



WEB COPY



O.S.A.No.254 of 2025

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02.09.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

O.S.A.No. 254 of 2025
and
C.M.P.No.18189 of 2025

1.Prabhu Ramakrishn

2.N. Vishal Prasad

...Appellants

Vs.

Shyam Kumar Shrivastava (Deceased)

1.Ram Kumar Shrivastava

2.Anita Shrivastava

3.Sangeeta Setpal

4.Rashmi Khare

5.Keerthi Shrivastava

6.Vijay Kumar Varma

7.Ajay Kumar Verma

8.Neeta Shrivastava

9.Sambath Kumar

10.Narayanan

11.Pradeep Kumar

12.Selvdurai

13.Nirmal

1/6



O.S.A.No.254 of 2025

14.R.Rama Krishnan

15.A.Vijaya Kumar

16.Munuswamy

17.A.Baskar

18.D.Lokesh

19.K.Prakash

20.Sub-Registrar,
Red Hills, Chennai – 52.

21.A.K.Nageswara Rao

22.Priyanshi Shrivastava

23.Yash Kumar Shrivastava

24.Meeta Shrivastava

25.Harsh Shrivastava

26.Harshita Shrivastava

...Respondents

PRAYER: This Original Side Appeal filed under Order 36 Rule 9 of the Original Side Rules read with Clause 15 of the Letters Patent praying to set aside the order passed in Original Application No.3053 of 2025 in C.S.No.321 of 2019 dated 14.07.2025 and consequently allow the said application.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Pugaleanthi

For Respondents : Mr.A.Palaniappan for RR9 to 19
Mrs.K.Aswini Devi,
Addl. Govt. Pleader for R20



WEB COPY



O.S.A.No.254 of 2025

Mrs.N.Radha for R21

RR22 and 23 – not ready in notice.


J U D G M E N T

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

The present Original Side Appeal has been instituted challenging the order dated 14.07.2025 passed in A.No.3053 of 2025 in C.S.No.321 of 2019.

2. The appellants filed the application seeking the relief for an expert opinion by comparing the signatures alleged to have been signed by the respondents in the documents. However, the learned Single Judge made a finding that the respondents 9 to 19 who were present before the Court have unanimously stated that it is they who had executed the subject documents.

3. The act of perjury in filing false documents before Court can raise only if the parties claim that their signature has been forged by someone else to their detriment. Since *prima facie* the parties have deposed before the Court that they have signed the documents, the application filed by the appellants was dismissed. This Court does not find any reason to interfere with the finding as it is in consonance with the established principles.



O.S.A.No.254 of 2025

4. The other issues raised by the parties can be adjudicated in the Civil


WEB COPY

Suit. With these observations, this Original Side Appeal stands **dismissed**. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

(S.M.S., J.) (C.S.N., J.)
02.09.2025

dsa

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



O.S.A.No.254 of 2025

To:

WEB COPY
The Sub-Registrar,
Red Hills, Chennai – 52.



WEB COPY



O.S.A.No.254 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
C.SARAVANAN, J.

dsa

O.S.A.No. 254 of 2025

02.09.2025