



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

JUDGMENT RESERVED ON : 29.07.2024

JUDGMENT PRONOUNDED ON : 12.11.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

**S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013
and MP(MD).Nos.1 & 2 of 2013 & 3 of 2014**

SA(MD).No.334 of 2014

Selvakumaran @ Selvakumar

...Appellant/Appellant/Plaintiff

Vs

1.State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its District Collector
Collector's Office
Tiruchirappalli – 1

2.The Tahsildar
Lalgudi
Lalgudi Taluk
Tiruchirappalli District

3.The Village Administrative Officer
Kallakkudi Village
Kallakkudi
Lalgudi Taluk
Tiruchirappalli District

4.The Executive Officer
Kallakudi Panchayat Union
Kallakudi
Lalgudi Taluk, Tiruchirappalli District



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

5.The Assistant Engineer
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
Kallakkudi Distribution
Kallakudi
Lalgudi Taluk
Tiruchirappalli District

6.The Junior Engineer
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
Kallakkudi Distribution
Kallakkudi
Lalgudi Taluk
Tiruchirappalli District

7.Kennedy

8.Sathiyamurthi

9.S.Venkatesh

10.K.Annathurai

.....Respondents/Respondents
/Defendants

SA(MD).No.335 of 2014

1.S.Venkatesh

2.K.Annathurai

...Appellants/Appellants 1 & 3
/Plaintiffs 1 & 3

Vs

1.Selvakumaran @Selvakumar

2.Kennedy

3.Sathiyamurthi

....Respondents 1 to 3/Respondents
/Defendants

4.Paramasivam

....4th Respondent/2nd Appellant
/2nd Plaintiff



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

CRP(MD).No.1080 of 2013:

1.Venkatesh

2.Annadurai

...Petitioners/3rd parties
/3rd parties

Vs

1.A.Kennedy

....1st Respondent/Petitioner
/Plaintiff

2.M.Sathyamoorthy

....2nd Respondent/Respondent
/Defendant

PRAYER in SA(MD).No.334 of 2014: Second Appeal is filed under Section 100 of C.P.C, to set aside the judgement and decree dated 19.12.2013 passed in A.S.No.36 of 2013 on the file of the Principal District Court, Tiruchirappalli confirming the judgment and decree dated 20.06.2013 passed in O.S.No.321 of 2011 on the file of the I Additional Subordinate Court, Tiruchirappalli.

PRAYER in SA(MD).No.335 of 2014: Second Appeal is filed under Section 100 of C.P.C, to set aside the judgement and decree dated 19.12.2013 passed in A.S.No.37 of 2013 on the file of the Principal District Court, Tiruchirappalli confirming the judgment and decree dated 20.06.2013 passed in O.S.No.699 of 2009 on the file of the I Additional Subordinate Court, Tiruchirappalli.

CRP(MD).No.1080 of 2013: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Section 115 of C.P.C, to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 20.06.2013 made in E.A.No.71 of 2011 in E.P.No.410 of 2010 in O.S.No.448 of 2010 on the file of Subordinate Judge, Tiruchirappalli and to allow the above civil revision petition.



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

WEB COPY

SA(MD).No.334 of 2014:

For Appellant : Mr.V.Meenakshi Sundaram
for M/s.S.Rajeshkanna

For Respondents : Mr.C.Satheeshkumar
Government Advocate for R1 to R3

:Mr.B.Ramanathan
Standing Counsel for R5 & R6

:Mr.Raguvaran Gopalan for R7

:No appearance for R4, R8, R9 & R10

SA(MD).No.335 of 2014:

For Appellants : Mr.V.Meenakshi Sundaram
for M/s.S.Rajeshkanna

For Respondents : Mr.Raguvaran Gopalan for R2

: No appearance for R1 & R3

CRP(MD).No.1080 of 2013:

For Petitioners : Mr.V.Meenakshi Sundaram
for M/s.D.Nallathambi

For Respondents : Mr.Raguvaran Gopalan for R1

: No appearance for R2

COMMON JUDGMENT

The unsuccessful plaintiffs before the trial Court as well as the appellate Court are the appellants in both the second appeals.



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

2.The petitioner in an application filed under Order 21 Rule 97 of C.P.C are the revision petitioners in CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013.

3.Since the properties involved in all the proceedings are one and the same, they are tagged together and a common judgment is being passed.

(A)The undisputed facts are as follows:

4.The suit schedule property is the ancestral property of the family of one Muthusamy Udayar. His elder son namely Periyasamy had predeceased him. The said Muthusamy Udayar had passed away leaving behind his wife Velambal, son namely Sathiyamurthi and his three daughters namely Dhanalakshmi, Tamilselvi and Manimegalai. The legal representatives of the Muthusamy Udayar, claiming it to be the ancestral property have jointly executed an unregistered sale agreement in favour of one Selvakumaran on 17.06.2009. Based upon the said sale agreement, a registered sale deed has been executed in favour of Selvakumaran on 20.07.2009.

5.One of the sons of the Muthusamy Udayar namely Sathiyamurthi (who is also a party to the sale agreement dated 17.06.2009 and sale deed dated 20.07.2009) had executed a registered sale agreement in favour of one Kennedy in his individual capacity. Based upon the said sale agreement, the agreement holder, Kennedy had filed O.S.No.448 of 2010 on the file of the First Additional Subordinate Court, Trichy seeking specific performance of



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

the agreement sale. The suit was decreed exparte on 06.09.2010. The decree holder namely Kennedy had filed E.P.No.410 of 2010 on 15.10.2010 for execution of sale deed. The Court had executed a sale deed in favour of Kennedy on 27.01.2011. The decree holder had filed E.P.No.71 of 2011 for delivery of the property. Alleging tenants of the said property, one Annadurai and Venkatesh had filed E.A.No.130 of 2011 under Order 21 Rule 97 of C.P.C raising objection to the delivery.

(B)The proceedings before the Court Below are as follows:

6.One Venkatesh, Paramasivam and Annathurai claiming themselves to be the tenants of Selvakumaran had filed O.S.No.699 of 2009 seeking a decree for permanent injunction not to disturb them unless by due process of law. In the said suit, the decree holder in O.S.No.448 of 2010 namely Kennedy was arrayed as the second defendant and the son of Muthusamy Udayar namely Sathiyamurthi was arrayed as third defendant. The suit was dismissed by the trial Court on 20.06.2013. The plaintiffs therein had filed A.S.No.37 of 2013 before the District Court, Trichy. The appeal was dismissed by the First Appellate Court on 19.12.2013. Challenging the same, SA(MD).No.335 of 2014 is filed by the tenants.

7.Selvakumaran claiming title based upon the sale deed dated 20.07.2009 had filed O.S.No.321 of 2011 before the Subordinate Court, Trichy for the



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

relief of declaration that he is the absolute owner of the property and for consequential injunction. The plaintiff had further prayed for a declaration that the sale deed executed by the Court based upon the exparte decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010 is void abinitio. The plaintiff had also prayed for permanent injunction as against all the defendants and forbearing them from mutating the revenue records or disturbing the possession of the plaintiff therein. The said suit was dismissed by the trial Court on 20.06.2013. The plaintiff therein had filed A.S.No.36 of 2013 before the District Court, Trichy. The appeal was dismissed by the First Appellate Court on 19.12.2013. Challenging the same, the plaintiff had filed SA(MD).No.334 of 2014.

8.The decree holder in O.S.No.448 of 2010 on the strength of the sale deed executed by the Court had filed E.P.No.71 of 2011 for taking delivery. The Executing Court has ordered delivery on 20.06.2013. Challenging the said order, CRP(MD).No.1080 of 2013 has been filed by the alleged tenants.

(C) Summary of the pleadings of the parties concerned are as follows:

9.The plaintiffs in O.S.No.699 of 2009 had contended that they are the tenants under Selvakumaran and the said Selvakumaran and Kennedy who is said to have purchased the property from Sathiyamurthi are attempting to disturb their possession.



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

WEB COPY

10.In the said suit, Kennedy has filed a written statement contending that the plaintiffs are not in possession of the suit schedule property, but it is in possession of only Sathiyamurthi who is the judgment debtor in O.S.No.448 of 2010. The sale deed executed by the legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar in favour of Selvakumaran is after the registered sale agreement in his favour. Therefore, the said Selvakumaran can never be considered to be a bonafide purchaser for valuable consideration without notice of the pre-existing sale agreement. He had further submitted that there was a partition in the family of Muthusamy Udayar between the eldest son Periyasamy and Sathiyamurthi and the property was allotted to the share of Sathiyamurthi. Therefore, the other legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar do not have any share in the suit schedule property. In such circumstances, an antedated sale agreement has been created by the legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar after the registered sale agreement was entered into between the Sathiyamurthi and himself.

11.The defendant/Kennedy had further contended that the legal heirs of Periyasamy are available and without impleading them, the suit for declaration of title filed by Selvakumaran is not maintainable. The said Periyasamy while he was alive, had sold the property allotted to his share in favour of one Baskaran on 27.10.2003 with a recital that the property has



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

been allotted to his share in the partition. Therefore, it is not correct that the property remained undivided after the death of Muthusamy Udayar.

(D) Findings of the Courts below are as follows:

12.(a).The trial Court as well as the Appellate Court have found that the unregistered sale agreement dated 17.06.2009 said to have been executed by the legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar in favour of Selvakumaran has not been proved.

(b)The suit filed by Selvakumaran without impleading the legal heirs of Periyasamy is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties.

(c)When the sale deed was executed in favour of Selvakumaran on 20.07.2009, the encumbrance certificate reveals that there is a registered sale agreement, in favour of Kennedy dated 15.07.2009. Therefore, Selvakumaran is not a bonafide purchaser for valuable consideration without having knowledge about the pre-existing agreement.

(d)The suit for specific performance in O.S.No.448 of 2010 has been decreed in favour of Kennedy. In a suit for specific performance, only the vendor is a necessary party. Therefore, the non-impleading of the other legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar will not in any way affect the legality or validity of the said decree.

(e)The plaintiffs in O.S.No.699 of 2009 claiming be the tenants of



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

the property have not established the same. No documents have been filed on the side of the plaintiffs therein to establish their tenancy and possession.

(E) Substantial questions of law:

13.SA(MD).No.334 of 2014 has been admitted on the following substantial questions of law:

“Whether the judgment and decree of the Courts below rejecting the declaration and other reliefs claimed by the appellant herein/plaintiff is correct, when the 7th respondent herein/decreed holder in O.S.No.448 of 2010 have failed to prove the factum of partition took place between the 8th respondent herein and his brother late.Periyasamy and thus the same disproved the case of the 7th respondent herein and thus the judgment and decree of the Courts below warrants interference under Section 100 of Civil Procedure Code, 1908”

14.SA(MD).No.335 of 2014 has been admitted on the following substantial questions of law:

“A)When the sale deed obtained by the 2nd respondent herein in an execution proceedings initiated in pursuance to the exparte judgement and decree dated 06.09.2010 in O.S.No.448 of 2010 and the said exparte judgment is not in consonance with the definition of “judgment” as defined in Section 2(9) of Civil Procedure Code, whether the Courts below are correct in dismissing the present suit filed by the appellants, accepting the title of the 2nd respondent herein and hence, the judgment and decree of the Courts below warrants interference under Section 100 of Civil Procedure Code?



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

WEB COPY

B)When it is pleaded and proved by these appellants that their tenancy was attorned by the subsequent purchaser/Selvakumaran/Plaintiff in O.S.No.321 of 2011 after his purchase from the legal heirs of late.Muthusamy Udaiyar, the approach of the Courts below dismissing the present suit filed by these appellants without discussing the factum of attornment of tenancy and dismissing the suit and E.A.No.130 of 2011 under Order 21 Rule 97 of Civil Procedure Code is correct and thus the judgment and decree of Courts below warrants interference under Section 100 of Civil Procedure Code?”

(F) Submissions of the learned counsels appearing on either side are as follows:

15.The learned counsel appearing for the appellants herein had contended that the defendant namely Kennedy in both the second appeals has not established the fact that the sale deed obtained by him from Sathiyamurthi on 20.07.2009 is not a valid document. When no registered partition had taken place between the legal heirs of the deceased Muthusamy Udayar, the female heirs of late Muthusamy Udayar are entitled to a share in the suit schedule property.

16.The learned counsel for the appellants had further contended that the eldest son namely Periyasamy is a separated son and therefore, any document executed by him cannot be relied upon by the said Kennedy for



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

obtaining a sale deed from other brother namely Sathiyamurthi. After Periyasamy left, the other family members continued to be joint and therefore, the ancestral character of property continued. In such circumstances, the sale agreement executed by one of the co-parceners namely Sathiyamurthi on 15.07.2009 or the decree granted by the Court for specific performance on the basis of the above said sale agreement are void abinitio and they are not valid in the eye of law.

17.The learned counsel had further contended that in a suit for specific performance filed by the said Kennedy, Selvakumaran was not made as a party. Even though the sale deed was executed by the legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar in favour of Selvakumaran in July 2009, they were not made party to the specific performance suit filed in the year 2010. Therefore, the said decree is not enforceable as against the plaintiff namely Selvakumaran.

18.He had further contended that when the entire burden is upon the defendants to prove the oral partition, they have not discharged their burden by placing any public document or any registered document to establish the said fact. In such circumstances, the Court below ought not to have believed the plea of partition.

19.The learned counsel for the appellants had further contended



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

that a perusal of the ex parte decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010 reveals that it does not reflect the pleadings or documents filed on the side of the plaintiffs. Therefore, the same cannot be considered to be a judgment as defined under Section 2(9) of C.P.C. When the decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010 is invalid in the eye of law, the defendant namely Kennedy cannot get any title to the property based upon the sale deed executed by the Court pursuant to the said decree.

20.The learned counsel appearing for the appellants had further contended that the plaintiff in O.S.No.699 of 2009 have pleaded and proved that they have attorned their tenancy to the subsequent purchaser namely Selvakumaran. In such circumstances, the Courts below were not right in dismissing the suit for permanent injunction not to evict them except by due process of law. Hence, he prayed for allowing the second appeals and the revision petition.

21.Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents had contended that the defendants have filed Exhibit B12 dated 27.10.2003 which is a sale deed executed by the eldest son Periyasamy in favour of the brother of Kennedy. A perusal of the said sale deed reflects that already partition had taken place. The boundary recitals in the registered sale agreement dated 15.07.2009 also reflect that already partition had taken



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

place. In such circumstances, the trial Court as well as the Appellate Court were right in arriving at a finding that the defendants have established the plea of oral partition based upon public documents and registered documents. He had further contended that Exhibit B12 has been attested by one of the sons of Muthusamy Udayar namely Sathiyamurthi admitting the partition. Hence, Sathiyamurthi cannot turn around and contend that the property continued to be the ancestral property of Muthusamy Udayar.

22.The learned counsel for the respondents had further contended that the said Kennedy has entered into a registered sale agreement with Sathiyamurthi on 15.07.2009 and only on 20.07.2009, a sale deed has been executed by all the legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar in favour of Selvakumaran. If the encumbrance had been verified, it would have come to the knowledge of Selvakumaran that already there is a registered agreement in favour of Kennedy. Only to get over the registered sale agreement, a fraudulent antedated sale agreement dated 17.06.2009 has been created. In fact, the said document was not filed before the Court by the plaintiffs. He had further contended that the sale agreement dated 17.06.2009 is not reflected in the sale deed dated 20.07.2009. Therefore, it is a fraudulent document.

23.The learned counsel for respondents had further contended that



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

Selvakumaran is a purchaser subsequent to the registered sale agreement and therefore, he need not be impleaded in a suit for specific performance filed by Kennedy as against the vendor namely Sathiyamurthi. That apart, the exparte decree passed in O.S.No.448 of 2010 has not been challenged in the suit. When there is no prayer to set aside the exparte decree, the Courts below have rightly not gone into the issue of validity of the said decree.

24.The learned counsel had further contended that even assuming that the property continues to be the ancestral property, the legal heirs of Periyasamy should have been included in the sale deed or at least in the suit for declaration of title. The availability of the legal heirs of the Periyasamy has been proved by the defendants by filing Exhibit B2 legal heir certificate. In such circumstances, the suit for declaration of title without impleading the legal heirs of Periyasamy who is the eldest son of Muthusamy Udayar is not maintainable. The learned counsel had further contended that the said Periyasamy has sold the share allotted to him in partition in favour of the brother of Kennedy namely Baskar under Exhibit B12 on 27.10.2003. In the said property, the Baskar has put up a huge commercial property. In case, if the property remained undivided, the other legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar would have objected to the construction. In such circumstances, it could very well be presumed that there was a oral partition between Periyasamy and



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

Sathiyamurthi and the other legal heirs have not evinced any interest in seeking a claim over the property of Muthusamy Udayar. Hence, he prayed for sustaining the order passed by the Trial Court as well as the Appellate Court.

25. I have considered the submissions made on either side and perused the material records.

(G)Discussion:

S.A(MD).No.334 of 2014:

26.A perusal of the plaint averments in O.S.No.321 of 2011 reveal that the said Selvakumaran has specifically pleaded that the suit schedule property is the ancestral property of Muthusamy Udayar. It further reveals that there was no partition among the legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar and the property continued to be an ancestral property. However, it is the contention of the defendants that there was an oral partition between the elder son Periyasamy and younger son Sathiyamurthi.

27.It is a settled position of law that the burden of proof is upon the party who pleads oral partition. The defendants have filed Exhibit B12 dated 27.10.2003 which is a sale deed executed by the elder son Periasamy in favour of one Baskar who is none other than the brother of Kennedy.

28.A perusal of the said sale deed reveals that Periyasamy has sold



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

away his share allotted to him in partition. This sale deed has been attested by Periyasamy's brother Sathiyamurthi. However, the said Sathiyamurthi along with other legal heirs had entered into unregistered sale agreement on 17.06.2009 under Exhibit B14 in favour of Selvakumaran. He had also proceeded to execute the sale deed in favour of Selvakumaran on 20.07.2009 under Exhibit A1. Considering the fact that Exhibit B12 is a registered document and it has been attested by Sathiyamurthi, this Court can safely come to a conclusion that already oral partition has taken place between Periyasamy and Sathiyamurthi.

29.The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a judgement reported in **(2020) 9 SCC 1 (Vineeta Sharma Vs. Rakesh Sharma and others)** in paragraph No. 137.5 has held that in exceptional cases where plea of oral partition is supported by public documents and partition is finally evinced in the same manner as if it had been affected by a decree of a Court, oral partition stands proved. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has chosen to interpret Section 6(5) of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 as amended by Hindu Amendment Act 2005 in the above said manner.

30.The other legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar, especially Sathiyamurthi has not been examined by the plaintiffs to establish the fact that there was no oral partition. The plaintiff Selvakumaran is said to have



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

entered into an unregistered sale agreement with the legal heirs of Muthusamy Udayar on 17.06.2009. However, the said document has not been marked on his side. That apart, the said sale agreement is not reflected in the sale deed in favour of Selvakumaran dated 20.07.2009 which is marked as Exhibit A1. When Selvakumaran had entered into the sale deed on 20.07.2009, he should have very well noticed the fact that already there was a registered sale agreement in favour of Kennedy on 15.07.2009 which is marked as Exhibit A11. During cross examination, the said Selvakumaran has admitted that he had not verified the encumbrance. In such circumstances, the said Selvakumaran can never be considered to be a bonafide purchaser for valuable consideration without having knowledge of the pre-existing agreement.

31.It is the contention of the appellants that the exparte decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010 does not fall within the definition of judgment as defined under Section 2(9) of C.P.C. A perusal of the plaint prayer in O.S.No.321 of 2011 reveal that the plaintiff therein has only chosen to challenge the sale deed executed by the Court in E.P.No.410 of 2010 as void abinitio. The plaintiff had not chosen to challenge the exparte decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010. When there is no pleading or prayer challenging the validity of the exparte decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010, the Trial Court as well as the



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

Appellate Court were right in not considering the said issue. When there is no pleadings or prayer, this Court is not inclined to consider the validity of the exparte decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010. The defendant in O.S.No.448 of 2010 has not chosen to challenge the same. It is to be noted that the validity of decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010 has not been raised as a substantial question of law by appellant/Selvakumaran in S.A(MD).No.334 of 2014.

32.As plaintiffs, the entire burden is upon the appellants to establish their better title over the defendants. When the defendants have established oral partition between the elder son and the younger son and the plaintiffs are not the bonafide purchasers, the plaintiffs cannot rely upon the alleged weakness of the exparte decree in O.S.No.448 of 2010 to claim title to the suit schedule property.

SA(MD).No.335 of 2014

33.S.A(MD).No.335 of 2014 has been filed by the tenants challenging the concurrent findings of the Courts below which have rejected the claim of the plaintiffs on the ground that they have not established their tenancy or possession over the suit schedule property. Though the plaintiffs therein have contended that they are the tenants under the vendor of A.Selvakumaran, they have not marked any document to establish their tenancy. The first plaintiff has chosen to examine himself as DW2 in O.S.No.



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

321 of 2011. The evidence of DW2 does not inspire the confidence of the Court. A perusal of the list of documents filed on the side of the defendants (in O.S.No.321 of 2011) reveal that no document has been filed to establish the functioning of a hotel in the suit schedule property as alleged by them. The Trial Court as well as the Appellate Court have rejected the tax receipts filed by the tenants on the ground that they do not reflect the door number or the business run by them. In such circumstances, this Court is constrained to arrive at a finding that the plaintiffs in O.S.No.699 of 2009 have neither established their tenancy nor their possession over the suit schedule property. The tenant cannot challenge the validity of the specific performance decree in a suit filed by them seeking permanent injunction not to evict them unless by due process of law. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the respondents, the plaintiffs in O.S.No.699 of 2009 have been set up by the plaintiffs in O.S.No.321 of 2011 in order to drag on the proceedings.

CRP(MD).No.1080 of 2013:

34.Based upon the exparte decree in the specific performance suit in O.S.No.448 of 2010, the decree holder therein had filed E.P.No.410 of 2010 for execution of sale deed. The Court has also executed a sale deed in favour of Kennedy on 27.01.2011. Based upon the said sale deed, the decree holder has filed E.A.No.71 of 2011 for delivery of property under Order 21



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

Rule 95 of C.P.C. Pending this application, the tenants who are the plaintiffs in O.S.No.699 of 2009 have filed E.A.No.130 of 2011 under Order 21 Rule 97 of C.P.C raising objection to the delivery of the property. The Trial Court by way of common judgement on 20.06.2013 while dismissing O.S.No.699 of 2009 and O.S.No.321 of 2011, had proceeded to dismiss E.A.No.130 of 2011 also. However, no appeal has been filed challenging the order dismissing an application under Order 21 Rule 97 of C.P.C. In such circumstances, the revision petition filed by the tenants challenging the delivery order passed in E.A.No.71 of 2011 is not maintainable. When this Court has already arrived at a finding that the plaintiffs in O.S.No.699 of 2009 have not established their tenancy or possession over the suit schedule property, the order of delivery passed by the Executing Court in E.A.No.71 of 2011 does not call for any interference.

35.In view of the above said deliberations, all the substantial questions of law raising in both the second appeals are answered as against the appellants. There are no merits in the civil revision petition. Therefore, both the Second Appeals and the Civil Revision Petition stand dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

12.11.2024



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

NCC : Yes/No

msa

To

1.The Principal District Judge, Trichy

2.The Subordinate Judge, Trichy

3.The District Collector

State of Tamil Nadu

Collector's Office

Tiruchirappalli – 1

4.The Tahsildar

Lalgudi

Lalgudi Taluk

Tiruchirappalli District

5.The Village Administrative Officer

Kallakkudi Village

Kallakkudi

Lalgudi Taluk

Tiruchirappalli District

6.The Section Officer

V.R.Section

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court

Madurai



WEB COPY



S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013

R.VIJAYAKUMAR,J.

msa

S.A.(MD).Nos.334 & 335 of 2014
& CRP(NPD)(MD).No.1080 of 2013
and MP(MD).Nos.1 & 2 of 2013 & 3 of 2014

12.11.2024