



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

Reserved on 06.03.2023

Delivered on 28.02.2024

CORAM:

The Honourable Mr.Justice Sathi Kumar Sukumara Kurup

C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.7276 of 2020

Dr.T.Chinnaraju

... Petitioner/Petitioner/Plaintiff

-Vs-

1.S.Thomas

2.Mariya Shoba

3.A.Vijayashanthi

4.Madhammal

... Respondents/Respondents/

Defendants

Prayer:- Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decretal order dated 05.02.2020 made in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 on the file of the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri.

For Petitioner : Ms.Mithraneshaa
for M/s.V.Srimathi

For Respondents : Mr.J.Hariharan
for M/s.V.Nicholas

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition had been filed to set aside the fair and decretal order dated 05.02.2020 made in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 on the file of the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri.



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

2. The learned Counsel Ms.Mithraneshaa for M/s.Srimathi, learned Counsel appearing for the Revision Petitioner submitted that the Plaintiff in O.S.No.52 of 2015 on the file of the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri, is the Revision Petitioner. It is the contention of the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner that the suit in O.S. No.52 of 2015 was pending from the year 2015 onwards. The Plaintiff is aged about 85 years. He had filed the suit for declaration of his title to the suit property and also seeking permanent injunction restraining the Defendants from interfering with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of the property. Also seeking permanent injunction restraining the Defendants, their men, authorised agents from in any way dealing or alienating the suit property in any manner. The learned Counsel for the Plaintiff invited the attention of this Court to the averments in the plaint, copy of which is enclosed in the typed set. The Plaintiff purchased the property in the year 1992. Originally, the property was part of Survey No.58/2 of Pedhathalapalli Village measuring 2.78.5 Hectares, belonging to the father of the first Defendant. After the death of the father of the first Defendant, there was a partition amongst the heirs of Iyyadurai @ Sowriappa Mudaliar. At the time of partition, Survey number was not subdivided. As per the partition deed, Susai Mary wife of Sowriappa Mudaliar and S.Joseph, son of Iyyadurai @ Sowriappa Mudaliar



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

were granted 2 acres and 16 cents. The said Susaimary and S.Joseph entered into an agreement of sale on 26.10.1986 in favour of one S.Vajjiravel, B.Manickam and S.Munusamy and they in turn agreed to sell the property to the Plaintiff on 12.02.1987. There were 49 plots in the property of Susaimary and S.Joseph. The Plaintiff had purchased Plot No.6 from the agreement holders. By mistake, the Power of Attorney seems to have executed the sale deed giving wrong number of power of attorney. Actually the parties to the Plot No.6 alone agreed to sell the property. The description given in the sale deed tallies with the Plot No.6. The description of property in Doc.No.31 of 1987 was handed over in possession to the Plaintiff and he is in possession from the year 1992. During the life time of Joseph, he filed a suit for recovery of possession. In that plaint, he did not claim possession of Plot No.6. He had admitted in the plaint that except the suit property, all other portions were sold. From the plaint in O.S.No.110 of 2007, the said Joseph did not claim the sold plots. The said Joseph is alleged to have executed a Will. Plot No.6 is not the subject matter of the Will. From the date of sale, both the parties were aware of the sale of Plot No.6 to the Plaintiff herein as per sale deed dated 11.12.1992. Therefore, the Plaintiff is in possession of the property under the *bona fide* impression that he purchased the property i.e., Plot No.6 in



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

Survey No.58/2C from Joseph. Recently the Defendants herein attempted to encroach on the property and attempted to alienate the property claiming under the Will. Therefore, the Plaintiff seeks declaration of title. Also by the principle of adverse possession, he is in continuous possession from the year 1992. Originally the owner Joseph had not filed the suit within 12 years from the date of sale in favour of the Plaintiff herein. So the Plaintiff had perfected the title. The heirs of Joseph cannot claim ownership or any right in the property of the Plaintiff. The Defendants claim that they will dispossess the Plaintiff from the property. Therefore, the Plaintiff had approached the Court seeking declaration of title to the suit property and seeking relief of permanent injunction against the Defendants, their men, agent or any one from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. Also seeking permanent injunction restraining the Defendants, their authorised agents or any one claiming under them from dealing with or alienating the suit property by any manner. During the pendency of the suit, the Plaintiff came to know that the first Defendant executed a settlement deed in favour of the second Defendant. The second Defendant sold the property in favour of the Defendants 3 and 4. Therefore, for the binding nature, the Plaintiff had included the Defendants 2 to 4 in the suit. After execution of the settlement deed by the



first Defendant in favour of the second Defendant the Plaintiff had amended the plaint by filing petition to implead the persons with whom settlement was executed. As per order in I.A.No.88 of 2018 dated 25.01.2018 the purchasers of the property also were included as Defendants 3 and 4. The Defendants had filed written statements. The first Defendant filed written statement wherein at paragraph No.5 he claimed as follows:

“Admittedly Soosaimary and Joseph did not sell the property either of 12 years from 1992 onwards, the right to Property is lost the said Joseph. The said Joseph was not aware of the alleged sale deed 11.12.1992. On the other hand, he was in continue possession and enjoyment of the suit property throughout his life. The Plaintiff cannot take advantage that deceased Joseph did not filed any suit for declaration of his title or recovery of possession. There was no such necessary because he had title and possession. It is untenable to allege that the Defendant or other heirs of Joseph have also not filed any suit for their title or recovery of possession. In fact after the demise of Joseph, his legal heirs continued in possession. It is not correct to allege that the heirs of Joseph have no right to the suit property, and their right if any is also allegedly lost after expiry of period of 12 years.”

3. The learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner also relied on the averments in the written statement filed by the first Defendant in paragraph No.9 which reads as under:-

“9. It is further submitted that the Defendant gifted the suit property to his daughter by name T.Mariyasobha as per Gift Deed dated 05.09.2008 and handed over its possession to her. Hence, the suit against the Defendant is not maintainable.”



Therefore, the Plaintiff had filed I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015

wherein the Plaintiff as Petitioner had stated as follows:

"2. I originally filed the suit against the first Respondent/first Defendant, who gave trouble to me for declaration of my title and for permanent injunction relief, and also for the relief of my restraining him for dealing with the property. The first Respondent/first Respondent filed a written statement later on, and in that statement he has mentioned that he has settled the property to his daughter, who is 2nd Respondent/2nd Defendant herein, and she in turn sold the property in two bits to the Respondent 3 and 4 Defendants 3 and 4. So I have filed a petition to implead the Respondents 2 to 4 and the Respondent 2 to 4 have filed the written statement also. From their statement, I am able to understand that the second Respondent became a donee in 2008, and this fact was not known to me at the time of filing of the suit. Anyhow the said settlement in favour of 2nd Respondent is invalid, and void under law, because on that date the original owner Joseph was not alive, and further apart from 1st Respondent, other heirs are also available to said Joseph. In fact the said Joseph died without filing any suit for recovery of possession of the suit property from me, and in fact in the original plaint itself I have clearly mentioned about this fact. In fact the sale in my favour is of the year 1992, and I continued in possession till recently, and Respondents 3 and 4 trespassed upon the suit property after their sale, and in fact the second Respondent never got possession, nor filed any suit for recovery of possession from me. So the defect in title is cured by the long possession and also by 2004 I have acquired my right in the suit property, and also perfected my title, and so I filed the suit for declaration and injunction.

3. As already stated the brother of the first Respondent S.Joseph was the original owner, and he did not filed any suit, establish his right in the suit property, and so he lost his right under Limitation Act, and so the first Respondent brother of said Joseph alone cannot claim title to the suit property, because there are other sisters, and so the document in favour of 2nd Respondent was created for litigation purposes, and similarly wantonly the Respondents 1 and 2 have sold the property to the Respondents 3 and 4 during the pendency of the suit, and so the sales in favour of Respondents 3



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

and 4 are affected by law of lis pendens. But the using influence and political power, the 3rd Respondent and the 4th Respondent have trespassed upon the suit property, and in fact during pendency of the suit the 3rd Respondent has put up construction. This is not a valid one. So now I am advised to file this amendment petition, seeking the relief of declaration of title against the Respondents in particular the Respondents 3 and 4, who are present owners. Further, now I am advised to file this amendment petition for recovery of possession, because there are two registered sale deed, which are fraudulent and so I am filing the amendment petition, seeking remedy of recovery of possession also. Hence, I am seeking declaration of title to the suit property and also for recovery of possession from the Respondents 3 and 4. Further, the Respondent No.3 has put up illegal construction only recently, and so I am seeking the relief of mandatory injunction also. Now the Respondents 3 and 4 as alleged owners are trying to dispose of their property, and so I am seeking permanent injunction relief also, restraining them, from alienating the property in any manner. Further, as already stated, the settlement deed of 2008 in favour of 2nd Respondent and the sale deeds of 2015 in favour of the Respondents 3 and 4 cannot confer any title on them, because I am already a owner in 1992, and also I perfected my title in 2004 itself. So to avoid future trouble, I am seeking for a declaration that the three documents ie., settlement deed in favour of 2nd Respondent, and the sale deed in favour of 3rd Respondent, and the sale deed in favour of 4th Respondent is null and void. So I am seeking amendment of the plaint, due to change of circumstances.”

“DETAILS OF AMENDMENTS

In para 9 of the plaint, last four line viz., “Hence, In the plaint” to be deleted., and add the following after deleting in the para as “Though the plaintiff file the suit for permanent injunction, now the Defendants 3 and 4 has trespassed upon the suit property about the year 2015 or so, and so the Plaintiff is now seeking reovery of possession of B schedule property from the 3rd Defendant, and D schedule property from the 4th Defendant, and hence, the suit for recovery of possession from the Defendants 3 and 4 as they are claiming as owners of the suit property. Further, the Defendants No.3 has illegally put up construction over the suit B schedule



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

property, and so mandatory injunction is sought against the 3rd Defendant and the property to be demolished forms part of B schedule property, and more fully described as C schedule property. Further the Defendants 3 and 4 are attempting to alienate the property, and so Plaintiff is seeking permanent injunction reliefs, restraining the Defendants 3 and 4 from alienating the property in any manner. Further the Plaintiff is seeking a declaration that the sale deed in favour of 3rd Defendant dated 02.02.2015 is null and void. Similarly declaration relief is sought against the 4th Defendant regarding her sale deed dated 02.02.2015 as null and void. Further the 2nd Defendant has illegally obtained a settlement deed from the first Defendants only, and the said settlement deed also is null and void, and so her sales by relying upon the said settlement deed in her favour dated 05.09.2008 is null and void. Though the Plaintiff is not a party to the above documents, he is seeking declaration reliefs regarding the invalidity of those documents as null and void to avoid future litigation. Hence, the Plaintiff is seeking the above reliefs in the present suit due to change of circumstances. Further, the sale deeds dated 02.02.2015 in favour of Defendants 3 and 4 is affected by lay of lis pendens. Even otherwise they are null and void.”

After para 9 (a) add the following as para 9 (b):-

In the description of property the Plaintiff is showing the A schedule property, which he has purchased and got title to the same under law, and by adverse possession. The B and D schedule property are forming part of A schedule property and the B and D schedule are given as Defendants 3 and 4 have separately purchased the property, and in fact out of 2400 sq. ft. A schedule property, 3rd and 4th Defendant have each purchase 1200 sq. ft. only by giving high valuation, and that will not represent the true value.

In the cause of action para before the word “at Peddanapalli Village add the following”. The 2nd Defendant has illegally got a settlement deed on 05.09.2008, and the Defendants 3 and 4 illegally obtaining sale deeds separately in their name dated 02.02.2015.

Delete the para 11 and insert the following as para 11

11. Value for the purpose of court fees and jurisdiction is Rs.3,39,600-00



WEB COPY

At the end of A schedule property insert Rs.3,21,600-00 as per Sec. 47(A) of the Stamp Act.

b) Market value of the B schedule property is Rs.1,60,800-00

b(1). For the relief of permanent injunction against D3 the alienation under Section 27 @ the Plaintiff values the relief at Rs.500/- But under that section minimum value is Rs.1,000-00.

b(2). For the relief of Mandatory injunction against D3 for removal of illegal construction in the B schedule property, morefully described in the C schedule property, the Plaintiff values the relief at Rs.500/- But under that section minimum value is Rs.1,000-00.

b(3). For the relief of declaration that the sale deed in favour of D3 as null and void, the Plaintiff values the relief at Rs.1,000/- But under that section minimum value is Rs.5,000-00.

so for that reliefs claimed against the D3 total value comes Rs.1,67,800-00, Hence, a total of Rs.5,034/- is payable.

C. Market value of the D schedule property is Rs.1,60,800-00

C(1). For the relief of permanent injunction against D4 the alienation u/s 27 @ the Plaintiff values the relief at Rs.500/- But under that section minimum value is Rs.1,000-00.

C(2). For the relief of declaration that the sale deed in favour of D4 as null and void, the Plaintiff values the relief at Rs.1,000/- But under that Section (d) minimum values is Rs.5,000-00.

So for that reliefs claimed against the D4 total value comes Rs.1,66,800-00, Hence a total C.F. of Rs.5,004/- is payable

d). For the relief of declaration that the settlement deed in favour of D2 as null and void, the Plaintiff values the relief at Rs.500/- But under that Section 25 (d) minimum value is Rs.5,000-00. Hence, a total C.F. of Rs.150-00 is payable.

Total C.F. payable for the above reliefs against the



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

<i>Defendants is</i>	<i>Rs.10,188-00</i>
<i>C.F.already paid on the plaint</i>	<i>Rs. 9,076-00</i>
<i>Hence difference in C.F. paid is</i>	<i>Rs. 1,112-00</i>

12.Delete the entire prayers and substitute the following:-

- 1. Declare the title the Plaintiff to the suit B and D schedule property;*
- 2. Direct the D3 to surrender possession of B Schedule property;*
- 3. Grant permanent injunction restraining the D3 from alienating the suit property in any manner;*
- 4. Grant mandatory injunction, directing the D3 to remove the illegal construction, put up in B schedule property and the construction is mentioned as C schedule property;*
- 5. Grant the relief of declaration that the sale deed in favour of D3 dated 02-02-2015 is null and void;*
- 6. Direct the D4 to surrender possession of B schedule property;*
- 7. Grant permanent injunction restraining the D4 from alienating the suit property in any manner;*
- 8. Grant the relief of declaration that the sale deed in favour of D4 dated 02-02-2015 is null and void;*
- 9. Declare the settlement deed dated 05-09-2008 in favour of D2 as null and void,*
- 10. Grant such other relief as this Honourable Court may deem fit to grant under the circumstances of the case;*
- 11. Grant costs of the suit*
- 12. And render justice.*

In the description of property in the existing description of property insert the word A schedule

After A schedule insert the word “B” schedule for the property purchased by D3.

“B” Schedule Property

In Krishnagiri RD, in Krishnagiri SRD, in Krishnagiri Taluk in Peddathanapalli Village, Survey No.58/2 as per new-sub-Division S.No.58/2C extent of 0.29.40 Acres Ass.R.1.00 in this plot No.6 Northern side 1200 sq. feet. And this plot is bounded as follows:



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

East : Plot No.7
West : 20 Feet Common Road
North : 20 Feet Common Road
South : Madhammal Property (Defendant No.4)
Value Rs.1,60,800/-

After B schedule property insert the word “C” schedule as the property involved for the relief of mandatory injunction against D3.

“C” Schedule Property

The Newly constructed building in “B” schedule property.

Insert the word D schedule property purchased by D4

“D” Schedule Property

In Krishnagiri RD, in Krishnagiri SRD, in Krishnagiri Taluk in Peddathanapalli Village, Survey No.58/2 as per new-sub-Division S.No.58/2C extent of 0.29.40 Acres Ass.R.1.00 in this plot No.6 Northern side 1200 sq. feet.is bounded as follows:

East : Plot No.7
West : 20 Feet Common Road
North : A.Vijayasanthi Property (3rd Defendant Land)
South : Plot No.10
Value Rs.1,60,800/-

Note: 'B' and 'D' schedule properties are forms part of 'A' schedule property.”

4. The Defendants 1 to 3 filed counter disputing the contention of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner. After due enquiry, the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri by order dated 05.02.2020 dismissed the Petition seeking amendment in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015.



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

Therefore, the Plaintiff had approached this Court by filing this Revision Civil Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India seeking to set aside the order of dismissal of the amendment petition in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015. If the same is not set aside, the Plaintiff will suffer injustice and miscarriage of justice as the Plaintiff cannot enjoy the property purchased by him with his hard earned money.

5. It is the further contention of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner that the suit was pending. Therefore, the amendment petition is to be allowed liberally prior to commencement of trial. The trial in the suit is yet to commence. While so, the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri had dismissed the amendment petition quoting Article 58 of the Limitation Act and that the amendment sought for is belated and suffered from delay and latches.

6. It is the contention of the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner/Plaintiff before the trial Court that during the pendency of the suit, the Limitation Act is not at all attracted. Even if Limitation Act is to be invoked, Article 65 of the Limitation Act alone is applicable. Articles 58 and 65 are extracted as under:



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

WEB COPY

Description of suit		Period of limitation	Time from which period begins to run
Part-III Suits relating to declarations			
58	To obtain any other declaration.	Three years	When the right to sue first accrues.
Part-V Suits relating to immovable properties			
65	For possession of immovable property or any interest therein based on title.	Twelve years	When the possession of the defendant becomes adverse to the plaintiff.

7. The learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner also placed reliance on the reported ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **(2019) 7 SCC 76 [Sopanrao and another -vs- Syed Mehmood and others]** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court had held as under:

“A. Limitation Act, 1963 - Art. 65 or Art. 58 – Suit for declaration of title and possession based on title i.e., both for relief of declaration and for relief of possession – Limitation period applicable would be that under Art. 65 and not Art. 58 – Distinguished from case where only relief sought is that of declaration – Specific Relief Act, 1963 – S. 5 and S. 34 – Property Law – Ownership and Title.

Held:



WEB COPY

The main prayers made in the suit concerned clearly indicate that it is a suit not only for declaration but the Plaintiffs also prayed for possession of the suit land. The limitation for filing a suit for possession on the basis of title is 12 years and, therefore, the suit is within limitation. Merely because one of the reliefs sought is of declaration that will not mean that the outer limitation of 12 years is lost. In a suit filed for possession based on title the Plaintiff is bound to prove his title and pray for a declaration that he is the owner of the suit land because his suit on the basis of title cannot succeed unless he is held to have some title over the land. However, the main relief is of possession and, therefore, the suit will be governed by Article 65 of the Limitation Act, 1963. Article 65 deals with a suit for possession of immovable property or any interest therein based on title and the limitation is 12 years from the date when possession of the land becomes adverse to the Plaintiff. In the instant case, even if the case is of the Defendants is taken at the highest, the possession of the Defendants become adverse to the Plaintiffs only on 19.08.1978 when possession was handed over to the Defendants. The suit concerned was filed in 1987 and was thus, well within limitation.”

8. It was observed in the said ruling that when it is a suit for mere declaration, Article 58 is attracted. But when the suit is for declaration of title and possession of the property, on the basis of the title, 12 years is the period of limitation. Therefore, the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner seeks to set aside the order of dismissal and allow the amendment in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015.

9. The learned Counsel for the Respondents/Defendants in the suit in O.S.No.52 of 2015 vehemently objected to the submission of the learned



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

Counsel for the Revision Petitioner stating that from the institution of the suit itself the Plaintiff did not have possession of the property. The Defendants had filed their written statement as early as in the year 2015. While so, the amendment sought for after filing of the written statement is after four years of the filing of the written statement. Therefore, the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri passed a well reasoned order which does not warrant any interference by this Court. The learned Counsel for the Respondents invited the attention of this Court to the order passed by the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri. Also the learned Counsel for the Respondents relied on the reported ruling in **2018 (4) L.W. 775 [Hemandkumar vs. D.Melvinkumar]** wherein it has been held as follows:

“C.P.C., Order 6, Rule 17, amendment of Plaintiff Limitation Act, (1963), Section 27, Article 58, 65, 113 Amendment of plaint – scope – suit was filed for permanent prohibitory injunction – Plaintiff filed application seeking amendment of plaint for – Declaration of Title, possession – Court dismissed it – Court below held that the proposed amendment is barred by limitation, cause of action arose when Defendants filed their written statement not only denying Plaintiff's Title but also asserting their Title over suit property – Challenge to that order.”

Therefore, the order of the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri, does not warrant any interference and seeks to dismiss this



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

Civil Revision Petition.

WEB COPY

10. Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioner M/s.B.S.Mithraneshaa, the learned Counsel for the Respondents Mr.J.Hariharan and perused the materials available on record.

Point for consideration:

Whether the amendment sought by the Plaintiff before the learned trial Judge in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 is to be allowed and the order of dismissal dated 05.02.2020 made in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 by the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri, is to be set aside as perverse?

11. On consideration of the rival submission and on perusal of the records in the documents, copy of the plaint, copy of the written statement, copy of the affidavit filed along with the amendment petition and the counter filed by the Defendants as Respondents in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015, the order passed by the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri, is found unacceptable in the light of the reported ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *(2019) 7 SCC 76 [Sopanrao and another*



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

-vs- Syed Mehmood and others]. The order of the learned Additional

Special Judge, Krishnagiri, rejecting the amendment is found not reasonable. When the plaint averments seeks to declare the title of the Plaintiff and the written statement was filed by Defendants, the possession of the Plaintiff is disputed by the Defendant No.1 who claims to have executed the settlement deed in favour of her daughter and the daughter having sold the property to Defendants 3 and 4, the Plaintiff had sought amendment of the plaint in O.S.No.52 of 2015 seeking declaration of the documents executed by the Defendant No.1 to Defendant No.2 and the Defendant No.2 in turn to Defendants 3 and 4 as null and void and also seeking mandatory injunction to remove the alleged illegal construction put up in the suit property. Therefore, as rightly contented by the learned Counsel for the Revision Petitioner/Plaintiff before the trial Court, Article 65 of the Limitation Act is attracted.

12. In the light of the reported ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **(2019) 7 SCC 76 [Sopanrao and another -vs- Syed Mehmood and others]**, the amendment had to be permitted liberally if the trial had not commenced. In that case, the amendment sought for by the Plaintiff had to be accepted.



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

WEB COPY

13. In the light of the above discussion, the point for consideration is answered in favour of the Revision Petitioner/Plaintiff before the trial Court and against the Respondents/Defendants. The amendment sought by the Plaintiff before the learned trial Judge in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 is to be allowed and the order of dismissal dated 05.02.2020 made in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 by the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri, is to be set aside as perverse.

In the result, **this Civil Revision Petition is allowed.**

The order dated 05.02.2020 made in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 by the learned Additional Special Judge, Krishnagiri, is set aside. The amendment sought by the Plaintiff before the learned trial Judge in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 is allowed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

28.02.2024

SRM

Index : Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation : Yes/No



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

To

1. The Additional Special Judge,
Krishnagiri.
2. The Section Officer, VR Records,
High Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020

SATHI KUMAR SUKUMARA KURUP, J.,

SRM

**Order made in
C.R.P.No.1327 of 2020**

28.02.2024