



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.12.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE R.HEMALATHA

S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

Ananthababu

... Appellant

Vs.

1. D.Sasivarnan

2. Saraswathi

3. S.Govinda Raghavan

... Respondents

Prayer : Second Appeal filed under Section 100 CPC, 1908 against the decree and judgment dated 04.03.2020 passed in A.S. No.2 of 2017 and Cross Appeal No.39 of 2017, on the file of the II Additional District Court, Vellore at Ranipet, reversing the decree and judgment dated 29.06.2016 passed in O.S.No.38 of 2014, on the file of the Sub Court, Arakkonam.

For Appellants	: Mr.P.Krishnan
For RR1 and 2	: Mr.J.Ravikumar
R3	: No appearance



WEB COPY



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

JUDGMENT

The appellant, A.V.Ananthababu is the plaintiff in O.S.No.49/2008 on the file of the Sub Court, Ranipet. He filed the suit for a declaration that the decree in O.S.No.127/2006 on the file of the Sub Court, Ranipet is null and void and for a mandatory injunction directing the first defendant to return the original documents of title deeds in respect of the suit property and for costs.

2. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per their ranking in the trial court and at appropriate places, their rank in the present second appeal would also be indicated.

3. The case of the plaintiff in a nutshell is as follows :

3.1. The plaintiff obtained a loan of Rs.2,45,000/- from the first defendant on 22.03.2006. A sale agreement (Ex.A1) was entered into between him and the first defendant on the same day in respect of the suit property. The first defendant obtained his signatures on blank promissory



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

notes, blank papers, blank cheques, blank vakalat etc. on the date of the sale agreement.

3.2. On 08.06.2006, another sale agreement (Ex.A2) came to be executed between him and the wife of the first defendant (second defendant) for a higher sale consideration in respect of the very same suit property. Both the sale agreements were executed only as a security for the loan obtained by the plaintiff from the first defendant and therefore, the plaintiff never intended to sell the property in favour of the first defendant or his wife, the second defendant. Though there was a specific mention in both the sale agreements that possession of the suit property was handed over to the defendants it was not done so and the plaintiff continued to be in possession and enjoyment of the suit property.

3.3. While so, the first defendant filed the suit in O.S.No.127/2006 before the Sub Court, Ranipet, for specific performance of contract against the plaintiff based on the agreement dated 22.03.2006 (Ex.A1). In the plaint, the first defendant did not mention the second sale agreement dated 08.06.2006 (Ex.A2) entered



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

into between the plaintiff and the second defendant. In both the sale agreements dated 22.03.2006 and 08.06.2006 (Ex.A1 and Ex.A2) it was clearly mentioned that the first defendant can only claim the amount as compensation / damages and not the property.

3.4. According to the plaintiff, in the settlement deed dated 09.03.2006 (Ex.A4) executed by his father in his favour, the value of the suit property was indicated as Rs.55,65,308/-. The first defendant also was aware of the market value of the suit property, but in the sale agreement dated 22.03.2006 (Ex.A1) the sale consideration was mentioned as Rs.2,45,000/-. In the second sale agreement dated 08.06.2006 (Ex.A2) it was indicated as Rs.9,00,000/-.

3.5. On 12.06.2006, the plaintiff handed over all his title deeds to the first defendant. All these facts would go to show that the sale agreement dated 22.03.2006 (Ex.A1) was executed only as a security for the loan advanced by the first defendant in favour of the plaintiff. The plaintiff never intended to sell the suit property in favour of the first defendant.



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

3.6. However, the first defendant suppressing all these facts had filed the suit in O.S.No.127/2006 before the Sub Court, Ranipet. The first defendant had misused the blank vakalat duly signed by the plaintiff. Thiru. S.Govinda Ragavan, the counsel (third defendant) signed the vakalat and presented it before the Sub Court, Ranipet, as if he was engaged by the plaintiff.

3.7. The suit was posted for filing written statement on 21.03.2007. However, on 16.03.2007 a petition in I.A.No.72/2007 was filed for advancing the hearing date and the third defendant (counsel) filed the written statement. Thereafter, the case was posted on 21.03.2007 for framing issues and issues were also framed. Subsequently, the case was posted for trial on 27.03.2007 and the first defendant examined himself as P.W.1 and marked three documents. The third defendant also cross examined P.W.1 on the same day and made an endorsement that there is no oral evidence on the side of the plaintiff (defendant in O.S.No.127/2006). Arguments were advanced by both the counsels on the same day and the case was posted for judgment on 10.04.2007. On



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

09.04.2007, I.A.No.84/2007 was filed to amend the plaint and the said petition was allowed on the same day since the third defendant made an endorsement that he does not have any objection to allow the said petition.

3.8. On 10.04.2007, the judgment was pronounced. The plaintiff neither engaged the third defendant to file vakalat nor gave him any instructions to make endorsements like "No oral evidence" and "No objection". Subsequently, the plaintiff came to know about the decree passed in O.S.No.127/2006. The plaintiff immediately filed two petitions one to set aside the *ex parte* decree passed in O.S.No.127/2006 and another to revoke the vakalat filed by the third defendant. The said petitions were dismissed as against which, the plaintiff preferred a revision in C.R.P.(NPD) No.1920/2007 before this Court. The CRP was disposed of on 11.07.2007 directing the plaintiff to file a separate suit to set aside the decree passed in O.S.No.127/2006 and hence, the suit.



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

4. The suit in O.S.No.38/2014 was resisted by the defendants 1 and 2 on the following grounds:

- i. All the allegations contained in the plaint are false.
- ii. It is false to contend that the plaintiff obtained a loan of Rs.2,45,000/- from the first defendant on 22.03.2006.
- iii. The first defendant never obtained signed blank promissory notes, signed blank papers, signed blank cheques, signed vakalat forms etc. from the plaintiff.
- iv. It is true that on 08.06.2006 the plaintiff and the second defendant entered into a sale agreement in respect of the suit property.
- v. The sale agreement dated 08.06.2006 (Ex.A2) is not valid and is not also enforceable and therefore, the first defendant filed the suit based on the first sale agreement dated 22.03.2006 (Ex.A1).
- vi. The suit was posted on 21.03.2007 for filing written statement. However, the hearing was advanced and the written statement was filed on 16.03.2007 itself.
- vii. The trial court framed issues on 21.03.2007 and posted the case for



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

trial on 27.03.2007 on which the date the plaintiff (first defendant herein) filed the proof affidavit and marked three documents (Ex.A1 to Ex.A3). The counsel (third defendant) engaged by the present plaintiff cross examined P.W.1 on the same day and also made an endorsement that the defendant (in O.S.No.127/2006) has "No oral evidence".

viii. After hearing the arguments on both sides the case was posted for judgment on 10.04.2007 and the judgment was pronounced on the same day. There is no infirmity in the decree and judgment passed by the trial court in O.S.No.127/2006 and therefore, the suit filed by the plaintiff has to be dismissed.

ix. On the date of judgment i.e. on 10.04.2007 the plaintiff filed two applications one to revoke the vakalat filed by the third defendant and another to set aside the *ex parte* decree passed against him. Both the petitions were returned by the court on the ground that such applications were not maintainable. However, the plaintiff preferred a revision in C.R.P.(NPD) No.1920/2007 before the Hon'ble High Court and the said petition was disposed of on



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY 11.07.2007.

- x. In fact, the plaintiff approached the first defendant in the month of March 2006 and conveyed his intention to sell the suit property for a sale consideration of Rs.2,45,000/-.
- xi. The first defendant also paid a sum of Rs.2,20,000/- as advance and the balance sale consideration was Rs.25,000/-.
- xii. In order to help the plaintiff who was a civil contractor, another sale agreement dated 08.06.2006 (Ex.A2) was executed and the said document is only a sham and nominal one.
- xiii. When the first defendant orally demanded the plaintiff to receive the balance sale consideration of Rs.25,000/- and execute the sale deed in his favour, the plaintiff started evading and therefore, the first defendant issued a legal notice and thereafter, filed the suit in O.S.No.127/2006. There is no fraud or collusion between the defendants as alleged by the plaintiff.

5. The trial court after framing necessary issues posted the case for trial.



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

6. The third defendant (counsel) remained absent before the trial court and was set *ex parte*.

7. In the trial court, the plaintiff examined himself and one another witness and marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A17. The first defendant examined himself and marked Ex.B1 and Ex.B2.

8. The learned trial court judge after analysing the oral and documentary evidence on record, decreed the suit in favour of the plaintiff and also directed the plaintiff to pay a sum of Rs.2,45,000/- to the first defendant together with interest @ 24% per annum from 22.03.2006 till the date of filing of the suit and thereafter, @ 6% per annum till the date of realisation, vide her decree and judgment dated 29.06.2016.

9. Aggrieved over the decree and judgment passed by the trial court judge, the defendants 1 and 2 filed an appeal in A.S.No.2/2017



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

before the II Additional District Court, Vellore at Ranipet and the plaintiff filed a Cross Appeal No.39/2017 since the plaintiff was directed to pay a sum of Rs.2,45,000/- to the first defendant together with interest. The first appellate court set aside the decree and judgment passed by the trial court judge and dismissed the suit filed by the present plaintiff vide his decree and judgment dated 04.03.2020, as against which the present second appeal is filed.

10. At the time of admission the following substantial questions of law were framed by my learned predecessor.

"(a) Whether the First Appellate Court is legally correct in holding that there is no evidence for fraud committed by the 3rd defendant/Advocate, particularly when the pleadings and evidences on record would overwhelmingly prove their collusion between the defendants?

(b) Has not the First Appellate Court committed an error in ignoring the fraud and misrepresentation committed by the 3rd defendant, when it would vitiate the collusive decree granted in O.S.No.127 of 2006,



WEB COPY



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

especially when the 3rd defendant/Advocate has neither disputed nor denied the allegations made against him?

(c) Has not the First Appellate Court erred in refusing to go into the merits of the decree in O.S.No.127 of 2006, particularly when the said decree has been challenged on the ground of Inter se fraud committed by the defendants 1 to 3 ?"

11. Heard Mr.K.V.Babu for Mr.P.Krishnan, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr.J.Ravikumar, learned counsel for the respondents 1 and 2.

12. The plaintiff has filed the suit for a declaration that the decree passed in O.S.No.127/2006 on the file of the Sub Court, Ranipet, is null and void, since it is vitiated by fraud. A decree obtained through fraud is considered as nullity and can be challenged in any court, including in collateral proceedings. The fraud avoids all judicial acts. However, the fraud must be specifically pleaded and proved with cogent evidence. Mere allegations without substantial proof are not sufficient to



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

vitiating a decree as the courts require a clear evidence of intent to deceive for a finding of fraud to be established. Thus the burden of proof lies heavily on the party who alleges fraud.

13. In the instant case, the plaintiff admitted that he received summons in the suit in O.S.No.127/2006. According to Mr.K.V.Babu, learned counsel for the appellant, the plaintiff did not want to contest the suit in O.S.No.127/2006 but that would not give the first defendant a right to engage a counsel for the plaintiff. It is his specific contention that the plaintiff did not engage Mr.S.Govinda Ragavan (third defendant) as a counsel to defend his case in the suit in O.S.No.127/2006.

14. Unfortunately, Mr.S.Govinda Ragavan (third defendant) remained absent before the trial court and was set *ex parte*. In the present second appeal also there is no representation on his behalf even though he was served with notice and his name is printed in the cause list. At the same time, it is pertinent to point out that the plaintiff herein did not give a complaint against the counsel (third defendant) before the Bar Council.



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

No notice was also issued to him. However, the plaintiff states that the defendants 1 and 3 colluded with each other for getting a decree of specific performance of contract.

15. In order to substantiate the theory of collusion and fraud, the plaintiff has narrated as to how the trial was conducted in O.S.No.127/2006. According to the plaintiff, the third defendant was not engaged by him and that he made an endorsement "No oral evidence" on his behalf without getting instructions from him. It is further contended by him that in the plaint in O.S.No.127/2006 the first defendant did not mention anything about the second sale agreement dated 08.06.2006 (Ex.A2) between the present plaintiff and the second defendant.

16. The trial court also took exception to the manner in which the entire trial was conducted in O.S.No.127/2006 by the Presiding Officer. Her observation is that

- i. The trial court judge after framing issues on 21.03.2007 did not post the case for filing list of witnesses and documents and instead



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY posted the case for trial on 27.03.2007.

- ii. On 27.03.2007, the plaintiff in O.S.No.127/2006 filed his proof affidavit and the third defendant cross examined him on the same day and also made an endorsement that he does not have any oral evidence.
- iii. The case was posted for judgment on 10.04.2007.
- iv. On 09.04.2007, two petitions one to reopen the case and another to amend the plaint, were filed. Normally a court would make an endorsement on the petitions to 'check and call on'. However, in the instant case, the amendment petition was allowed on the same day i.e. on 09.04.2007.
- v. The judicial officer did not post the case for filing additional written statement or for filing amended plaint copy. However, the judgment was pronounced on 10.04.2007.

Thus the trial court in O.S.No.38/2014 had found fault with the judicial officer in O.S.No.127/2006 also. However, there is no specific allegations against the judicial officer in the plaint. Mr.K.V.Babu, learned counsel for the appellant would contend that the plaintiff is not



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

finding fault with the trial court judge in O.S.No.127/2006. It is pertinent to point out that when the parties to a suit request the court to post the case on a particular date for trial and also file a proof affidavit, the judicial officer need not post the case for filing list of exhibits and witnesses. The third defendant who filed vakalat for the present plaintiff cross examined P.W.1 on 27.03.2007 and also made an endorsement that the defendant (present plaintiff) did not have any oral evidence and arguments were also advanced. The case was posted for judgment only on 10.04.2007 i.e. after 14 days. It is true that on 09.04.2007 a petition to amend the plaint was filed. This petition was to amend the balance sale consideration as Rs.25,000/- which was wrongly typed as Rs.20,000/- in the prayer column. In the entire body of the plaint the balance sale consideration was indicated only as Rs.25,000/- and therefore, the amendment sought for by the first defendant was only to correct the said amount in the prayer column. The amendment was also carried out and there was no necessity for filing amended plaint copy since it is a simple correction made in the plaint itself. There was also no need for filing additional written statement since the specific case of the first defendant



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COURT

(plaintiff in O.S.No.127/2006) was that he was ready and willing to pay the balance sale consideration of Rs.25,000/-. When the counsel for the defendant makes an endorsement 'No objection' in the petition it is not necessary for the court to post the petitions for 'check and call on' and then issue notice to the other side. Thus the learned trial court judge had wrongly found fault with the judicial officer who disposed of O.S.No.127/2006 especially when there is no allegation against him.

17. Now it has to be seen whether the defendants 1 to 3 colluded with each other to play fraud upon the court. The suit in O.S.No.127/2006 was filed for specific performance of contract against the present plaintiff based on an unregistered agreement of sale dated 22.03.2006. The first defendant in the present suit had admitted that on 08.06.2006 another sale agreement was entered into between the wife of the first defendant (second defendant) and the plaintiff. In the plaint in O.S.No.127/2006 there is no reference about the second sale agreement dated 08.06.2006 (Ex.A2). However, this aspect alone cannot be a ground to set aside the decree passed in O.S.No.127/2006 as the plaintiff



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

did not file an appeal against the decree and judgment passed in O.S.No.127/2006. If the plaintiff had felt that the counsel had wrongly made an endorsement "No oral evidence" he could have adduced additional evidence before the first appellate court. Moreover, when several allegations are made against Mr.S.Govinda Ragavan (third defendant counsel) it is not known as to why the plaintiff did not file any complaint against him before the Bar Council of Tamil Nadu. As already observed, he did not also issue any notice to him.

18. Mr.J.Ravikumar, learned counsel for the respondents 1 and 2 contended that collusion is only between the third defendant and the plaintiff and not between the defendants 1 and 3. His contention is that the plaintiff was watching the entire proceedings and on the date of judgment i.e on 10.04.2007 he had filed two applications

- (1) to set aside the *ex parte* decree passed against him ;
- (2) to revoke the vakalat given to the third defendant

His specific contention is that when the plaintiff has not established the fraud actually played upon the court by the defendants 1 and 3, the suit



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

filed by the plaintiff fails. It is also his contention that the trial court had unnecessarily gone into the merits of the case in O.S.No.127/2006 and had given a finding that the transaction between the plaintiff and the first defendant was only a loan transaction and not a sale agreement. Such a finding given by the trial court judge is unknown to law. According to him, the only issue which has to be decided in the instant case is whether the decree in O.S.No.127/2006 was obtained, by playing fraud upon the court by the defendants 1 and 3. His specific contention is that the first appellate court had rightly framed points for consideration and by a well reasoned judgment had dismissed the suit filed by the plaintiff. He also relied upon the decision in *M/s. Cambridge Solutions Limited, Bangalore vs. Global Software Limited, Chennai* reported in **2016 (5) L.W.45** and contended that when fraud is charged against a defendant, it is an acknowledged rule of pleading that the plaintiff must set forth the particulars of the fraud which is alleged and that it is not enough to use such general words as 'fraud', 'deceit' or 'machinations'. It is also his contention that it is not the case of the plaintiff that the fraud has been played upon the Sub Court, Ranipet for getting a decree and judgment.



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

19. The plaintiff himself had admitted that he received summons in O.S.No.127/2006. On the first hearing date, the third defendant had filed vakalat duly signed by the plaintiff. The plaintiff did not deny the signature either on the vakalat or on the written statement. In fact the written statement was filed on 21.03.2007 and after closure of the evidence, the case was posted only on 10.04.2007 for pronouncing the judgment and the plaintiff had sufficient time to putforth his contentions. However, he chose to file the applications to revoke the vakalat given to the third defendant and to set aside the *ex parte* decree allegedly passed against him only on the date of judgment i.e. on 10.04.2007. It is not known as to how the plaintiff came to know about the decree passed on 10.04.2007. The conduct of the plaintiff is to be taken into consideration as far as the present case is concerned. The plaintiff has not explained as to why he did not appear in person after receiving summons from the court when he states that he did not engage Mr. S.Govinda Ragavan (third defendant) as his counsel.



WEB COPY



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

20. The first appellate court had in fact gone into all these aspects of this case and had observed thus :

"21. The act of plaintiff in filing these two applications on the date of judgment itself would create more suspicion against the conduct of the plaintiff, as this court viewed. Further, the plaintiff did not take any action against the 3rd defendant for his misconduct in his profession till now. The plaintiff did not send any legal notice to the 3rd defendant informing that, he did not give any instruction to him to act on his behalf and he did not authorize him to make an endorsement on his behalf and he did not seek any relief that, all his acts done in O.S.No.127/2006 are vitiated and null and void. In fact, the plaintiff and his counsel the 3rd defendant can collude together and they can file this suit on the ground of fraud played upon the court and hence, the 3rd defendant did not appear in this suit and did not deny the allegations raised by the plaintiff against him. No complaint was given by the plaintiff against the 3rd defendant before the Tamil Nadu Bar Council against his misconduct in conducting the case.

22. The plaintiff ought to have given the complaint



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY *against the 3rd defendant before the Tamil Nadu Bar Council, if the allegations raised against him are true and genuine one. This court does not find any amount of fraud played by the 1st defendant on Sub Court, Ranipet in getting the decree in O.S.No.127/2006 and all the proceedings passed by the Sub-Court, Ranipet in O.S.No.127/2006 are all valid and it does not vitiate any fraud and it cannot be stated as a fraudulent decree. Mere simple allegation of fraud played upon the Sub-Court, Ranipet in getting the decree in O.S.No.127/2006 is not at all acceptable and maintainable one without proving the contention of fraud with concrete evidence, as this court viewed. In the written statement, the plaintiff did not deny his signature in the vakalat, but he only contended that, he put his signature in blank vakalat. But in the cross examination, the plaintiff P.W.1 has denied his signature in the Vakalat which is quite contra to his written statement.*

PW1 has deposed in cross examination that,

“அசல் வழக்கு எண் 127/2006 ல் நான் தாக்கல் செய்ததாக சொல்லப்படும் வக்காலத்தில் உள்ள கையெழுத்து நான் வழக்கறிஞரை சந்தித்து போட்டு கொடுத்த கையெழுத்து வாங்கி வைத்திருந்தார். அதை பயன்படுத்தி வக்காலத்து என் சார்பாக தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்டதாக நீதிமன்றத்தில் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. நான் வழக்கறிஞர் யாரையும் பார்த்தது இல்லை. நான் என்னுடைய பிரமாண வாக்குமூலத்தில் பத்தி 8ல் 10.04.07 அன்று தீர்ப்பிற்காக ஒத்திவைக்கப்பட்டு அன்றைய



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

தினமே தீர்ப்பு சொல்லிவிட்டதாக சொல்லியிருக்கிறேன் என்றால் ஆமாம். தீர்ப்பிற்காக ஒத்தி வைக்கப்பட்ட அன்றைய தினமே தீர்ப்பு சொல்லப்பட்டது தவறு என்று சொல்கிறேனா என்றால் இல்லை. தீர்ப்பு சொல்லப்பட்டது பற்றி தெரியாது என்று தான் சொல்கிறேன்”

PW1 has further deposed in cross examination that,

“நீதிமன்றத்தின் மீது குற்றம் சுமத்திதான் வழக்கு போட்டிருக்கிறேன் என்றால் அந்த வழக்கு பற்றி எனக்கு தெரியாது என்பதால் அவ்வாறு போட்டிருக்கிறேன். 127/2006 வழக்கின் பேரில் நிறைவேற்று மனு தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்டது என்றால் சரி. அதன் பின்னர் தான் இந்த வழக்கு போட்டேன். நிறைவேற்று மனுவில் நான் வழக்கறிஞரை நியமித்தேன். அ.வ.127/2006 ல் எனக்கு சார்வு செய்யப்பட்ட சம்மன் மற்றும் நோட்டீஸ் ஆகியவற்றை நகல் பெற்று தாக்கல் செய்திருக்கிறேனா என்றால் ஞாபகம் இல்லை.”

23. On perusal of evidence of PW1, it finds that, the plaintiff has filed this suit simply by raising the allegation of fraud played by the 1st defendant in colluding with the counsel of plaintiff who is the 3rd defendant herein without having any iota of concrete evidence about the allegation of fraud and it was not proved by the plaintiff in this case that, the 1st defendant has obtained a fraudulent decree from the Sub-Court, Ranipet in O.S.No.127/2006. Hence, this court came to the conclusion that, the decree passed by the Sub-Court, Ranipet in



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY *O.S.No.127/2006 is a valid decree and it legally binds upon the plaintiff. Hence, the finding of trial court that, the sale agreement dt. 22.03.2006 is only a Loan agreement and it is only a security document for the loan amount does not stand good and it is required to be interfered by this court."*

If really, the third defendant had filed vakalat without getting instructions from the plaintiff, the plaintiff would not have kept quiet. Till date no action was taken against the third defendant by the plaintiff.

21. The plaintiff relies on the value indicated in the settlement deed dated 09.03.2006 (Ex.A4) executed by his father Velayutha Mudaliar in his favour. The value of the property as per Ex.A4 is 55,00,000/-. Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the plaintiff is that that the actual value of the property cannot be Rs.2,45,000/- as indicated in the sale agreement (Ex.A1). On the contrary the learned counsel for the first defendant contended that the value of the property was boosted by the father of the plaintiff since the plaintiff is a civil contractor and is taking up Government contracts. In any event, the



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

plaintiff did not adduce any evidence to show either the guideline value of the property or the actual market value of the property. Merely based on the settlement deed dated 09.03.2006 (Ex.A4) this Court cannot come to a conclusion that the actual market value / guideline value of the property was Rs.55,00,000/-. Apart from that, the plaintiff is not an illiterate and he admitted that he executed the sale agreement dated 22.03.2006 (Ex.A1). It is not his case that he signed on blank papers and that the same was subsequently converted as sale agreement. The plaintiff also admitted his signatures on the vakalat and on written statement.

22. The general rule of law is that a party of full age and understanding is normally bound by his signature to a document whether he reads it or understands it or not. Because, equity does not save people from the consequence of their own folly. In the instant case, the plaintiff is a civil contractor and he admitted that he entered into a contract for sale of his immovable property. He had also admitted his signature on the vakalat form. He knew that he was signing a vakalat. It is also relevant to



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

WEB COPY

point out that the signatures found on the written statement are his signatures. As already observed, the plaintiff cannot take advantage of his own wrong. Moreover, the plaintiff being a party to the proceedings in O.S.No.127/2006 has no *locus standi* file the present suit for setting aside the decree and judgment passed in O.S.No.127/2006. The very contention of the plaintiff that the defendants 1 to 3 played fraud on the court is unsustainable. The first appellate court had infact by a well reasoned judgment dismissed the suit filed by the plaintiff and I do not find any reason to interfere with the same. The substantial questions of law are answered accordingly and the second appeal stands dismissed.

23. In the result,

- i. the Second Appeal is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Civil Miscellaneous Petition is closed.
- ii. the decree and judgment dated 04.03.2020 passed in A.S. No.2 of 2017 and Cross Appeal No.39 of 2017, on the file of the II Additional District Court, Vellore at Ranipet, is upheld.



WEB COPY



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

iii. the decree and judgment dated 29.06.2016 passed in O.S.No.38 of 2014, on the file of the Sub Court, Arakkonam, is set aside.

03.12.2024

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-Speaking order
mtl

To

1. The II Additional District Court, Vellore at Ranipet.
2. The Sub Court, Arakkonam.
3. The Section Officer, VR Section, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

R. HEMALATHA, J.

mtl

S.A.No.487 of 2020
and C.M.P.No.6883 of 2024

03.12.2024