



WEB COPY



A NO. 894 of 2025
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14-03-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

A NO. 894 of 2025

in

C.S.No.599 of 2019

V.Sreemanikandan
I.D.4, Jain Sagarika, No.94, Satyadev Avenue,
MRC Nagar, R.A.Puram, Ch-28

Applicant(s)

Vs

V.Sreekant and 5 others
S/o.S.Vaithiyanathan, No.181/27, Kumbakonam
Rd. Panruti, Cuddalore Dist. and 5 Others

Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s): Mr.O.P.Padmaprakash

For Respondent(s): Mr.P.Kannan Kumar (For R1)

Mr.R.Venkatraman
For M/s.Tatva Legal (For R2 & R3)

ORDER

This application has been filed to receive the documents mentioned hereunder in evidence in the above suit.



WEB COPY

2. An objection has been taken with regard to Serial No.9 of the list of documents by raising a contention that the document is incomplete and secondly, the said document cannot be marked that too as a secondary evidence.

3. The learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the list of documents were not located at the relevant point of time and only now he had been able to trace the said documents and therefore, he seeks permission of this Court to mark the said documents.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents would submit that they have no objection for receiving the documents listed in Serial Nos.1 to 8 subject to proof and relevancy. As regards the Serial No.9 document, the learned counsel for the respondents would submit that the said document does not belong to the respondents and the document is addressed to the first respondent/plaintiff and therefore, the same cannot be relied upon by the applicant and would further submit that the said document is incomplete document.

5. I have considered the submissions made on behalf of the learned counsel on either side.

6. Since there is no objection to receive the document Nos. 1 to 8 of the List schedule documents, subject to proof and relevancy, the same is permitted to be received. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for the



first respondent/plaintiff, document No.9 is an incomplete document. The said document itself reveals that it is Page 1 of 2 and there is no second page.

Hence, the same stands rejected. No costs.

14-03-2025

kak

To

1. V.Sreekant and 5 others

S/o.S.Vaithiyanathan, No.181/27, Kumbakonam Rd.

Panruti, Cuddalore Dist.

2. V.Jayalakshmi

W/o.Late S.Vaithiyanathan, No.181/27, Kumbakonam Rd. Panruti, Cuddalore Dist.

3. Vidyalatha Baskar

Janaki, No.88/7, Sardar Patel Rd. Adyar, Ch-20

4. The Branch Manager

City Union Bank, Panruti Branch, No.9, RC Complex, Kumbakonam Rd.

Panruti, Cuddalore Dist.

5. The Branch Manager

Karur Vysya Bank, Panruti Branch, No.5/2, SR Ramachandra Complex,

Cuddalore Rd. Panruti, Cuddalore Dist.

6. The Branch Manager

Lakshmi Vilas Bank, Panruti Branch, No.26/D1, Kumbakonam Rd. Panruti,

Cuddalore Dist.