



WEB COPY

CRP No. 4757 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

**CRP No. 4757 of 2025
and C.M.P.No.24043 of 2025**

1. A. Saravanan

S/o.Late Anguraj Reddy, D.NO.1/147,
Karthiripatty Village, Achankuttapatti
Tharappu, Salem Tk, Salem Dist.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. M.Narayanan @ Narayanasamy
S/o.late Malli Nayakkar, D.No.297,
NGGO Colony, thadampatty Village,
Salem Dist 14.

2.N.Nedumaran
S/o.M.Narayanan @ Narayanasamy,
D.No.297, NGGO Colony, thadampatty
Village, Salem Dist 14.

3.N.Poornima
D/o.Nedumaran, D.No.297, NGGO
Colony, thadampatty Village, Salem
Dist 14.



4.Thangavelu Textile Mills Pvt Ltd
Rep.Managing Director, Office at
111/1, Thadampatty, Kamaraj Nagar
Colony, Salem 14.

5.M. Raju
S/o.Malli Gounder, D.NO.3/195, Periar
Avenue, NGGO Colony, Thadampatti
Village, Salem 14.

6.Kumar
S/o.M.Raju, D.No.3/195, Periar
Avenue, NGGO Colony, Thadampatti
Village, Salem 14.

7.M. Andai
W/o.Moorthy, D.NO.10, Temple
Avenue, Thindal, Samundi Nagar,
Erode.

8.M. Swathi
D/o.Moorthy, D.NO.10, Temple
Avenue, Thindal, Samundi Nagar,
Erode. Late.Saraswathi, W/o.Late
Natesan.

9.N. Ravindran
S/o.late P.Natesan, NO.249/1, Modern
Theater Back Side, Anna Nagar,
Kannankurichi Post, Salem 8.

10.Karikalan
S/o.Munusamy, NO.165/225,
Kasthuribai St, Salem Town, Salem 15.

11.Dinesh Kumar



S/o.Vijayaraj, No.113/1, K.S.Complex,
Kottai Main Road, Cherry Road,
Shevapet, Salem 7

WEB COPY

12.State Bank of India
Cherry Road, Salem 7

13.State Bank of India
Rep.by its Chief Manager, Having
Office at. Siruthozhil Branch, Cherry
Road, Hasthampatty, Salem 7.

14.The Tahsildar
Salem East, Salem 1

15.Te Joint Sub Registrar No.1 (District
Registrar)
Salem East, Ramasundaram Mudali St,
Ammamet, Salem 3.

Respondent(s)

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to dispose the OS.No.589/2015 as expeditiously as possible preferably fixed by this Honble Court in on the file of Learned III Additional District Munsif at Salem, Salem District, by allowing the above CRP.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Naresh Kumar

For Respondents Mr.D.Gopal,
14 and 15: Government Advocate



ORDER

WEB COPY Seeking a direction for the speedy disposal of the case in O.S.No.589 of 2015 on the file of III Additional District Munsif, Salem,, the petitioner has preferred the present civil revision petition.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the case is of the year 2015 and the same is pending for more than ten years, which causes great hardship and irreparable loss to the petitioner. He would further submit that the speedy disposal of O.S.No.589 of 2015 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:



WEB COPY

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

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. Considering the fact that the suit is of the year 2015, the learned III Additional District Munsif, Salem shall dispose of the case in O.S.No.589 of 2015 as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 6 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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

07-10-2025

srn

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

The III Additional District Munsif
Salem.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 4757 of 20



M.JOTHIRAMAN J.

srn

CRP No. 4757 of 2025

07.10.2025



WEB COPY

CRP No. 4757 of 20





WEB COPY

CRP No. 4757 of 20

