



WEB COPY



CRP.No.6267 of 2025

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

**DATED : 11.12.2025**

**CORAM:**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR**

**CRP.No.6267 of 2025 and**  
**CMP.No.31034 of 2025**

Abirami

... Petitioner

Vs.

Senthilkumar

...Respondent

**PRAYER :**Civil Revision Petition filed Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to allow this CRP by set aside the order dated 25.07.2025 passed in IA NO. 2 of 2024 in HMOP NO. 97 of 2022 on the file of the Learned Subordinate Judge, Attur, Salem District.

For Petitioners

: M/s.P.Gajalakshmi

for Mr.M.Janarthanan

**ORDER**

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Sub-Ordinate Judge, Attur, Salem allowing the application filed by the respondent to condone the delay in filing documents.



WEB COPY

2. The respondent herein filed original petition seeking divorce on the grounds of cruelty and desertion. The trial in the main OP was already commenced and it is in the stage of PW1 cross. The respondent/husband filed an application to condone the delay in filing two documents namely FIR filed against the petitioner in Crime No. 114 of 2023 and a compact disc containing the audio recordings. The said application was allowed by the trial court. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has come before this court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that FIR filed against the petitioner was closed as mistake of fact and therefore, the contents of the same cannot be accepted. It is further submitted that the audio recordings produced by the respondent are fabricated documents and therefore, the same shall not be received. The learned counsel further submitted that the respondent failed to file necessary certificate under Section 63(4) of the BSA Act, 2023. Therefore, the document cannot be admitted as evidence.

4. By impugned order, the trial court only allowed the application filed by the respondent seeking to condone the delay in filing documents. The documents are not yet marked before the trial court. The relevancy of the



CRP.No.6267 of 2025

documents, genuineness of the same etc., cannot be considered at this stage. As and when the respondent attempts to mark the documents before the trial court, the petitioner is entitled to raise all objections with regard to the genuineness, relevancy and admissibility. Even then, the trial court can mark the documents subject to relevancy, proof and admissibility. Therefore, I do not find any error in the impugned order passed by the Trial Court. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that petitioner is entitled to raise all objections at the time of arguments. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

**11.12.2025**

Index : Yes / No  
Internet : Yes / No  
Neutral Citation: Yes/No.  
nr

To  
The Subordinate Judge, Attur, Salem District.



WEB COPY



CRP.No.6267 of 2025

**S.SOUNTHAR, J.**

nr

**CRP.No.6267 of 2025 and**  
**CMP.No.31034 of 2025**

**11.12.2025**