



WEB COPY



O.S.A.Nos.331 & 332 of 2025

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MOHAMMED SHAFFIQ

O.S.A.Nos. 331 and 332 of 2025

O.S.A.No.331 of 2025:

1.G.V.Adhimoolam

2.A.Vijay Raj

...Appellants

Vs.

1.S.Asaithambi

2.Kavitha

3.Makala

4.Senthilkumar

5.Lokeshwaran

6.Lalithambikai

7.Shanmugam

8.Selvi

9.K.Makewari

10.K.Mohan Kumar

11.Yasotha

12.Rajamani

...Respondents



O.S.A.Nos.331 & 332 of 2025

PRAYER in O.S.A.No.331 of 2025: This Original Side Appeal filed under Order 36 Rule 1 of the Original Side Rules read with Clause 15 of the Letters Patent read with Section 37 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 praying to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 25.10.2024 made in O.A.No.442 of 2024 by allowing this appeal.

For Appellants : Mr.K.Suresh Babu

For Mr.K.Vanisree

For Respondents : Ms.K.Niranjana Devi for R1 to R3

Mr.S.P.S.Nithyan for R4 to R12

O.S.A.No.332 of 2025:

1.G.V.Adhimoolam

2.A.Vijay Raj

...Appellants

Vs.

1.S.Asaithambi

2.Senthilkumar

...Respondents

PRAYER in O.S.A.No.332 of 2025: This Original Side Appeal filed under Order 36 Rule 1 of the Original Side Rules read with Clause 15 of the Letters Patent read with Section 37 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 praying to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 25.10.2024 made in O.A.No.392 of 2024 by allowing this appeal.

For Appellants : Mr.K.Suresh Babu

For Mr.K.Vanisree

For Respondents : Ms.K.Niranjana Devi for R1

Mr.S.P.S.Nithyan for R2



O.S.A.Nos.331 & 332 of 2025

COMMON JUDGMENT

WEB COPY

(Order of the Court was made by S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.)

The present Original Side Appeals have been instituted challenging the order dated 25.10.2024 passed in O.A.Nos.392 and 442 of 2024.

2. Both the applications have been filed along with Arbitration Application filed under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. Initially an order of interim injunction was granted. During pendency of the application, parties entered into a compromise deed and it was filed before the Court. As per the terms in compromise deed, 1st respondent is entitled to sell the properties to person of his choice without any restrictions. Thus the 1st respondent executed settlement deed and sale deeds during the pendency of applications in O.A.No.392 of 2024.

3. Raising objection against the alienation, the appellants contended before the learned Single Judge that the injunction is to be restored. The learned Single Judge considered the issues and made a finding that the compromise deed entered into between the parties are binding and the alienations were made in terms of the compromise deed. Thus the appellants are not entitled for the relief of interim injunction.



O.S.A.Nos.331 & 332 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. This Court does not find any infirmity in respect of the order impugned in the present Original Side Appeals. However, if any other grievance exists to the appellants, it is open to the parties to seek appropriate relief in the manner known to law.

5. With the above observations, these Original Side Appeals are **dismissed**. No costs.

(S.M.S., J.) (M.S.Q., J.)
15.10.2025

dsa

Internet :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
Neutral Citation :Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order



WEB COPY



O.S.A.Nos.331 & 332 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
MOHAMMED SHAFFIQ, J.

dsa

O.S.A.Nos. 331 and 332 of 2025

15.10.2025