



CRP No.2056 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated :27.06.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BALAJI

C.R.P.No.2056 of 2024 and CMP No.10977 of 2024

1.C.Mylsamy

2.C.Selvakumar

.... Petitioners

VS

1.C.Thulasiammal

2.C.Kalaiselvi

... Respondents

Revision filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the order dated 02.03.2024 passed in I.A.No.3 of 2024 in O.S.No.299 of 2014 on the file of IV Additional Subordinate Court, Coimbatore.

For Petitioners : Mr.P.Tamilvel

For Respondent : Ms.V.Ambika

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The 1st revision petitioners is the plaintiff and the 2nd revision petitioner is the second defendant in O.S.No.299 of 2014. The defendants took out an application to permit receipt of additional documents which was strongly



CRP No.2056 of 2024

opposed by the revision petitioners/plaintiffs. However, the trial Court


proceeded to allow the application, as against which, the present revision has been preferred by the revision petitioners.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the affidavit filed in support of the petition filed to receive the documents is bereft of any material particulars and no document was even enclosed along with written statement. Therefore, it is contended that the trial Court ought not to have granted permission to receive documents along with proof affidavit.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents/defendants would state that the trial Court has exercised discretion to permit receipt of documents and no prejudice would be caused to the petitioners and therefore, the order passed by the trial court does not require any interference.

5. I have carefully considered the submissions advanced by the learned counsel on either side and I have also gone through the order passed by the trial Court.

6. The trial Court has considered the objection of the plaintiff that no



CRP No.2056 of 2024

sufficient reason has been set out in the affidavit and yet, proceeded to give an

opportunity to the respondents/defendants to file additional documents, holding

that no serious prejudice would be caused to the revision petitioners. I do not

find the said order of the trial Court being perverse, warranting interference

under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, in view of the fact that the suit

is only at the trial stage and the respondents/defendants are yet to be examined.

Therefore, I do not find any merit in this revision.

7. In the result, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.06.2025

Index: Yes/No

Website:yes/no

Speaking Order/Non-speaking Order

sr

To

The IV Additional Subordinate Court, Coimbatore.



WEB COPY



CRP No.2056 of 2024

P.B.BALAJI.,J.

SI

CRP No.2056 of 2024

27.06.2025