



A.No.63 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

RESERVED ON
18.02.2025

PRONOUNCED ON
10.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

A.No.63 of 2025

in

C.S.No.87 of 2024

Chennaivazh Thiruthangal Hindu Nadar,
Uravinmurai Dharma Rund, Regn.No.114/1960
Represented By Its Secretary Mr,D.Subbiah,
Having Office At No.113, P.A.N.Rajarathinam
Salai, Old Wadhermanpet, Chennai 21

Applicant(s)

Vs

C.Sankaralingam,
S/o Of Mr,S.Chandrasekaran, No.36/39, Nethaji Nagar, 6th Street,
Tondiarpet, Chennai 81. and 2 Others

Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s): Mr.S. Thanka Sivan

For Respondent(s): T.P.Prabhakaran for RR1 to 3

ORDER

This application had been filed to receive the petition schedule documents to enable the applicant/plaintiff to produce the same for evidence in the Suit as well as in the applications therein.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the applicant would contend that



A.No.63 of 2020

WEB COPY

the schedule mentioned documents in the Judges summons are all documents pertaining to the copies of public records on the file of the Police authorities and the Courts. The said documents are required to be relied upon to prove the nature and conduct of the defendant. Therefore, he would submit that no prejudice would be caused to the respondents, if the additional documents are received by this Court. He would further contend that the present Suit is to claim damages for the defamatory statement made by the defendant against the plaintiff. Hence, he would seeks this Court to indulgence to allow the application.

3. Countering his arguments, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent would submit that the documents that are sought to be relied upon by the applicant, are not at all relevant to the adjudication of the Suit. He would submit that the present application had been filed only to protract the proceedings against the defendant. He would further submit that the action of the Police is the subject matter of a political influence to take vengeance against the respondent. Hence, at any stretch of imagination these documents cannot be treated as documents to prove the defamation alleged against the respondent. Therefore, he would seek dismissal of the application.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and



A.No.63 of 2025

perused the materials placed on record.

WEB COPY

5. The Suit for defamation filed is by the applicant/plaintiff against the respondent/defendant. In the said Suit to establish the conduct of the respondent, the applicant seeks to bring on record certain documents, which are public records namely the First Information Report, the orders passed by the XV Metropolitan Magistrate Court, imposing punishments on the first respondent. The claim of the applicant is that these documents would throw light on the conduct of the respondent of this nature in support of his claim. As seen from the schedule of documents, that are sought to be relied upon by the applicant are documents of public records. Further as to the claim of the respondent can be decided at the end of the trial as to whether such documents would substantiate the claim of the applicant/plaintiff.

6. In such view of the matter, the application is allowed as prayed for and the judges summon schedule documents are directed to be received in evidence subject to proof on the side of the applicant/plaintiff. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

10.03.2025

pbn

Index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



A.No.63 of 2025

K.KUMARESH BABU., J

pbn

Pre-Delivery Order in
A.No.63 of 2025
in
C.S.No.87 of 2024

10.03.2025