



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Date of Reserved : 26/03/2024

Date of Pronounced : 20/06/2024

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice **G.ILANGO VAN**

C.R.P (MD) No.1657 of 2023

and

CMP (MD) No.8268 of 2023

Paramakudi Vaniyar Uravin
Muraiyarkalin Pothu Sabai
Rep. by its Secretary,
8/191, Kannagi Street,
Paramakudi-623 707

: Petitioner/2nd Defendant

Vs.

1.V.Sundaramoorthy : 1st Respondent/Plaintiff
2.The President,
Election Committee,
Paramakudi Vaniyar Uravin
Muraiyarkalin Pothu Sabai,
S-191, Kannagi Street,
Paramakudy-623 707. : 2nd Respondent/1st Respondent

PRAYER:-Civil Revision Petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to call for the records in connection with OS No.52 of 2022 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Paramakudy and strike off the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohamed Ibram Saibu
for M/s.Ajmal Associates

For 1st Respondent : Mr.K.Yasar Arafath

For 2nd Respondent : No appearance



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

O R D E R

WEB COPY This civil revision petition is filed seeking to strike off the plaint in OS No.52 of 2022 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Paramakudi.

2.The Facts in brief:-

The suit in OS No.52 of 2022 is filed by the first respondent herein making the following averments:-

Paramakudi Vaniyar Uravi Muraiyarkalin Pothu Sabai is a registered Society as per the provisions of Central Registration Act XXI of 1860 in the year 1973. As per the by-laws, the Secretary is the authorised person to sue and be sued on behalf of the Society. But as per the Act, the President, Chairman or Principal Secretary must sue or be sued. Along with the application, the particulars of properties were not annexed at the time of filing of the application for registration. The Society did not perform its functions as set out in the by-laws. The accounts were not submitted to the Registrar of Societies properly. As per the by-law, there was no specific provision for removal of the particular person. The office bearers by its resolution dated 05/02/2023 removed the plaintiff from the membership in



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

contravention as well as the provisions of the Central Act. So the subject meeting dated 05/09/2023 is not valid under law. More-over, the resolution is also beyond the jurisdiction of the society. In the meantime, the plaintiff also challenged the amendment made in the by-laws by filing the suit in OS No.9 of 2005. That was dismissed. Challenging the same, AS No.17 of 2006 was filed before the Sub Court, Paramakudi. That was also dismissed. Against which, SA(MD)No.1258 of 2006 was filed. It is stated to be pending. In the plaint, he is referring two types of irregularities committed, which are not relevant for the present subject matter. He is also referring to some other unconnected particulars. So we need not extract. Suffice to say that the plaintiff filed the suit for declaration that the by-law submitted on 06/09/2021 to the District Registrar, Sivagangai is null and void and for consequential permanent injunction.

3. Seeking quashment of the entire proceedings, this revision is preferred directly by invoking the Articles 227 of the Constitution of India without approaching the trial Court under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC on the ground that the suit in OS No.150 of 2011 on the file of the District Munsif, Paramakudi was struck off as per the order of this court made in CRP(MD)No.646 of 2017 stating that the



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

plaintiff is not a member of the society. So he cannot question the affairs. The suit is also barred by res-judicata. Large number of suits and appeals were filed by the plaintiff, which are listed in para 11 of the grounds. The Registrar has not made as a party. So the plaint is a clear abuse of process of court and must be struck off.

4.Heard both sides.

5.In the connected CRP(MD)No.610 of 2022 the following discussion is made with reference to the development of law on that aspect namely the preliminary objection that was made by the respondents herein, which may be extracted hereunder:-

6.Pending further process, this revision is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to strike off the plaint on the ground that it is a clear case of res-judicata since there is a clear abuse of process of court without approaching the trial court under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC, this petition is maintainable.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

7.Before going into the factual aspect in this matter, the first question is to be decided is whether a petition in the form of Revision under Article 227 of the Constitution of India will lie directly for rejection of plaint before this Court without invoking the jurisdiction of the trial Court under Order 7 Rule 11 of Civil Procedure Code.

8.This question remains the matter for consideration from the inception of Indian High Courts Act, which is also known as Charter Act, 1861 and has evolved various developments in the form of Legislative Enactments and judicial pronouncement. Still the issue goes on. Let us briefly survey the development of law on this point, as has been elaborately discussed by the Allahabad High Court in the case of **Ram Roop v. Biswa Nath** reported in **AIR 1958 All. 456**, had traced the origin as mentioned above from the Indian High



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

Courts Act, 1861. Later, came the Civil Procedure Code, 1877, wherein the revision powers were conferred upon the High Courts, that too restricted only in certain circumstances. One, when the Subordinate Court exercised the jurisdiction not vested in it failed to exercise the jurisdiction, vested on it.

9.Later came the new Act namely the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. When the Original Act namely Civil Procedure Code of 1908, there was no provision in Section 115 of Civil Procedure Code. Later the Government of India Act, 1915, was enacted. Section 107 conferred power of Superintendents to the High Courts.

10.The question whether the power of Superintendents will include the power of judicial Superintendents also involved and finally now confirmed that it includes the judicial Superintendents also.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

11. Again another problem arose, when specific provision under Section 115 of the Civil Procedure Code is available, whether the power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India can be invoked also become the process of evolution. It was answered by Two Judges Bench of the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of **Surya Dev Rai vs. Ram Chander Rai & Ors**, reported in **AIR 2003 SC 3044** that in spite of amendment by the Amendment Act 46/1999 w.e.f. 01.07.2002, Section 115 of C.P.C. will not affect the jurisdiction conferred upon the High Court under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India. This was clarified by Honourable Three Judges Bench of the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of **Radhey Shyam and Ors. Vs. Chhabi Nath and Ors.** reported in **MANU/SC/0200/2015**. Paragraph No.22 of the Judgment can be extracted for better appreciation.

"22. The Bench in **Surya Dev Rai** also observed in para 25 of its



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

judgment that distinction between Articles 226 and 227 stood almost obliterated. In para 24 of the said judgment distinction in the two articles has been noted. In view thereof, observation that scope of Article 226 and 227 was obliterated was not correct as rightly observed by the referring Bench in Para 32 quoted above. We make it clear that though despite the curtailment of revisional jurisdiction under Section 115 Code of Civil Procedure by Act 46 of 1999, jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 227 remains unaffected, it has been wrongly assumed in certain quarters that the said jurisdiction has been expanded. Scope of Article 227 has been explained in several decisions including **Waryam Singh and Anr. vs. Amarnath and Anr.**, MANU/SC/0121/1954; AIR 1954 SC 215 ; 1954 SCR 565, **Ouseph Mathai vs. M. Abdul Khadir** MANU/SC/0718/2001 : 2002(1) SCC 319, **Shalini Shyam Shetty vs. Rajendra Shankar Patil** MANU/SC/508/2010: 2010 (8) SCC 329 and **Sameer Suresh Gupta vs. Rahul Kumar Agarwal** MANU/SC/0555/2013 : 2013 (9) SCC 374. In **Shalini Shyam Shetty**, this Court observed :



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

"64.However, this Court unfortunately discerns that of late there is a growing trend amongst several High Courts to entertain writ petition in cases of pure property disputes. Disputes relating to partition suits, matters relating to execution of a decree, in cases of dispute between landlord and tenant and also in a case of money decree and in various other cases where disputed questions of property are involved, writ courts are entertaining such disputes. In some cases the High Courts, in a routine manner, entertain petitions under Article 227 over such disputes and such petitions are treated as writ petitions.

65.We would like to make it clear that in view of the law referred to above in cases of property rights and in disputes between private individuals writ court should not interfere unless there is any infraction of statute or it can be shown that a private individual is acting in collusion with a statutory authority.

66. We may also observe that in some High Courts there is a tendency of entertaining petitions under Article 227 of the Constitution by terming them as writ petitions. This is sought to be justified on an erroneous appreciation



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

of the ratio in Surya Dev and in view of the recent amendment to Section 115 of the Civil Procedure Code by the Civil Procedure Code (Amendment) Act, 1999. It is urged that as a result of the amendment, scope of Section 115 CPC has been curtailed. In our view, even if the scope of Section 115 CPC is curtailed that has not resulted in expanding the High Court's power of superintendence. It is too well known to be reiterated that in exercising its jurisdiction, High Court must follow the regime of law.

67.As a result of frequent interference by the Hon'ble High Court either under Article 226 or 227 of the Constitution with pending civil and at times criminal cases, the disposal of cases by the civil and criminal courts gets further impeded and thus causing serious problems in the administration of justice. This Court hopes and trusts that in exercising its power either under Article 226 or 227, the Hon'ble High Court will follow the time honoured principles discussed above. Those principles have been formulated by this Court for ends of justice and the High Courts as the highest courts of justice within their jurisdiction will adhere to them strictly." (emphasis added)"



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

12.Now it has been clarified that the power of Superintendents under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has not extended or expanding the power. Under what circumstances Article 227 of the Constitution of India can be invoked has already been settled, which requires no repetition.

13.Now this case is on one line of the issue, when some orders passed by the trial Court.

14.Another line of petition is with reference to the striking off plaint like the present one directly to the High Court invoking Article 227 of the Constitution of India without proper application under Order 7 Rule 11 of C.P.C. before the concerned trial Court and this also become the process of evolution.

15.In some cases such a power was exercised directly and matters were



dealt by the High Courts. But, again this was not approved by the Supreme Court. And the power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India in a like manner was decided by the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of **Shalini Shyam Shetty and another Vs. Rajendra Shankar Patil**, reported in **2011 (1) CTC 854 (SC)**. Wherein, it has been held as follows:

"49. On an analysis of the aforesaid decisions of this Court, the following principles on the exercise of High Court's jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution may be formulated:

(a). A petition under Article 226 of the Constitution is different from a petition under Article 227. The mode of exercise of power by the High court under these two articles is also different.

....

(c). High Courts cannot, at the drop of a hat, in exercise of its power of superintendence under Article 227 of the Constitution, interfere with the orders of tribunals or courts inferior to it. Nor can it, exercise of this power, act as a court of appeal over



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

the orders of the court or tribunal subordinate to it. In cases where an alternative statutory mode of redressal has been provided, that would also operate as a restrain on the exercise of this power by the High Court.

...

(e). According to the ratio in Waryam Singh V. Amarnath (AIR 1954 SC 215), followed in subsequent cases, the High Court in exercise of its jurisdiction of superintendence can interfere in order only to keep the tribunals and courts subordinate to it "within the bounds of their authority"

(f), In order to ensure that law is followed by such tribunals and courts by exercising jurisdiction which is vested in them and by not declining to exercise the jurisdiction which is vested in them.

(g). Apart from the situations pointed in (e) and (f), High Court can interfere in exercise of its power of superintendence when there has been a patent perversity in the orders of the tribunals and courts subordinate to it or where there has been a gross and manifest failure of justice or the basic principles of natural justice have been flouted.

.....

(k). The power is discretionary and has



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

to be exercised on equitable principle. In an appropriate case, the power can be exercised suo motu.

(l). On a proper appreciation of the wide and unfettered power of the High Court under Article 227, it transpires that the main object of this article is to keep strict administrative and judicial control by the High Court on the administration of justice within its territory.

(m). The object of superintendence, both administrative and judicial, is to maintain efficiency, smooth and orderly functioning of the entire machinery of justice in such a way as it does not bring it into any disrepute. The power of interference under this article is to be kept to the minimum to ensure that the wheel of justice does not come to a halt and the fountain of justice remains pure and unpolluted in order to maintain public confidence in the functioning of the tribunals and Courts subordinate to the High Court.

...

(o). An improper and a frequent exercise of this power will be counterproductive and will divest this extraordinary power of its strength and vitality."

16.Perhaps Shalini Shyam Shetty



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

and another Vs. Rajendra Shankar Patil was followed in Radhey Shyam and Ors. Vs. Chhabi Nath and Ors. referred above.

18.By referring to this judgment the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in a Judgment in the case of **T.K.Chithran V. C.Samsari @ Chithran and Ors.** reported in **2015(3) CTC 485**, after relying upon the Shalini Shyam Shetty's case, observed as follows:

"13. From the above decision, it is clear that power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has to be exercised sparingly and only in appropriate cases, where judicial conscience of this Court dictates it to act lest a gross failure of justice would occasion. This Court in exercise of power under Article 227 of the Constitution of India having supervisory jurisdiction will not convert itself into an appellate Court and appreciate or evaluate the facts by itself and draw inference. In my considered view, the remedy open to the petitioner is to move the same Court where the suits are filed under Order 7 Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

and make out the applicability of the ingredients of the said Rule. Without doing so, the petitioners cannot be permitted to rush to this Court."

19. Now, we will also go further to the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court made in the case of **Virudhunagar Hindu Nadargal Dharma Paribalana Sabai and others Vs. Tuticorin Educational Society & Ors. in Civil Appeal No.7764 of 2019**. The Honourable Supreme Court by relying upon the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of **A.Venkatasubbiah Naidu Vs. S.Chellappan & Ors.**, made the following observation:

"13. But courts should always bear in mind a distinction between (i) cases where such alternative remedy is available before Civil Courts in terms of the provisions of Code of Civil procedure and (ii) cases where such alternative remedy is available under special enactments and/or statutory rules and the fora provided therein happen to be quasi judicial authorities and tribunals. In respect of cases falling under the first category, which



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

may involve suits and other proceedings before civil courts, the availability of an appellate remedy in terms of the provisions of CPC, may have to be construed as a near total bar. Otherwise, there is a danger that someone may challenge in a revision under Article 227, even a decree passed in a suit, on the same grounds on which the respondents 1 and 2 invoked the jurisdiction of the High court. This is why, a 3 member Bench of this court, while overruling the decision in Surya Dev Rai vs. Ram Chander Rai², pointed out in Radhey Shyam Vs. Chhabi Nath³ that "orders of civil court stand on different footing from the orders of authorities or Tribunals or courts other than judicial/civil courts.

14. Therefore wherever the proceedings are under the code of Civil Procedure and the forum is the Civil Court, the availability of a remedy under the CPC, will deter the High Court, not merely as a measure of self imposed restriction, but as a matter of discipline and prudence, from exercising its power of superintendence under the Constitution. Hence, the High Court ought not to have entertained the revision under Article 227 especially in a case where a specific remedy of



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

appeal is provided under the Code of Civil Procedure itself."

20.This observation throws much light upon the issue now. No more interpretation by this Court is required except making further observation of judgment of this Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **M.Kishanlal and another Vs. K.Pushpavalli @ Elizabeth Pushpavalli and others** made in **C.R.P. (PD) .No.1512 of 2021** dated 05.01.2022, the following observation has been made in paragraph No.3.

"3. The Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this Court have repeatedly held that Order VII Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure is not exhaustive and a plaint can be rejected on grounds other than the ones enumerated Order VII Rule 11 also. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Virudhunagar Hindu Nadargal Dharma Paribalana Sabai and Others v. Tuticorin Educational Society and Others**, reported in (2019) 9 SCC 538, has held that the High Court will refrain from exercising jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

of India, not merely as a measure of self-imposed restriction, but as a matter of discipline and prudence, when a remedy under the code of Civil Procedure is available to the party approaching the High Court. I am therefore of the considered opinion that this is not a fit case to exercise jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India."

21. So this line of judgments are against invoking the Article 227 of the Constitution of India directly when alternative remedy is available.

*22. Another line of judgments are also available quite opposite to this. We can also briefly survey those judgments to keep the record and discussion complete. **Azhar Hussain V. Rajiv Gandhi, 1986 (Supp) SCC 315**, wherein, it has been held that when the pleadings show that clear abuse of the process of the law, causing embarrassment or delay the fair trial of the action or which is otherwise an*



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

abuse of the process of law.

23.Further in **K.K.Modi Vs. K.N.Modi**, 1998 (3) SCC 573; **Lakshmi V. Prasanna Mani**, 2011 (2) MWN (Civil) 363; **Ranipet Municipality rep. by its Commissioner and Special Officer, Ranipet V. M.Shamsheerkhan**, 1998 (1) CTC 66; **Tamil Nadu Handloom Weavers'Co-operative Society Vs. S.R.Ejaz.**, rep. by his Power Agent, **Muralidhar T. Balani**, 2009 (5) CTC 710; has held that revision can be directly filed when there is case of abuse of process of the law and re-litigation.

24.Further in **Maria Soosai and another Vs. Esakkiammal**, reported in 1999 (1) LW 227, the following observation is made.

"The court will prevent improper use of its machinery and will in a proper case, summarily prevent its machinery from being used as a means of vexation and oppression in the process of



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

litigation.... The categories of conduct rendering a claim frivolous, vexatious or an abuse of process are not closed but depend on all the relevant circumstances. And for this purpose considerations of public policy and the interests of justice may be very material."

"Frivolous or vexatious proceedings may also amount to an abuse of the process of court especially where the proceedings are absolutely groundless. The Court then has the power to stop such proceedings summarily and prevent the time of the public and the court from being wasted. Undoubtedly, it is a matter of courts' discretion whether such proceedings should be stopped or not."

25. But, now as mentioned above, that position was clarified by the Honourable Supreme Court in Virudhunagar Hindu Nadargal Dharma Paribalana Sabai and others Vs. Tuticorin Educational Society & Ors. holding the field now when alternative and efficacious remedy is available it is nothing but proper on the part of



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

the High Court to direct the revision petitioner to approach the trial Court by filing proper petition under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC.”

6.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the plaintiff is not a member of the society. Absolutely, he is a third party and his right was not infringed. More-over in the plaint, he has stated the irrelevant facts. So according to him, the plaintiff is involved in filing suit after suit dragging the society to endless litigation, which according to him, it is a clear abuse of process of the court. Since the plaintiff is not a member of the association, the suit itself is not maintainable. Since the suit is a clear abuse of process of the court by exercising the power under Article 227 of the Constitution of Law, it must be strike off.

7.Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the 1st respondent would submit that he is a Member of the society. He challenged his removal and that matter is also pending before this court in the form of second appeal. But further particulars are not available. The correct second appeal number is also not mentioned by the



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

1st respondent herein.

WEB COPY

8.Now whatever it may be, in view of the above said statement of law, I am of the considered view that liberty may be granted to the petitioner to move appropriate application before the trial court under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC, if so advised. On that ground, without going into the merits of the argument advanced on either side, this civil revision petition is **dismissed**. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

20/06/2024

Index:Yes/No
Internet:Yes/No
er

G.ILANGOVAN, J



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1657 of 2023

er

C.R.P (MD) No.1657 of 2023

20/06/2024