



WEB COPY



CRP.No.4425 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17.09.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

CRP.No.4425 of 2025

Zaibunnissa

... Petitioner / 3rd Respondent
/ 6th Defendant


Versus

1. Afsar @ Tajuddin
2. Afrose @ Kamruddin
3. Meharunnissa
Arifunnissa (Died)
Sirajunnissa (Died)
4. Suraiyah
5. Kiswar Begum
6. Razia Begum
7. Nizar Ahmed
8. Rokya Begum
9. Asia Begum
10. K. Musrath Jahan
11. Mohammed Faizullah
- 12.K.Nasreen

... Respondents 1 to 12 /
Petitioners 1,2,4,7 to 15 /
Defendants 2,3,5,9,12-16,
LRs of 8th defendant

13. Syedunissa Bee

1/8



CRP.No.4425 of 2025

Salauddin (died)

14. Raja Talkies,

Rep. by its Partner Janardhana Raja,
Odugathur, Vellore Taluk, Vellore.

15. Devi Talkies,

Ramaanayanaikuppam,

Rep. by its Partner Jayarama Raja,
Ramanayanikuppam Village,
Via Guruvarajapalayam,
Ambur Taluk, Vellore District.


... Respondents 14 & 15 /
Respondents 4 & 5 /
Defendants 10 & 11

Prayer:- Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to direct the Trial Court to dispose of the proceedings in I.A.No.1352 of 2012 in O.S.No.311 of 1996 (originally filed in O.S.No.162 of 1983) on the file of the Hon'ble Principal District Munsif Court, Vellore on merits within the time limit fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Ms.K.Sumathi

ORDER


Seeking a direction for the speedy disposal of the suit in O.S.No.311 of 1996 on the file of the learned Principal District Munsif Court, Vellore, the petitioner has preferred the present civil revision petition.



WEB COPY

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that in the suit filed for partition in O.S.No.311 of 1996, already Preliminary Decree was passed on 14.06.2016. Thereafter, the application in I.A.No.1352 of 2012 in O.S.No.311 of 1996 filed seeking for passing final decree is being adjourned from time to time. The learned counsel further submit that the petitioner is 71 years old senior citizen suffering immense hardship, mental agony, and financial strain due to the protracted litigation. Though the said suit in O.S.No.162 of 1983 is of the year 1983 and the case has been renumbered as O.S.No.311 of 1996 and more than 42 years have been lapsed, she prays for speedy disposal of the suit in O.S.No.311 of 1996 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



CRP.No.4425 of 2025

“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



CRP.No.4425 of 2025

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 extraordinary circumstances, the Principal District Munsif Court, Vellore, shall dispose of the suit in O.S.No.311 of 1996 within a period of four 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.

17.09.2025

av

Index : Yes/No


Speaking order : Yes/No

Neutral Case Citation : Yes/No

Note: Issue order copy on 18.09.2025

To

6/8



CRP.No.4425 of 2025

The Principal District Munsif Court, Vellore.

WEB COPY

M. JOTHIRAMAN, J.



WEB COPY



CRP.No.4425 of 2025

av

CRP.No.4425 of 2025

17.09.2025