



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 05.03.2024

PRONOUNCED ON : .03.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.SIVAGNANAM

CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

and

CMP.Nos.15551, 15718 & 15790 of 2023

CRP.No.2511 of 2023

1.K.Arul Mozhi

2.M.Akila

3.V.Arunalini

...

Petitioners

VS.

1.Selvaraj Arun Kumar

2.S.Amudha Ganesan

3.A.Praveena

4.A.Aksara

5.TRIBUTO HOLDINGS PVT.LTD,

Rep.by its Director Gopalakrishna Shetty,

No.3, Club road, Chetpet, Chennai-600 031.

6.HURACAN HOLDINGS PVT.LTD.

Rep.by its Director Gopalakrishna Shetty,

No.3, Club Road, Chetpet, Chennai-600 031.

7.PORTFINO HOLDINGS PVT.LTD.,

Rep. By its Director Gopalakrishna Shetty,

No.3, Club Road, Chetpet, Chennai-600 031.

8.S.R.Booshanam

...

Respondents



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

CRP.No.2541 of 2023

1.Selvaraj Arun Kumar
2.S.Amudha Ganesan
3.A.Praveena
4.A.Akshra

Vs.

Petitioners

1.K.Arul Mozhi
2.Akila
3.V.Arunalini

4.Tributo Holdings Pvt. Ltd.,
Rep.by its Director Gopalakrishna Shetty,
No.3, Club road, Chetpet, Chennai-600 031.

5.Huracan Holdings Pvt.Ltd.,
Rep.by its Director Gopalakrishna Shetty,
No.3, Club Road, Chetpet, Chennai-600 031.

6.Portifino Holdings Pvt.Ltd.,
Rep. By its Director Gopalakrishna Shetty,
No.3, Club Road, Chetpet, Chennai-600 031.

7.S.R.Booshanam

...

Respondents

CRP.No.2557 of 2023

1.M/s.Tributo Holdings Pvt Ltd.,
2.M/s.Huracan Holdings Pvt. Ltd.,
3.M/s.Portfino Holdings Pvt.Ltd.,
(Rep.by its Director Gopalakrishna
Shetty, No.3, Club Road, Chetpet,
Chennai – 600 031.)

...

Petitioners



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

Vs.

1.K.Arul Mozhi
2.Akila
3.V.Arunalini
4.Selvaraj Arunkumar
5.S.Amudha Ganesan
6.A.Praveena
7.A.Akshara
8.S.R.Booshnam

...

Respondents

PRAYER in CRP.No.2511 of 2023: This civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the judgment and decree dated 08.12.2022 passed in I.A.No.4 of 2021 in O.S.No.201 of 2021 on the file of the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu.

PRAYER in CRP.No.2541 of 2023: This civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the judgment and decree dated 08.12.2022 passed in I.A.No.7 of 2021 in O.S.No.201 of 2021 on the file of the Principal District Court, Kancheepuram District at Chengalpattu and reject the plaint by allowing I.A.No.7 of 2021 in O.S.No.201 of 2021 on the file of the Principal District Court, Kancheepuram District at Chengalpattu.

PRAYER in CRP.No.2557 of 2023: This civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the order dated 08.12.2022 passed by the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu District in I.A.No.3 of 2021 in O.S.No.201 of 2021.



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

CRP.No.2511 of 2023

For Petitioner	...	Mr.R.Viduthalai Senior counsel for Mrs.A.V.Bharathi
For Respondent Nos.1 to 4	...	Ms.Kavitha Deenadayalan
For Respondent Nos.5 to 7	...	Mr.Srinath Sridvan Senior Counsel for Mr.Swarnam J.Rajagopalan
For Respondent No.8	...	Mr.N.Dorai Kannan

CRP.No.2541 of 2023

For Petitioners	...	Ms.Kavitha Deenadayalan
For Respondent Nos.1 to 3	...	Mr.R.Viduthalai Senior counsel for Mrs.A.V.Bharathi
For Respondent Nos.4 to 6	...	Mr.Srinath Sridvan Senior Counsel for Mr.Swarnam J.Rajagopalan
For Respondent No.7	...	Mr.N.Dorai Kannan



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

CRP.No.2557 of 2023

For Petitioners	...	Mr.Srinath Sridvan Senior Counsel for Mr.Swarnam J.Rajagopalan
For Respondent Nos.1 to 3	...	Mr.R.Viduthalai Senior counsel for Mrs.A.V.Bharathi
For Respondent Nos.4 to 7	...	Ms.Kavitha Deenadayalan
For Respondent No.8	...	Mr.N.Dorai Kannan

COMMON ORDER

These civil revision petitions have been filed to set aside the order dated 08.12.2022 passed in I.A.Nos.4, 7 & 3 of 2021 in O.S.No.201 of 2021 on the file of the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in CRP.No.2557 of 2023 filed a memo dated 27.02.2024 stating that the suit in O.S.No.201 of 2021 pending on the file of the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu, has been transferred to VII Additional City Civil Court, Chennai and renumbered as O.S.No.6337 of 2023 during the pendency of the civil revision petitions.



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

WEB COPY

3.The petitioners in CRP.No.2511 /2023 are the respondents 1 to 3 in CRP.Nos.2541 and 2557 of 2023, who are the plaintiffs in O.S.No.6337 of 2023 and the petitioners in CRP Nos.2541 & 2557 of 2023 are the respondents in CRP.No.2511 of 2023, who are the defendants in O.S.No.6337 of 2023 on the file of the VII Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.

4.For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per their rankings in the suit in O.S.No.6337 of 2023.

5.The plaintiffs and the first and second defendants are the daughters and sons of the 8th defendant namely S.R.Bhooshanam W/o.N.Selvarajan. The third defendant is the wife of the second defendant namely S.Amudha Ganesan and the fourth defendant is the daughter of first defendant namely Selvaraj Arun Kumar. The defendants 5 to 7 are the subsequent purchasers of the plaint scheduled properties.



WEB COPY 6. The facts of the case are as follows:

(i).The suit properties consisting of three schedules and vast area in survey Nos.92 part, 93 part and 94 part in Kovilanchery Village, total measuring 4 acres 54 cents. According to the plaintiffs, the properties were purchased by the 8th defendant out of her sridhana jewels given at the time of marriage and she became the absolute owner of the properties enjoyed by the plaintiffs and defendants 1 & 2 jointly without any interruption. It is an admitted fact that the 8th defendant has executed a registered settlement deed in favour of the first and second defendants on 01.06.2007 and to safeguard her right, she retained her right over the enjoyment of the properties till her life time, thereafter upon, the first and second defendants.

(ii).On 21.09.2012, a release deed was executed by the 8th defendant releasing her right of enjoyment in the properties to first and second defendants. Thereafter, the first defendant executed a settlement deed in favour of his wife Jayanthi and daughter Akshara, who is the fourth



defendant, by a settlement deed dated 19.03.2020. The second defendant executed a registered settlement deed dated 19.03.2020 in favour of his wife Praveena, who is the third defendant. Thereafter, the compulsion of the defendants 1 & 2, a rectification deed was executed on 08.03.2021 by the 8th defendant.

(iii).The first, second and third defendants executed a sale deed dated 24.03.2021 in favour of 6th defendant. Again, the first, third and fourth defendants executed a sale deed dated 24.03.2021 in favour of 7th defendant. Further, the first and fourth defendants executed a sale deed dated 24.03.2021 in favour of 5th defendant. According to the plaintiffs, the defendants 1 & 2 by influencing their mother namely the 8th defendant obtained settlement deed on the promise of taking care of her but failed to take care of her. Therefore, the plaintiffs filed the suit for preliminary decree of partition and claim of 1/6th share in the plaint schedule properties and declare the sale deeds executed in favour of the defendants 5 to 7 as null and void, besides sought permanent injunction against the defendants 5 to 7.



WEB COPY (iv).Pending suit, I.A.Nos.4, 7 & 3 of 2021 have been filed by the plaintiffs, defendants 1 to 4 and defendants 5 to 7, who are the purchasers respectively.

I.A.No.4 of 2021

I.A.No.4 of 2021 has been filed by the plaintiffs in the suit in O.S.No.6337 of 2023 praying for a direction that the defendants 1 to 4 to deposit the sale consideration received on 24.03.2021 under three sale deeds. As many as 11 reliefs including the main relief of declaration to declare the deed of settlement dated 01.06.2007 registered as document No.5750 of 2007 in the office of Sub Registrar of Tambaram executed by the 8th defendant in favour of her sons the defendants 1 & 2 as illegal and null and void as also all the subsequent deeds flowing from the said settlement deed such as the release deed dated 21.09.2012, the rectification deed dated 08.03.2021 and the various settlement deeds executed by the settlees in favour of their own children as null and void and ultimately sought for the relief of preliminary decree of partition of the suit schedule



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

properties in 6 equal shares and allot 1/6th share to each of three plaintiffs apart from 1/6th share each to the defendants 1 & 2 and to the 8th defendant, who is the mother of the plaintiffs and the defendants 1 & 2. The said I.A No.4 of 2021 was dismissed on 08.12.2022.

Against the said order of dismissal, the present CRP.No.2511 of 2023 has been filed by the plaintiffs.

I.A.No.7 of 2021

I.A.No.7 of 2021 has been filed by the defendants 1 to 4 for rejection of plaint and the same was dismissed on 08.12.2022 as the same is barred by limitation, has no cause of action and for non-payment of requisite court fee.

Against the said order of dismissal, the present CRP No.2541 of 2023 has been filed by the defendants 1 to 4.



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

WEB COURT **I.A.No.3 of 2021**

I.A.No.3 of 2021 has been filed under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC by the defendants 5 to 7, who are the purchasers of the properties, against the plaintiffs for rejection of plaint and the same was dismissed on 08.12.2022 as the same is barred by limitation, has no cause of action and for non-payment of requisite court fee.

Against the said order of dismissal, the present CRP No.2557 of 2023 has been filed by the defendants 5 to 7.

7.In CRP.No.2511 of 2023

(i).The learned counsel appearing for the plaintiffs would contend that the civil revision petitions in CRP.Nos.2541 & 2557 of 2023 are devoid of merits. The suit properties were purchased out of sridhana jewels, personal loans obtained and income from the ancestral properties received by the 8th defendant. It has been enjoyed as the joint family properties and the plaintiffs have been paying taxes in the name of the 8th



defendant, who is the mother of the plaintiffs and the defendants 1 & 2. In fact, the settlement deed was executed and it was informed by the defendants 1 & 2 that the plaintiffs have been added as party in the settlement deed as settlees. This information was given by the 8th defendant when she stated that the settlement deed was executed by preserving life interest for constructing petrol bunk. The plaintiffs have supported the 8th defendant in developing the suit properties and the 8th defendant was executing the settlement deed without the consent of the plaintiffs and informed the plaintiffs that they are also the settlees along with the defendants 1 & 2. The settlement deed deprives the right of the plaintiffs in the 8th defendant/mother's properties as well as the ancestral properties in the hands of the 8th defendant. Therefore, the plaintiffs have every right to question the same. It is settled law that the plaint averments have to be read as a whole. The defendants cannot pick and choose certain averments in the plaint in order to seek the relief of rejection of plaint. All the objections raised by the defendants can be decided only at the time of trial. Therefore, the civil revision petitions are not maintainable.



WEB COPY

(ii).Further, the learned counsel for the plaintiffs submitted that para 2 of the plaint which categorically states that the 8th defendant mother of the plaintiffs purchased the suit properties through her stridhana jewels and income from her ancestral properties gives right to the cause of action. The averments in para 3 of the plaint states that the suit properties has been enjoyed by the plaintiffs along with defendants 1 & 2 without any interruption also gives rise to cause of action. The statement that the 8th defendant informed the 1st and 2nd defendants to include the names of the plaintiffs also as settlees is another aspect of cause of action. The averment in the para 6 of the plaint that the plaintiffs supported the 8th defendant in all ways to develop the suit properties but without the consent the 8th defendant had executed the settlement deed definitely forms part of the cause of action. The averment in para 14 of the plaint that the defendants 1 and 2 and the plaintiffs, who are children of 8th defendant, have got equal right in the suit properties is also a cause of action for the suit. In these paragraphs, it is reiterated that the suit properties was purchased from the income of the ancestral properties.



WEB COPY

(iii).The learned counsel for the plaintiffs further submitted that the averments contained in the para 19 discloses the significant aspect of the cause of action of the suit. The plaintiffs have specifically averred that the 8th defendant had lodged a complaint to the Superintendent of Police, Chengalpattu, Inspector of Police, Selaiyur Police Station and Commissioner of Police, Anti Land Grabbing Cell on 21.04.2021, seeking action against the defendants 1 to 7 and filing the said complaint as a document filed along with the plaint under Order 7 Rule 14 CPC also gives a cause of action because the Supreme Court has stated that such documents filed under Order 7 Rule 14 form part of the averments in the plaint. In this complaint dated 21.04.2021, the 8th defendant categorically stated that her sons and daughters have equal rights in the suit properties and further states that her daughters have helped her and supported her for the construction of house and with the regard to agricultural lands. Reading of this complaint which is actually addressed to the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu and also to the Superintendent and Inspector of Police and Commissioner of land grabbing cell dated 21.04.2021 discloses



ample cause of action and the right of the plaintiffs to the properties can be espoused by filing of suit. Hence, the plaint is not liable to be rejected for the want of cause of action.

(iv).Further, the learned counsel contended that the release deed dated 21.09.2012 obtained from the 8th defendant mother was fraudulent and in any event it loses its value after the rectification deed is executed on 08.03.2021 which alone contains the correct boundaries of the suit properties. The rectification deed dated 08.03.2021 which for the first time described the suit properties correctly and appropriately with the actual boundaries on 08.03.2021 is the date on which the right to sue accrues to the plaintiffs and suit filed on 28.04.2021 within two months from the date of execution of the rectification deed is well within the period of limitation. The settlement deed dated 01.06.2007 cannot stand on its own unless the correct boundaries are incorporated by rectifying the misdescription of the properties. Hence, this settlement deed dated 01.06.2007 as rectified on 08.03.2021 being challenged in April 2021, and all other documents and deeds challenged only flow from these two vital



documents, the suit is well within the period of limitation. The plea of bar of suit by the law of limitation is a mixed question of law and facts and is unsustainable as the averments in the plaint which alone is relevant for deciding the application clearly mentions about the settlement deed and rectification deed specifically and pithily in para 11 of the plaint and the cause of action in para No.29 of the plaint also makes this position very clear.

(v).Further, the learned counsel contended that the properties was purchased by the 8th defendant through her sridhana properties and ancestral properties vide document No.4967 of 1979 dated 10.02.1979, SRO, Tambaram. In the recitals, it is very clearly stated that the properties was purchased by purush jeevanam. Therefore, from the above, it is proved beyond doubt that the properties are joint family properties and suit for partition is maintainable and the question of limitation will not apply. Further, as per Rule 6(1) of Hind Succession Act, Women get right by birth thereby daughters will become coparaceners of the joint family properties and their consent is mandatory at the time of execution of any deed.



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

Therefore, without consent of daughters, the subsequent sale by the sons/brothers is not valid in the eye of law. Therefore, the defendants 1 to 4 are compulsorily duty bound to deposit the sale consideration of Rs.30 crores. The plaint is not liable to be rejected for not paying court fee under section 37(1) of Tamil Nadu Court Fees and Suit Valuation Act. The court fee had been appropriately paid as the possession of one co owner with regard to properties is deemed to be possession of all the co owners.

In view of the above, the civil revision petitions in CRP.Nos.2541 & 2557 of 2023 are not maintainable, thus, prayed to dismiss the same and to allow the civil revision petition in CRP.No. 2511 of 2023.

8.To support of his argument, the learned counsel appearing for the plaintiffs relied upon the following judgments:

1.In ***Uttam Vs. Saubhag Singh and others*** reported in ***(2016) 4 Supreme Court Cases 68.***

2.In ***Arunachala Gonder (Dead) By Lrs. Vs. Ponnusamy and Ors*** reported in ***AIR 2022 Supreme Court 605.***



3.In ***P.Narasimha Vs. Emadi Dayakar Reddy and others*** reported in ***2022 SCC OnLine TS 1531.***

4.In ***Hema Gusain Vs. India International Centre and others*** reported in ***2022 SCC OnLine Del 1972.***

5.In ***Salim D.Agboatwala and others Vs. Shamalji Oddhavji Thakkar and others*** reported in ***(2021) 17 Supreme Court Cases 100.***

6.In ***Srihari Hanumandas Totala Vs. Hemant Vithal Kamat and others*** reported in ***(2021) 9 Supreme Court Cases 99.***

7.In ***Shakti Bhog Food Industries Limited Vs. Central Bank of India and another*** reported in ***(2020) 17 Supreme Court Cases 260.***

8.In ***Church of Christ Charitable Trust and Educational Charitable Society represented by its Chairman Vs. Ponnamman Educational Trust Represented by its Chairperson/Managing Trustee*** reported in ***(2012) 8 Supreme Court Cases 706.***



**9.In *P.V.Guru Raj Reddy Represented by GPA
Laxmi Narayan Reddy and another Vs. P.Neeradha
Reddy and others* reported in (2015) 8 Supreme Court
Cases 331.**

9.CRP.Nos.2541 & 2557 of 2023

(i).The contentions of the defendants 1 to 7 are that the plaintiff schedule properties are owned by the 8th defendant, who is the mother of the plaintiffs and the defendants 1 and 2. She executed the settlement deed dated 01.06.2007 by the document No.5750 of 2007 in the Sub Registrar Officer at Tambaram. The same was also informed to the plaintiffs by their mother 8th defendant. Further, the 8th defendant executed a release deed dated 21.09.2012 by the document Nos.4208 /2012 and 4209 /2012 for relieving her right and interest over the plaintiff schedule properties. It is admitted by the plaintiffs in the plaintiff averments paras 2, 3, 4 & 6 and the suit is barred by limitation. There is no cause of action for maintaining the suit for partition. The suit is abuse of process of law. The 8th defendant being an absolute owner is entitled to dispose her properties as she lives. Therefore, there is no cause of action for the suit and the suit is barred by



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

limitation and further, the suit is liable to be rejected for improper valuation of the Court fees and thus, prayed to dismiss the civil revision petition in CRP.No.2511 of 2023 and to allow the civil revision petitions in CRP.Nos.2541 & 2557 of 2023.

10.To support of their argument, the learned counsel appearing for the defendants 1 to 7 relied upon the following judgments;

1.In *Life Insurance Corporation of India Vs. Asha Ramchandra Ambekar (Mrs) and another* reported in (1994) 2 Supreme Court Cases 718.

2.In *Dahiben Vs. Arvindbhai Kalyanji Bhanusali (Gajra) dead through legal representatives and others* reported in (2020) 7 Supreme Court Cases 366.

3.In *L.T.C. Limited Vs. Debts recovery Appellate Tribunal and others* reported in (1998) 2 Supreme Court Cases 70.



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

4.In Raghwendra Sharan Singh Vs. Ram Prasanna Singh (Dead) By legal representatives
reported in ***(2020) 16 Supreme Court Cases 601.***

5.In C.S.Ramaswamy Vs. V.K.Senthil and others
reported in ***2022 SCC OnLine SC 1330.***

6.In Annapurani Vs. Muthupillai and others
reported in ***2021 SCC OnLine Mad 1159.***

7.In Shantha Devi and another Vs. D.Purushothaman and others reported in ***2021 SCC OnLine Mad 2692.***

11.I have considered the matter in the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

12.In order to consider Order VII Rule 11 CPC, the Court has to scrutinize the averments/pleas in the plaint, the pleas taken by the defendants are wholly irrelevant and the matter is to be decided only on the



plaint averments. Therefore, the question whether the plaint discloses any cause of action and whether it is barred by any law is to be decided by looking at the averments contained in the plaint itself and not the defence set out by the defendants.

13.I have gone through the plaint averments and the relevant plaint averments para Nos.2, 4, 6, & 7 read as follows:

(2).The plaintiffs submit that, the 8th defendant is the mother of plaintiffs and 1st and 2nd defendants (hereinafter called as 8th defendant). The schedule mentioned properties were purchased by the 8th defendant through her stridhana jewels which was given by her parents at the time of her wedding and income of her ancestral properties, vide Doc.No.4967 of 1979, on 10.12.1979 in the Sub-Registrar office of Tambaram.

(4).The plaintiffs submit that, the 1st to 3rd plaintiffs alone are so affectionate and fond of their parents. The 1st defendant had lost his job in Qatar, therefore, he needed upliftment in his life. The 1st and 2nd defendants insisted the 8th defendant (mother) to execute the settlement deed in



favour of them for the purpose of constructing a petrol bunk in the schedule mentioned properties. The 8th defendant executed the settlement deed in favour of 1st and 2nd defendants which was registered as Document No.5750 of 2007 in the sub-registrar office of Tambaram on 1st June 2007. Whereas, to safeguard her interest over the properties, the 8th defendant executed the settlement deed by way of reserving life interest for her and her husband. In the deed of settlement the right of the residence, enjoyment of rental income from the suit properties was reserved to the 8th defendant and her husband. It was informed to the 8th defendant that they have added the names of the 1st to 3rd plaintiffs in the settlement deed. The same was informed to the plaintiffs by their mother 8th defendant.

(6).The plaintiffs submit that, the plaintiffs supported the 8th defendant in all ways to develop the suit schedule properties but the defendants 1st and 2nd without consent of the plaintiffs influenced the 8th defendant to execute the settlement deed. The 1st and 2nd defendants promised the 8th defendant to take care of the parents till their death but they failed to do so.



(7).The plaintiffs submit that, the 1st and 2nd defendants have deliberately did not make any clause in the settlement deed for settlement of money or properties for plaintiffs as already promised by them to the 8th defendant. The 1st and 2nd defendants kept silent for five years, thereafter out of greed for money prepared the release deed No.4208 of 2012 and 4209 of 2012 dated 21.09.2012 for relieving life interest of 8th defendant over the suit schedule properties and cheated the plaintiffs' mother by way of making her sign the release document. The clever forgery and fabrication of the alleged release deed which is against the averments of the settlement deed.

14.Further, it is to be recorded that during the course of arguments, the 8th defendant is present before this Court. Her counsel represented by the 8th defendant repudiated the alleged settlement deed and the release deed executed by her in favour of the defendants 1 & 2. The contention of the 8th defendant before this Court is not in support of her sons namely the defendants 1 & 2. Under these circumstances, the plaint averments i.e. the defendants 1 & 2 by influencing the 8th defendant got settlement deed and the release deed has to be adjudicated. The plaintiffs are daughters of the



8th defendant. Under these circumstance, the claim of the daughters is also to be adjudicated.

15.Rejection of the plaint under Order VII Rule 11 CPC is a drastic power conferred in the Court to terminate a civil action at the threshold. The averments in the plaint as extracted above ex-facie discloses a cause of action for adjudication between the parties. With regard to the arguments of barred by limitation, it is Court's duty scrutinize the averment contained in the plaint as a whole. To ascertain the period of limitation and to take decision on the application, the averments show that the 8th defendant reserved her right of life interest over the plaint schedule properties and she executed a release deed dated 21.09.2012 by document Nos.4208 of 2012 and 4209 of 2012. When the 8thdefendant herself repudiated the settlement deed and the release deed allegedly executed by her, it has to be adjudicated by the Court whether it was obtained by influencing the 8th defendant. The question of limitation being a mixed question of fact and law, the allegations had to be established by evidence. Therefore, the suit should not be dismissed as being barred by limitation at the initial stage.



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

Therefore, the argument advanced by the defendants in this regard is not acceptable.

16.The abovesaid decisions relied on by the learned counsel for the defendants are factually distinguishable one. I have not elaborately discussed herein as I have to see the plaint averments alone to decide whether the plaint has to be rejected or not. Therefore, it is not helpful to support the argument of the defendants.

In view of the above, I find no merit with regard to the petitioners' case in CRP.Nos.2511, 2541, and 2557 of 2023 and there is no acceptable reason advanced by the petitioners in CRP.No.2511 of 2023 to give a direction to deposit the sale consideration received on 24.03.2021 in the Court. Accordingly, all the civil revision petitions are dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
sms

.03.2024



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

To

WEB.COM The VII Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY



CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023

V.SIVAGNANAM ,J.

sms

Pre-delivery Order made in
CRP.Nos.2511, 2541 & 2557 of 2023
and
CMP.Nos.15551, 15718 & 15790 of 2023

.03.2024