



C.R.P.Nos.5292 & 5296 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 03.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.Nos.5292 & 5296 of 2025
and CMP.No.26591 of 2025 in CRP.No.5292 of 2025

P.Raguraman

... Petitioner in both CRPs

Vs

V.Saranya

... Respondent in both CRPs

Common Prayer : Civil Revision Petitions filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India praying to set aside the fair and final order dated 11.06.2025 passed by the learned Family Court Judge, Salem in (a) I.A.No.8 of 2025; and (b) I.A.No.9 of 2025 respectively in I.A.No.3 of 2022 in H.M.O.P.No.365 of 2021.

For Petitioner : Mr.L.Mouli
(in both CRPs)



WEB COPY



C.R.P.Nos.5292 & 5296 of 2022

COMMON ORDER

These Civil Revision Petitions are filed challenging the orders passed by the Court below dismissing the applications filed by the petitioner seeking to re-open the case and to issue witness summons to the Principal of the school, the employer of the respondent.

2. The petitioner herein filed HMOP.No.365 of 2021 on the file of Family Court, Salem seeking divorce on the ground of cruelty. The respondent herein filed an application seeking interim maintenance. Both the parties filed their respective affidavit of assets and liabilities. In the affidavit of assets and liabilities of the petitioner, he has clearly stated the respondent-wife is employed and drawing a salary of Rs.13,000/- per month. Now, the application has been filed by the petitioner seeking issuance of witness summon to the Principal of the school in which the respondent-wife is said to be working.

3. When the petitioner was examined before the Court, he clearly



admitted that he was drawing a salary of Rs.75,000/- per month and the respondent-wife was drawing Rs.13,000/- per month. Therefore, it is a definite case of the petitioner that the respondent-wife is employed in a private school and was drawing a salary of Rs.13,000/-. In these circumstances, absolutely there is no necessity for the petitioner to seek issuance of witness summons to the Principal of the school in which the respondent is allegedly working. It is also recorded by the Court that the respondent-wife admitted that she was working in a school and was drawing a salary of Rs.13,000/-. In such circumstances, the petitioner has no purpose to summon the Principal of the school and to examine him/her before the Court.

4. Taking into consideration the affidavit of assets and liabilities filed by the petitioner and the admission made by the respondent before the Court, the Court below decided that the applications filed by the petitioner seeking to re-open the case and to issue witness summons to the employer of the respondent are not necessary. I do not find any error in the orders passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Salem, dismissing the applications in I.A.No.8 of 2025 and I.A.No.9 of 2025 respectively in I.A.No.3 of 2022 in HMOP.No.365 of 2021.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.Nos.5292 & 5296 of 2025

5. Accordingly, both the civil revision petitions stand dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

03.11.2025

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No
ds

To:

1.The Family Court
Salem.

2.The Section Officer
VR Section, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.Nos.5292 & 5296 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

ds

C.R.P.Nos.5292 & 5296 of 2025

03.11.2025