



A NO. 5238 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-11-2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL**

**A NO. 5238 of 2025  
in  
C.S.No.297 of 2018**

Arulmigu Bharatwajeshwarar  
Thirukoil, Puliur, Kodambakkam,  
Chennai 600 024  
Rep.by its Fit Person

Applicant

Vs

N.S.Ramchandar and **3 Others.**  
No.73, Old No.49/1 & 50  
Vadapalani Andavar Koil St,  
Vivekanandar Colony Street,  
Vadapalani, Chennai 26.

Respondents

**For Applicant** : Mr. R. Bharanidharan

**For Respondents** : M/s. V. Ambika (for R1 and R2)

: R3 and R4 (Set Ex-parte)

### **ORDER**

This petition has been filed to receive the additional documents as mentioned in the list of Additional documents filed along with this application.



A NO. 5238 of 2025

2. According to the applicant/plaintiff, the main suit has been filed for recovery of possession, declaration of sale deed as null and void, and permanent injunction. It is further stated that Patta stands in the name of Temple. However, the said documents were inadvertently not included in the list of documents at the time of filing the main suit. The applicant, further submits that, as against the order passed by the Commissioner of Land Administration, Chennai, Writ Petition in W.P.No.11076 of 2013 was filed by the aggrieved occupants, including the first defendant, before this Court. Hence, the applicant contends that these documents are very vital for proper adjudication of the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents has strongly objected to allow the application and submitted that the documents were not filed along with the plaint and that this application has been filed only to delay the proceedings.

4. Considering the nature of the application and the fact that the documents relate to the order passed by the Commissioner of Land Administration and the subsequent order passed by this Court in the said writ petition, this Court is of the view that the said documents are necessary to



A NO. 5238 of 2025

defend the case effectively. Hence, this Court is inclined to allow this application and the documents can be received, subject to proof, relevancy and admissibility.

5. The respondents/defendants are at liberty to raise any objection in respect of the documents, i.e., sought to be received at the time of marking.

6. Accordingly, this application is allowed.

**11-11-2025  
(1/2)**

klt



WEB COPY



A NO. 5238 of 2025

**P.DHANABAL, J.**

klt

A.No.5238 of 2025  
in  
C.S.No.297 of 2018

**11.11.2025  
(1/2)**