



WEB COPY

CMP.Nos.6178, 6781 & 6176 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19-06-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

**CMP Nos. 6178, 6181 & 6176 of 2025
in C.R.P.No.794 of 2016**

D.Shiwani

Petitioner in all CMPs.

Vs

1. Velumani

Purushothaman (Died)

2.R.Mani

Kamalam (Died)

3.P.Venkatapathy

4.D.Jayasri

5.Kamalam

Respondents in all CMPs.

PRAYER in CMP.No.6178 of 2025: To grant leave to the petitioner herein to reopen the main civil revision petition in CRP NPD.No.794 of 2016 which was disposed of by this court on 26.04.2016.



PRAYER in CMP.No.6181 of 2025: To reopen the main civil revision petition in CRP NPD.No.794 of 2016 and restore the order passed on 26.04.2016 which was disposed of by this Court.

PRAYER in CMP.No.6176 of 2025: To implead the petitioner as party respondent in CRP NPD.No.794 of 2016.

For Petitioner in Mr.D.Rajagopal
all CMPs. :

COMMON ORDER

All that has been done by this court in CRP NPD.No.794 of 2016 was to give a direction to the learned Principal District Munsif at Coimbatore to pass appropriate orders in I.A.No.602 of 1991 in O.S.No.77 of 1979 within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of that order.

2. The civil revision petitioner was not a party to the proceedings. It is not necessary that only a party to the proceedings should be aggrieved by an order. If the order passed by the court is binding on the party, he or she can always move this Court and prefer an application seeking leave either to file an appeal or to review the said order.



3. The suit in O.S.No.77 of 1979 was one for ejectment. In the said proceedings, an application was taken out invoking the provisions of the Tamil Nadu City Tenants Protection Act. The application had been allowed and that order had attained finality. The tenant, feeling aggrieved by the learned Principal District Munsif in repeatedly adjourning the matter, approached this Court for a direction. This Court had not decided any rights between the parties, but merely passed a direction as aforesaid.

4. The petitioner, who was not even born on the date on which the suit was filed, cannot be said to be a person aggrieved. Hence, following the judgment of this Court in ***K.Ponnalagu Ammani v. State of Madras, rep. by the Secretary to the Revenue Department and Others, AIR 1953 MAD 485***, all the CMPs are dismissed.

5. Needless to add, it is always open to the petitioner to workout her rights, if she has any, in the manner known to law.

19-06-2025

nl

Index:Yes/No



WEB COPY

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

CMP.Nos.6178, 6781 & 6176 of 2



V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN J.

nl

To

1.The Principal District Munsif, Coimbatore.

**CMP.Nos.6178, 6181 & 6176 of 2025 in
CRP No. 794 of 2016**



WEB COPY

CMP.Nos.6178, 6781 & 6176 of 2



19-06-2025