



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.4924 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

C.R.P.No.4924 of 2025

B.Suresh Khanna

... Petitioner / Petitioner / Applicant / Third Party

Versus

1. K. Anand

... 1st Respondent / Respondent / Petitioner / Plaintiff

2. S.David Padmanabhan

... 2nd Respondent / Respondent / Respondent / Defendant

Prayer:- Civil Revision Petition filed under Section 227 of Constitution of India, to issue appropriate direction directing the learned Principal District Judge, Namakkal to decide I.A.No.9 of 2025 in I.A.No.2 of 2021 in O.S.No.91 of 2021 in a time bound manner.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ramesh



C.R.P.No.4924 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

Seeking a direction for the speedy disposal of the case in I.A.No.9 of 2025 in I.A.No.2 of 2021 in O.S.No.91 of 2021 on the file of learned Principal District Judge, Namakkal, the petitioner has preferred the present civil revision petition.


2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the first respondent herein filed a suit in O.S.No.91 of 2021 on the file for the Principal District Judge, Namakkal seeking recovery of a sum of Rs.11,35,000/-, claiming that the second respondent had borrowed the amount solely from him. In the said suit, the first respondent filed I.A.No.2 of 2021 for attaching the property in question, and the same was granted on 28.07.2025. The petitioner herein, upon becoming aware of this order, immediately filed an application in I.A.No.9 of 2025 to lift the attachment. The respondents have been delaying the application with ulterior motives. The first respondent filed a counter in the said application, and to date, the application to lift the attachment has not been decided, causing great hardship



and irreparable loss to the petitioner. Hence, it is submitted that the speedy disposal of I.A.No.9 of 2025 in I.A.No.2 of 2021 in O.S.No.91 of 2021 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:

“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.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.4924 of 2025

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.”

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:



WEB COPY




C.R.P.No.4924 of 2025

“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. In view of the same, the learned learned Principal District Judge, Namakkal, is requested to dispose of the case in I.A.No.9 of 2025 in I.A.No.2 of 2021 in O.S.No.91 of 2021 as expeditiously as possible.



C.R.P.No.4924 of 2025

7. With the above observations, this Civil Revision Petition stands disposed of. No costs.

13.10.2025

av

Index : Yes/No

Speaking order : Yes/No

Neutral Case Citation : Yes/No

To

The learned Principal District Judge, Namakkal.

M.JOTHIRAMAN, J.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.4924 of 2025

av

C.R.P.No.4924 of 2025

13.10.2025