



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.06.2024

CORAM:

The Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP

C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021
and
C.M.P.No.13482 of 2021

- 1.Abdul Khader (Died)
 - 2.Kolusambeevee
 - 3.Joolaiga Beevi
 - 4.Mohamed Yaseen
 - 5.Nilavar Nisha
 - 6.Sahul Hameed
 - 7.Nargees Subhagan
 - 8.Mumthaj
 - 9.Abdul Rahman
- ... Petitioners

[Sole Petitioner died. Petitioners 2 to 9 brought on record as Legal Representatives of the deceased sole Petitioner viz., Abdul Khader vide Court order dated 21.04.2023 made in CMP Nos.8031 & 8034 of 2023 in CRP No.1735]

Versus

Thiagarajan

... Respondent

Civil Revision Petition filed under Section 25 of Tamil Nadu Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, to set aside the judgment and decree passed in R.C.A. No.1 of 2019 on the file of the Rent Control Appellate Authority/Sub Court, Tiruvarur, dated 24.01.2020 reversing the fair order and decretal order of the learned Rent Controller, District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam, passed in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 dated 28.11.2018.



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

WEB COPY

For Petitioners

: Mr.N.G.Ashok Kumar
for Mr.C.Jagadish

For Respondent

: Mr.G.Govarthanam
for Mr.B.Ramamoorthy

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition had been filed to set aside the judgment and decree passed in R.C.A.No.1 of 2019 on the file of the learned Sub Judge/ Rent Control Appellate Authority, Tiruvarur, dated 24.01.2020.

2. The brief facts which are relevant to decide this Civil Revision Petition are as follows:-

2.1. The deceased 1st Revision Petitioner herein was impleaded as Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 shown as a tenant. R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was filed by one Thiagarajan, claiming himself to be the landlord. The Respondent had filed counter in the R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 disputing the claim of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 before the learned Rent Controller. The Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 claimed that he had purchased the superstructure through a registered sale deed in the year 1975 from one Kamruddin, the site belonged to Dharmapuram Adheenam. Therefore, the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 is a tenant under the Dharmapuram



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

Adheenam and the superstructure belonged to him. The Respondent had mortgaged the property with one Palaniammal, W/o.Murugayan for Rs.4 lakhs.

At the time of obtaining loan, the said Palaniammal had obtained signatures of the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 in blank papers and created false documents as though the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 had purchased the property from Palaniammal through an unregistered sale deed and Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 had executed sale agreement deed. The Respondent disputed the claim of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 that the Respondent as a tenant. The Respondent asserted that he is the owner of the property and not a tenant under the Petitioner.

2.2. During enquiry, the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was examined as P.W-1. Exhibits were marked as Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-P11. The Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was examined as R.W-1 and the documents relied by the Respondent were marked as Ex.R-1 to Ex.R-3. After assessment of the evidence, the learned Rent Controller/District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam, dismissed the R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 by order dated 28.11.2018.

2.3. Aggrieved by the same, the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 filed R.C.A.No.1 of 2019 on the file of the learned Sub Judge/Rent Control Appellate Authority, Tiruvarur. The learned Sub Judge, Tiruvarur, by



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

judgment dated 24.01.2020 reversed the finding of the learned Rent Controller, District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam, holding that the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 / Appellant in R.C.A.No.1 of 2019 as owner of the property based on the unregistered sale agreement deed.

3. Aggrieved by the finding of the learned Rent Control Appellate Authority/Sub Court, Tiruvarur allowing R.C.A.No.1 of 2019 filed by the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011, the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011, who is the Respondent in R.C.A.No.1 of 2019, had filed this Civil Revision Petition, seeking to set aside the judgment and decree dated 24.01.2020 passed in R.C.A.No.1 of 2019 of the learned Sub Judge/Rent Control Appellate Authority, Tiruvarur.

4. Mr.C.Jagadish, learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners submitted his arguments. As per his submission, the learned Rent Controller/District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam had on proper appreciation of evidence rejected the contention of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 that he had purchased the suit property through an unregistered sale deed. The claim of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 is inadmissible as per Section 40 of the Registration Act, 1908. An unregistered



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

document for value more than Rs.100/- is inadmissible in evidence. Whereas, the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011, the Revision Petitioner herein had furnished the sale deed which was the registered sale deed of the year 1975 for Rs.4,00,000/- (Rupees four lakh only).

5. The learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners invited the attention of this Court to the cross-examination of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011. The learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners contended that while filing the R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011, the Petitioner claimed that he purchased the suit property from the Respondent. After such sale, he had requested the Petitioner to permit him to reside in the suit property as a tenant for one year which was disputed by the Respondent. In the cross-examination, the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 had stated that he had purchased the property from Palaniammal and also states that he had executed the sale deed in the office of the Notary Public. Further in the cross-examination, he stated that the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 had sold the property to Palaniammal. From Palaniammal, the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 had received the sale deed. Also, he had stated that he had not filed any rental receipts as proof of his claim that the Respondent was a tenant. He had denied the suggestions of the Respondent that he had misused the signed blank papers



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

in the custody of Palaniammal. He had also stated in the cross-examination that he was ready to examine Palaniammal, but he had not examined Palaniammal as a witness. He had marked the document as though he had served notice on the Respondent as a tenant which was marked as Ex.P-4 to which as per the claim of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011, the Respondent had sent a reply which was marked as Ex.P-4. Ex.P-5 was marked without postal cover or acknowledgement card. The suggestion by the learned Counsel for the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 that both these documents were created by the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was denied in his cross-examination.

6. The Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was examined as R.W-1. Palaniammal was examined as R.W-2. He had in his evidence deposed that the mortgage executed by the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was settled with Palaniammal. Based on the appreciation of evidence, the learned Rent Controller/District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam, had dismissed R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011. While so, the learned Rent Control Appellate Authority/Sub Court, Tiruvarur, had relied on the alleged letter which was marked as Ex.P-5 by the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 without producing the registered cover. Based on the said document, the learned Rent



Control Appellate Authority, Tiruvarur, had reversed the finding of the learned Rent Controller/District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam. The finding of the learned Rent Control Appellate Authority/Sub-Court, Tiruvarur is hit by provisions of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, the provisions of Registration Act. Unstamped, unregistered sale deed for value more than Rs.100/- cannot be marked in civil proceedings. Also, before sale of the property, the house site belongs to Dharmapuram Adheenam, the persons who sell the property has to obtain prior permission from the HR & CE Department as per Section 17(1)(b) of the Registration Act, 1908. Therefore, the contention of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was rightly rejected by the learned Rent Controller/District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam, whereas the learned Rent Control Appellate Authority, Tiruvarur, had failed to appreciate those facts.

7. In support of his contention, the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioners relied on the ruling in the case of ***Packiriswamy Chettiar Vs. R.Ramadoss*** reported in ***1996 SCC Online Mad 705***” wherein this Court had held as follows:-

“Transfer of Property Act, S. 8 — Landlord must establish his claim as to existence of landlord-tenant relationship — Absence of lease or receipt for rent at any time as proof of tenancy, or recitals in account books as to payment of rent, omission to state the name of the particular tenant while listing out the names of other tenants



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

and inability of landlord to state the terms of tenancy, namely the rent and commencement of tenancy, held, would lead to inference by court that tenancy is not established.

To direct the eviction of a person in possession, the claimant has to clearly establish his claim of existence of landlord-tenant relationship. More so, (in this case) when it is admitted that the tenancy commenced in 1970 and the petition for eviction was filed in 1986, it has to be accepted there is no lease document, there is no proof of receipt of rent at any time, relevant account books, which must be available with the vendor, examined as PW2 are not produced. The vital document Ex. A-1 has not included the petitioner, Packiriswamy's name, while listing the names of other tenants, and even as late as in January, 1986, the petitioner, Ramadoss, to say the least, is unsure about the vital terms of the tenancy, viz., rent and the Commencement of the month of tenancy. There is the further fact that the vendor categorically admits that in regard to his other tenants, he has taken lease deeds. "I am, therefore of the view that the tenancy alleged to exist has not been made out. This, undoubtedly is a jurisdictional fact and an error in regard to this, will oust the jurisdiction of the Rent Controller and consequently, the Rent Control Appellate Authority.

13.....Even here, learned senior counsel points out to the admission of the witness that while he had taken lease deeds from his other tenants, he had not taken one from Packiriswamy. Learned senior counsel adds that in another case, judgment in which is being pronounced by me to-day C.R.P. No. 1644 of 1991 (1997-1-L.W. 1) the petitioner Ramadoss has exhibited the Account Books of his vendor as Exs. A-54 to Ex. A-60 to prove the alleged tenancy in that case".

Therefore sought to allow the Civil Revision Petition and to set aside the judgment and decree dated 24.01.2020 passed in R.C.A.No.1 of 2019 by the learned Sub Judge/Rent Control Appellate Authority, Tiruvarur

8. The learned Counsel for the Respondent submitted that the Civil Revision Petition is not maintainable as the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

2011 had filed O.S.No.48 of 2011 before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam, seeking injunction not to evict him from the suit properties. O.S.No.48 of 2011 against the Palaniammal, W/o.Murugayan and Thiagarajan, the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 as Defendants. The said suit was dismissed. The learned Counsel further submitted that as per the G.O passed by the Tamil Nadu Government in 2005, all the properties belonging to the temples and Dharmapuram Adheenam, registration could not be done. Therefore, the sale deed executed by Palaniammal in favour of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was an unregistered sale deed. That cannot be taken advantage by the Revision Petitioner. The cross-examination of the Revision Petitioner is sufficient proof that he was aware that the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was the landlord and he was the tenant. In the course of the cross-examination, the documents were marked as Ex.P-7, Ex.P-8 and Ex.P-9 which were admitted documents from the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011, the Revision Petitioner herein. Therefore, the R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was filed by Thiagarajan, claiming to be the owner of the property is to be allowed. Instead, the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam, had misdirected himself has misconstrued the evidence and dismissed the R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011. The learned Sub Judge, Tiruvarur, had on proper appreciation of evidence considered that the Revision



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

Petitioner herein was a Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was tenant by his own reply given to the notice given by the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011, Appellant in R.C.A.No.1 of 2019. Therefore, the learned Counsel for the Respondent seeks to dismiss this Civil Revision Petition.

Point for consideration:

(i) Whether this Civil Revision Petition is to be allowed and the judgment dated 24.01.2020 in R.C.A.No.1 of 2019 passed by the learned Sub Judge/Rent Control Appellate Authority, Tiruvarur, is to be set aside?

(ii) Whether the rent control original petition is maintainable?

(iii) Whether the Revision Petitioner in this Civil Revision Petition as a tenant to be evicted by the Respondent in CRP/ landlord?

9. Heard the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner and the learned Counsel for the Respondent. Perused the order passed by the learned Rent Controller in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 on the file of learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam and the judgment passed by the Rent Control Appellate Authority in RCA.No.1 of 2019 on the file of the learned Sub Judge, Tiruvarur.

10. During inquiry before the learned Rent Controller/District



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam in RCOP.No.3 of 2011, the

Revision Petitioner as Respondent in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 examined himself as P.W-1 and marked documents as Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-11. Ex.P-1 is the lawyer's notice issued by the landlord to the Respondent tenant. Ex.P-2 is the acknowledgment card as proof of receipt of lawyers notice by the Respondent, tenant. Ex.P-3 is the copy of the plaint in O.S.No.48 of 2011, the suit filed by the Revision Petitioner in C.R.P and the Respondent in R.C.O.Ps. Ex.P-4 is the letter dated 23.02.2010 sent by the landlord to the Respondent directing the Respondent/tenant to vacate and handover possession. Ex.P-5 is the reply notice dated 26.02.2010 by the Respondent/ tenant to the petitioner. Ex.P-6 is the copy of the affidavit filed by the Revision Petitioner in C.R.P and the Respondent in RCOP.No.3 of 2011 in I.A.No.66 of 2011 in O.S.No.20 of 2011. Ex.P-7 is the signature of the Respondent tenant in the Lease Deed dated 01.04.2010 executed between landlord and tenant, Petitioner in RCOP.No.3 of 2011 and the Respondent in RCOP No.3 of 2011. Ex.P-8 is the signature of the Respondent tenant in RCOP No.3 of 2011 dated 01.04.2010. Ex.P-9 is the also signature of the Respondent tenant dated 01.04.2010 in the Lease Deed. Ex.P-10 has receipts (6 Nos) dated 30.06.2012, 30.06.2013, 30.06.2014, 29.06.2015, 17.06.2016 and 31.03.2017 as proof of payment of lease to the land for the vacant site of the Dharmapuram Aatheenam, Sri Suyambunatha



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

Swamy Temple. Ex.P-11 is the series of recitals (4 Nos) dated 07.04.2017, 21.05.2015, 18.07.2014 and 25.04.2013.

11. The tenant Respondent in R.C.O.P, Abdul Kathar is examined as Respondent. On behalf of the Respondent, the documents were marked as Ex.R-1 to Ex.R-3. Ex.R-1 is the sale deed executed by one Kamruddin in favour of Revision Petitioner herein, dated 26.08.1975. Ex.R-2 is the bills of Electricity consumption charges. (6 in Nos). Ex.R-3 is the letter received by the Respondent in R.C.O.P from the TANGEDCO.

12. On assessment of evidence, the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam as Rent Controller rejected the claim of the petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 that the petitioner is the landlord and the Respondent is the tenant. The R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 was dismissed by the learned Rent Controller/District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam stating that what cannot be done legally directly and that also cannot be done indirectly. The learned Rent Controller rejected the claim of the Petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011 that he is the landlord stating that landlord failed to establish his claim that he had purchased the property from Palaniammal on the ground that in transfer of property belonging to the Dharmapuram Aathinam



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

cannot be transferred without getting prior approval from the Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowment Act and also stating section 17 of the Registration Act.

14. It is the contention of the learned Counsel for the Respondent that the learned Rent Controller cannot decide title of the property. Therefore he had misdirected himself and dismissed the Rent Control Original Petition. It is the contention of the learned Counsel for the Respondent that the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam as Rent Controller failed to consider the fact that the tenant himself had entered into lease agreement with the landlord and subsequently denied the title of the landlord which attracts the provision of Section 116 of the Indian Evidence Act, "Estoppel of title by tenant". The tenant is prevented from denying the title of the landlord. When the petitioner in RCOP.No. 3 of 2011 had produced the Lease Deed marked as Ex.P-7 to Ex.P-9, the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate as Rent Controller failed to appreciate on the same. The R.C.O.P is filed only regarding evicting the tenant from the super structure. The title of the property is with the Dharmapuram Aathinam only. Super structure is in the ownership of the petitioner in R.C.O.P. After entering into lease agreement with the petitioner in R.C.O.P, the conduct of the Respondent in denying title



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

of the landlord attracts provisions of 116 of the Indian Evidence Act. The learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate as Rent Controller failed to consider the same and misdirected himself thereby dismissed the claim of the petitioner in R.C.O.P.No.3 of 2011.

15. In the appeal, the learned Sub Judge, Thiruvarur had on the same set of evidence before the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam in R.C.O.P No.3 of 2011 had on proper appreciation of facts and law arrived at a conclusion that the petitioner in R.C.O.P No.3 of 2011 is the landlord and the Respondent in R.C.O.P. No.3 of 2011 is the tenant thereby reversed the finding given by the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam as Rent Controller and thereby set aside the order of dismissal of R.C.O.P No.3 of 2011 and allowed the R.C.A. No.1 of 2019, granting time to the Respondent in R.C.O.P to vacate and hand over the possession to the petitioner in R.C.O.P. within two (2) months from the date of passing of the judgment in R.C.A. No.1 of 2019, dated 24.01.2020.

16. On perusal of the document, it is found that the lease agreement between the landlord and tenant was marked on behalf of the landlord as petitioner under Ex.P-7 to Ex.P-9. Also letter sent by the landlord, the



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

petitioner in R.C.O.P to the Respondent marked under Ex.P-4 dated 23.03.2010 reveals that the Respondent had sought time to vacate and handover the possession. Contrary to the same, the Respondent had claimed ownership of the property and denied title to the property by the petitioner in R.C.O.P. The contention of the learned Counsel for the Respondent in R.C.O.P cannot be accepted in the Court of Law under Section 115 and 116 of the Indian Evidence Act. The Respondent in the R.C.O.P filed counter claiming that he had mortgaged property with One Palaniammal and executed the some documents in favour of Palaniammal and after mortgaging property to Palaniammal and claims that Palaniammal had colluded with the petitioner in R.C.O.P. It is for the Respondent to prove such contention by marking those documents that he had alleged to have executed in favour of Palaniammal or atleast summoned the said Palaniammal. The said Palaniammal had not been examined as witness. The learned Rent Control Appellate Authority considered all those facts. Therefore found that the order dismissing the R.C.O.P No.3 of 2011 by the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate Nanilam as Rent Controller is perverse. Therefore the learned Sub Judge, Thiruvavarur, the learned Rent Control Appellate Authority had set aside the order of dismissal of the R.C.O.P NO. 3 of 2011 and allowed the R.C.O.P No.1 of 2019 and also directed the Respondent in R.C.O.P.No. 1 of 2019 to



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

handover vacant possession within two (2) months from the date of passing of the judgment.

17. On perusal of the order of the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, it is found that the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate had exceeded his authority as Rent Controller. He was expected to decide the subject matter in the light of the Tamil Nadu Building lease and Rent Control Act. He had misdirected himself and arrived at a conclusion that the site wherein property is standing belongs to Dharmapuram Aathinam (தர்மபுர ஆதினம்). The petitioner in R.C.O.P has not established his claim through proper documents. Therefore dismissed the petition. The said order of the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate as Rent Controller is found perverse. He has misdirected himself by going into question of title. The learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate is not the Civil Court to decide the title while dealing with the cases under the Tamil Nadu Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act. He is to decide the petition as a summary trial. The learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate acted as Rent Controller. Therefore, he has to give finding based on the provisions of Tamil Nadu Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act and he miserably failed to consider those facts.



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

WEB COPY18. The learned Rent Control Appellate Authority, the learned Sub Judge, Thiruvarur had considered the evidence available before the learned Rent Controller and on proper appreciation of the same has rejected the contention of the learned Counsel for the Respondent denying the title of the landlord. Therefore the learned Sub Judge, Thiruvarur as Rent Control Appellate Authority has set aside the order of the learned Rent Controller. The judgment passed by the learned Rent Control Appellate Authority is proper in the light of the Tamil Nadu Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act. Regarding title of the property it is for the HR & CE authorities to consider those things. As far as the Rent Controller is considered, the lease deed and exchange of lawyer's notice and letters between landlord and tenant, petitioner and Respondent in R.C.O.P establish the fact that there was tenant and landlord relationship. Therefore the point for consideration is answered in favour of the landlord, the Respondent herein and against the Respondent in RCOP.

19. The Civil Revision Petition is dismissed confirming the judgment passed by the Rent Control Appellate Authority. The ruling cited by the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner in **1996 SCC Online Mad 705** will



not hold good to the facts of the case.

WEB COPY

20. As already discussed, the Lease Deed which was marked on side of the petitioner in R.C.O.P, the Respondent in C.R.P as Ex.P-7 to Ex.P-9 attracts the principles of estoppel of title by the tenant. That itself will be sufficient to arrive at a conclusion that there is a relationship between petitioner in R.C.O.P and Respondent in R.C.O.P as landlord and tenant. There is relationship of landlord and tenant as per Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-11. The ruling in *1996 SCC Online Mad 705* is not applicable to the facts of this case. The petitioner in R.C.O.P had established his right and claim through Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-11. Under those circumstances, the ruling cited by the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner in *1996 SCC Online Mad 705* is rejected.

21. In the light of the above discussion, the points for consideration are answered in favour of the Respondent and against Revision Petitioners. The judgment dated 24.01.2020 in R.C.A.No.1 of 2019 passed by the learned Sub Judge/Rent Control Appellate Authority, Tiruvarur, is found proper and the same is to be confirmed.

22. In the result, **this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed with cost**



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

throughout. The Revision Petitioners are directed to handover vacant possession within two (2) months from the date of uploading copy of the order in the website of this Court. The Respondent/Landlord is directed to file appropriate petition to evict the tenant before the learned District-cum-Judicial Magistrate/Rent Controller, Nannilam.

The learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Nanilam shall dispose of the execution petition filed by the Respondent in C.R.P, the petitioner in R.C.O.P within three months from the date of filing of execution petition.

13.06.2024

cda/Shl

Index : Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

To

- 1.The Sub Court,
Rent Control Appellate Authority,
Tiruvarur.
- 2.The District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate
Rent Controller,
Nannilam.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J.,

cda/shl

Order made in
C.R.P.No.1735 of 2021

13.06.2024