



WEB COPY

CRP No. 4199 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-09-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

CRP No. 4199 of 2025

1. MUNIYAMMAL

W/o.Late Kanniapa Naicker,
No.9/15, Thiruvalluvar I Street,
Nesapakkam, K.K.Nagar,
Chennai - 600 078.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. K.Shankar

S/o.Late Kanniappa Naicker,
New No.11 Old No.118, Annai Sathya
Nagar, 11th Street, Nesapakkam,
Chennai - 79.

2.Vasanthi

W/o.Arumugam,
New No.7/13, Annai Sathya Nagar,
11th Street, Nesapakkam, K.K.Nagar,
Chennai – 78.



3.Jayanthi Ethiraj

W/o.Ethiraj,

No.11/116, Annai Sathya Nagar,

11th Street, Nesapakkam, Chennai - 78.

4.Latha Mohan

W/o.Mohan, No.3/29,

Ezhupidariamman Koil Street,

Karambakkam, Porur,

Chennai - 600 116.

5.Prabhakaran

S/o.Late Kanniappa Naicker,

No.9/15, Thiruvalluvar I Street,

Nesapakkam, K.K.Nagar,

Chennai - 600 078.

6.Dhayanidhi

No.9/15, Thiruvalluvar I Street,

Nesapakkam, K.K.Nagar,

Chennai - 600 078.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to issue direction to the XX Additional City Civil Court, Chennai to dispose of the original suit in OS.No.5710 of 2021 within time frame.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.G.Mageshkumar



ORDER

WEB COPY

Seeking a direction for the speedy disposal of the suit in OS.No.5710 of 2021 on the file of the XX Additional City Civil Court, Chennai, the petitioner/first defendant has preferred the present civil revision petition.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/defendant No.1 would submit that the suit is of the year 2021 and nearly four years have been lapsed. He would further submit that the speedy disposal of the suit proceedings is just and necessary.

3. It is pertinent to mention that High Court cannot issue such directions for speedy disposal unless there is a justification (or) acceptable reasons for issuing any such directions. It is relevant to cite the judgment of this Court in ***S.Baby Vs. S.Sakkubai Ammal*** reported in ***2023 SCC OnLine Mad 674***, wherein, it has been held in paragraph nos.11 and 12 as follows:


“11. In the event of issuing direction in Civil Revision Petitions for speedy disposal without considering the number of



WEB COPY

cases pending in a particular Court on Board, it will result in discrimination against many other litigants, who all are waiting for disposal of their respective cases. There are allegations against the Courts that the cases are selectively picked up and disposed of. The plight of the poor and downtrodden are also to be taken into consideration, while disposing of the cases. The Court shall not pave way for such feeling to the litigants. The trust on the Judicial System is the Hallmark and any form of favouritism, nepotism or otherwise even in the matter of hearing of cases selectively will have larger repercussions on the system. No doubt certain cases are to be disposed of urgently, if there is a public interest involved or the litigants are able to establish genuine urgency for early disposal of the cases. Such cases alone are to be given priority.

12. The practice of giving preference to any litigation without any justification at all circumstances to be avoided. Every litigant approaching the Court of Law is waiting for justice and thus, it must be done in a consistent manner and without discriminating the litigants. Therefore issuing directions indiscriminately for speedy disposal of cases would do no service to the cause of justice. Every urgency cannot be considered for issuing a direction for speedy disposal, and the urgency, which is imminent alone to be considered.”




WEB COPY

4. It is also relevant to cite the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sangram Sadashiv Suryavanshi Vs. The State of Maharashtra*** reported in **2024 INSC 899**, wherein, it has been held as follows:

“In paragraph 47.3 of the decision of a Constitution Bench of in the case of ‘High Court Bar Association, Allahabad vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors. reported in (2024) 6 SCC 267, this Court has held that in the ordinary course, the Constitutional Courts should refrain from fixing a time-bound schedule for the disposal of cases pending before any other Courts. Paragraph 47.3 reads thus:

“47.3. Constitutional courts, in the ordinary course, should refrain from fixing a time-bound schedule for the disposal of cases pending before any other courts. Constitutional courts may issue directions for the time-bound disposal of cases only in exceptional circumstances. The issue of prioritising the disposal of cases should be best left to the decision of the courts concerned where the cases are pending;” (underline supplied)

A direction which can be issued in exceptional circumstances is being routinely issued by High Courts without noticing the law laid down by the Constitution Bench.”



WEB COPY

5. By applying the ratio laid down in the above judgments, fixing a time-bound schedule for the Court below to dispose of the cases pending therein is not warranted. The Court concerned is expected to regulate its own procedure in respect of the cases on board for effective disposal and to ensure that the cases are disposed of within a reasonable period of time.

6. In view of the same, the learned XX Additional City Civil Judge, XX Additional City Civil Court, Chennai shall dispose of the suit in O.S.No.5710 of 2021 as expeditiously as possible.

7. With the above observations, this civil revision petition stands disposed of. No costs.

08-09-2025


mfa

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



CRP No. 4199 of 2025



To

The XX Additional City Civil Judge,

XX Additional City Civil Court,

Chennai



WEB COPY

CRP No. 4199 of 2025



M.JOTHIRAMAN J.

mfa

CRP No. 4199 of 2025

08-09-2025