



WEB COPY



CRP.No.433 of 2024.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

CRP.No.433 of 2024

and CMP.No.2080 of 2024

1.S.Amudha

2.S.Kokila

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.Sivaprakasam

2.S.Malar

3.S.Komathi

4.S.Gnanam

5.S.Raghu

6.S.Janakiraman

7.The Sub Registrar,
Sub Registrar Office,
Walajapettai.

8.The Tahsildar, Taluk Office,
Wallajapettai, Walaja Taluk,
Ranipet District.

9.K.Ramachandran

10.The Collector,
Collector Office,
Ranipet and District.

11.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ranipet and District.

12.The Village Administrative Officer,
Musiri Village, Walaja Taluk,
Ranipet District.

...Respondents



CRP.No.433 of 2023.

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside the fair and decreetal order in I.A.No.1 of 2022 in O.S.No.80 of 2018 dated 02.11.2023 passed by the learned Subordinate Court, Ranipet and thereby allow the above Civil Revision Petition.

For Petitioners	: Mr.B.Sundarapandiyan
For Respondents	: Ms.Aswini Devi .K Additional Government Pleader for R7 and R8 and R10 to R12 R1 to R6-NRN Mr.C.Prabakaran for R9

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Court below, dismissing the application filed by the petitioners seeking impleadment of respondents 9 to 12.

2. The petitioners herein filed a suit for partition against the respondents 1 to 9 in O.S.No.80 of 2018. According to the petitioners, the subject property was purchased by their father, the first defendant in the suit out of sale profits of ancestral property. Therefore, claiming 1/6th share in the subject property, the suit was filed for partition and other reliefs.



WEB COPY

3. When the suit was pending, the petitioners filed instant impleading application seeking to implead the 9th respondent herein who said to have purchased 9th item of the suit property from the 3rd party called Munusamy under document dated 05.04.2007. Since he attempted to mutate the revenue records, the petitioner also sought for impleadment of revenue officials namely the respondents 10 to 12. The said application was dismissed by the Court below. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has come before this Court.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the impleadment of the respondents 9 to 12 is absolutely necessary for the effective adjudication of the *lis*.

5. It is seen from the averments found in the affidavit filed in support of the impleading application, the proposed respondent 9 is not a sharer and he has not purchased the property from any of the family members of the petitioners, therefore, he cannot claim title under any of the shares. In such circumstances, he need not be impleaded in the suit for partition filed by



CRP.No.433 of 2025.

the petitioner. If the petitioners have got any grievance with regard to the right claimed by the 9th respondent, it is for them to workout their remedy by way of separate suit. As far as the respondents 10 to 12 are concerned, they are sought to be impleaded only on the apprehension that after purchase, 9th respondent might mutate the revenue records by moving the respondents 10 to 12. The competent authority to mutate the revenue records is the Tahsildar and he is already on record as 8th defendant in the suit. In such circumstances, the superior officials namely the respondents 10, 11 and 12 need not to be impleaded.

6. I do not find any error in the order passed by the trial Court dismissing the impleading application. Hence, the Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

29.10.2025

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
ub



To
The Subordinate Court,
Ranipet.

WEB COPY



CRP.No.433 of 2021.

S.SOUNTHAR, J.



WEB COPY



CRP.No.433 of 2024.

ub

CRP.No.433 of 2024

29.10.2025