



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

A.No.252 of 2025
in C.S.(Comm.Div.) No.198 of 2024

T.N.Janarthanam

... Applicant/Plaintiff

-VS-

1.N.Venkatesan

2.M/s.Namma Veetu Kalaynam, Represented by its Managing Partner
Mr.N.Venkatesan, No. A 83, Sathiavani Maligai, A Block, 3rd Street, Anna
Nagar, Chennai-600102. ... Respondents/Defendants


Prayer : Application is filed under Order XIV Rule 8 of Original Side Rules
Read With Order VII Rule 14 of the CPC, to permit the applicant/plaintiff to
file the additional documents in C.S.(Comm.Div)No.198 of 2024 before this
Court.

For Applicant : Mr.Ramesh Ganapathy

For Respondents : Mr.Rajesh Ramanathan

ORDER

By this application, the plaintiff seeks leave to file the additional



documents described in the schedule to the Judge's summons.

WEB COPY

2. In the affidavit in support of the application, it is stated that the plaintiff did not file the documents while instituting the suit on the basis that the same may not be relevant. Upon the written statement being filed, it is stated that it has become necessary to place on record pleadings and orders in earlier proceedings between the same parties.

3. Learned counsel for the defendants opposes the application primarily on the ground that the reasons set out in paragraph 5 do not constitute a reasonable cause for not filing these documents earlier.

4. The plaint was admitted in October 2024 and the suit is at the stage where written statement has been filed but the plaintiff has prayed for leave to file a reply statement. The documents evidently relate to affidavits, orders and the like in proceedings between the same parties, which are pending before this Court. It appears that all the proceedings relate to the use of the same trade marks.



WEB COPY 5. Considering the above facts and circumstances holistically, although there is merit in the contention of learned counsel for the defendants that the reasons set out in paragraph 5 are not valid, I am inclined to allow this application subject to the right of the defendants to file an affidavit of admission/denial and raise objections, *inter alia*, on the grounds of admissibility, relevance and proof in course of trial.

kj

26.03.2025
(1/2)

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY,J.



WEB COPY



kj

A.No.252 of 2025
in C.S.(Comm.Div.) No.198 of 2024

26.03.2025
(1/2)