli, seeking the reliefs:



WEB COPY



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

"(a) For declaration to declare that Rule 182(A) of first defendant church that "If an office-bearer or a member of any committee or council is found to have acted in such a manner as to put the church to a loss, or to have done anything in violation of the Church Rules, the Church Council shall remove him/her from his/her position, and debar him/her for appointment to any responsible position in the TELC, in future, till such time as may be decided by them" is illegal, unconstitutional, violation of Article 21 of Constitution of India and null void.

(b) for a declaration to declare that Rule 188 of first defendant church that, "if any member of the Church goes to the civil court in regard to any question or dispute involving the work of church, or regarding personal differences arising out of the work of church, or regarding personal differences arising out of the work of the church without asking for an appeal under the rule given above, he/she shall ipso facto from the date of institution of the case be removed from any of the Committees of the Church of which he/she may a member, and be debarred from voting rights he/she may have as a member of the church. Any vacancy thus caused shall be filled as per rules. Any member thus penalized may be restored to his



WEB COPY



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

voting right, only after one year from the date of final disposal of the suit and then at the discretion of the Bishop of Tranquebar/President” is illegal, unconstitutional, violation of Article 21 of Constitution of India and null and void.

(c) for a declaration to declare that 8th defendant's proceedings dated 25.10.2022 debarring the plaintiff from holding any post in first defendant church, debarring the plaintiff from continuing as a voter in the first defendant church and debarring the plaintiff from contesting for any of the elections of TELC Christ Church, Coimbatore or first defendant Church is null and void and other reliefs.

Along with the plaint, the petitioner filed the petition in I.A.No.2 of 2023 seeking ad-interim relief.

12. It is the definite case of the petitioner that he was not given sufficient opportunity to explain the allegations and the 8th respondent passed the proceeding dated 25.10.2022 without following any settled principle of law and natural justice and gave his representation dated 27.11.2022. The same was considered and the 9th respondent gave a reply that 07.12.2022 stating the petitioner was given sufficient opportunity for



offering his explanation furnishing the reports of the respondents 9 and 10 and hence, the proceeding of the 8th respondent is passed adopting principles of natural justice and thereby his representation was rejected.

In that reply, the 9th respondent stated that unless the petitioner rectified the loss committed to TELC the petitioner is not at all entitled to any privilege enshrined in TELC church Rules and the petitioner has no *locus standi* or cause of action to question the Administrator's proceedings.

13. At this juncture, the petitioner contended that the 8th respondent was appointed as Administrator only to hold election for triennium 2022-2025. But, on perusal of counter filed by the respondents in I.A.No. 2 of 2023 it is specifically stated in paragraph No.17 as follows:

“17. In the Division Bench order of the Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court dated 08.08.2022, while appointing the 8th respondent as the Administrator conferred with all incidental powers as it was conferred to the previous Administrator appointed by the Court. It is also held in the said order that the Administrator is entitled to take decisions whatever is good for the



WEB COPY

C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023



Church....."

It is also specifically stated by the respondents in the said counter in paragraph No.16 as follows:

"16.From 10.09.2022 there is no Church Council in existence as the three year period was over by then and the entire administration is vested with administrator till the election to the post of Bishop and the CC Church Council is held."

On perusal of records, there is *prima facie* contra material is not placed by the petitioner. Therefore, the 8th respondent has rightly stated that he has been appointed as Administrator for administering the affairs in entirety is accepted.

14. The petitioner mainly contended that he was not given sufficient opportunity to explain the allegations. On perusal of records and typed set, page No.258 it is clear that the 8th respondent has issued proceedings dated 29.09.2022 said to have been issued to the petitioner wherein it is stated as follows:

"After considering the report, I, as the Administrator is constrained to seek explanation



from Dr.Nelson and Mr.Bengajmin Jeayaraj at the 1st instance. Hence, both of you are directed to submit your explanation to the report(copy enclosed) within two days i.e., on or before 12 noon on 01.10.2022 before the Administrator who will be available at Trichy Office.

If no explanation to the said report is given, further action will be initiated as if both of you have no explanation to offer. The Property Officer TELC is requested to serve this notice with copy of the report through email. Whatsapp to the above said two persons forthwith”

The petitioner has clearly stated in the petition that he appeared before the 8th respondent on 01.10.2022 and he has explained orally and has not submitted any written explanation. By this averment, it is clear that the petitioner was served the above notice prior to passing of the impugned proceeding dated 25.10.2022 by the 8th respondent. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner that he was not given opportunity to explain the allegation is untenable. Further, it is not stated by the petitioner that he has given requisition seeking further time for submitting explanation.



WEB COPY

15. On perusal of records, the respondents have clearly stated in paragraph Nos.5 and 20 in their counter in I.A.No.2 of 2023 in O.S.No. 133 of 2023 as follows:

“5.The order dated 25.10.2022 has already come into operation from 25.10.2022. For conducting the (14th Bishop election) the synod delegates election was held in the TELC Christ Church Coimbatore in November 2022 and in the said election due to the enforcement of the debarment order the petitioner was neither included as a voter nor in the eligible contestants lists.

20.The order having been implemented having come into force from 25.10.2022 and the suit injunction having been filed only on 04.03.2023, there is no balance of convenience in favour of the petitioner.”

The petitioner has not stated any contra statement against the above contentions. So, the impugned proceeding of the 8th respondent, *prima facie*, came to force. It is the specific contention of the respondents that as per Rule 188 enumerated that only civil Court barred but not the constitutional Court i.e., High Court and Supreme Court.



When enquiry proceedings was completed by Church authority in accordance with the rule, if any grievance over the same one should prepare appeal before the appellate authority of the Church or to high Court and not conduct a parallel trial in a civil Court.

16. On perusal of records, it is clear that in the typed set, the petitioner produced the Church Rules 1991 and Amendments - 2020 of the Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church. In respect of any alteration, interpretation etc, of the Rules, the Rules 196 and 197 are framed, which read as follows:

196. Alteration and Additions:

Any alteration or addition to these Rules can be made only by the SCC or the Synod.

197. Interpretation of the Rules:

In the interpretation of the Rules in this book the decision of the CC by a resolution shall be final.

As per Rules in Document A, it is stated that the Synod is the main legislative body of the Church. .

Rule 200 reads as follows:

200. Church Rules and proceeding of the Synod/SCC not to be questioned in any Court of law.



WEB COPY



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

“In consonance with the scheme and spirit of the rules of the Church, the above Rules shall be binding on the members as a domestic forum, and shall not be called into question in any Court of Law, nor shall these proceedings of the Synod/SCC be restrained on grounds of such defect or invalidation of election or irregularity or technicality of a like nature.”

Rule 188 reads as follows:

188.Action to be taken against those who go to court on Church matters:

In any member of the Church goes to the Civil Court in regard to any question or dispute involving the work of the Church, or regarding personal differences arising out of the work of the Church without asking for an appeal under the rule given above, he/she shall ipso facto from the date of institution of the case, be removed from any of the Committees of the Church of which he/she may be a member and be debarred from voting rights he/she may have as a member of the Church. Any vacancy thus caused shall be filled as per rules.

Any member thus penalized may be restored to his voting right, only after one year



WEB COPY

C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023



*from the date of the final disposal of the suit
and then at the discretion of the Bishop of
Tranquebar/president.*

17. The appellant claims that he is member of the respondent Church and served in various posts including Member of Church Council, from the year 1979 to 2022. So, the appellant would be well aware of the Church Rules. If so, the proceeding of the Administrator holds good until the above Rules 182(A) and 188 is repealed from the Rules of the Church. *Prima facie*, the appellant has not stated that as per provision of Rule 196 and 197, the appellant has sought for any alteration of interpretation of the Rules 182 (A) and 188 before SCC or Synod, which is legislative of Churches as per Rules. Therefore, this Court holds that the proceeding of the 8th respondent is, *prima facie*, enforceable one and it can be decided whether it is valid or not in the eye of law only after elaborate trial and the same cannot be done by this court at this stage of interim injunction.

18. It is the main case of the appellant that since the 9th respondent passed statement that the appellant is not at all entitled to any privilege enshrined in TELC Church Rules, which amounts to excommunication



according to appellant. So, he has filed the suit contending that his fundamental right is affected. As per citation relied on by the appellant he is entitled to struggle for his fundamental right before the Civil Court, that too, it can be decided only after full fledged trial after hearing both sides. At the same time, the contention of the respondents that the relief (a) and (b) declaring the Rules 182 (A) and 188 as null and void, can be decided only before the constitutional Court i.e., High Court or Supreme Court and the same cannot be sought before the Civil Court is also to be taken into consideration. However, the above rival contentions raised by both side cannot be decided in this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal which is arisen out of the order passed in petition in I.A.No.2 of 2023 in O.S.No. 133 of 2023 filed under Order 39 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Code, for ad-interim injunction. That can be done only after full fledged trial.

19. In the above facts and circumstances, this Court of the considered view that the appellant has not established *prima facie* case to get ad-interim injunction against the respondents from implementing the order of the 8th respondent, as the respondent contended that the order came into force as the appellant was not voting member and contesting party to the election held in November 2022. However, since the appellant apprehends of ex-communication upon the statement of the 9th



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

respondent, in the interest of natural justice this Court opines that the Trial Court may be directed to dispose the main suit in accordance with law within a stipulated period, which would meet ends of justice.

20. In the result, this Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is dismissed. The Trial Court is directed to dispose of the suit in O.S.No.133 of 2023 on merits, after giving sufficient opportunities to both sides within a period of five months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. The trial Court is further directed to dispose of the said suit on merit without being influenced in any way by any observation made in this judgment touching upon the merit of the case. No costs. Consequently connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

29.09.2023

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
vsd

To

- 1.The First Additional District Judge (PCR),
Tiruchirappalli.
- 2.The Record Keeper,
Vernacular Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023

P.VADAMALAI, J.

vsd

Pre - Delivery Judgment made in
C.M.A.(MD)No.730 of 2023
and
C.M.P(MD)No.10009 of 2023

29.09.2023