



CRP.No.5138 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.10.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

CRP.No.5138 of 2025 and

CMP.No.25888, 25893 and 25895 of 2025

Mrs.T.Rajeswari Vendan

... Petitioner

Vs.

Tamil Film Producers Council
Rep by Its Secretaries,
Film Chamber Compound,
606, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 006.

...Respondent

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying, to set aside the Fair and Decreetal order made in IA No. 3 of 2025 in OS No. 5379 of 2025 dated 07.10.2025 passed by the Honble XXII Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai.

For Petitioner

: Mr.T.Thiageswaran
for M/s.Waraon and Sai Rams

ORDER



CRP.No.5138 of 2025

WEB COPY

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Trial Court in IA.No.3 of 2025 seeking re-opening of I.A.No.2 of 2025 seeking injunction.

2. The petitioner herein filed a suit in O.S.No. 5379 of 2025 on the file of 22nd Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai seeking declaration that suspension order passed against her dated 02.09.2025 by the defendant is null and void. Pending suit, the petitioner filed an IA.No.2 of 2025 seeking an interim injunction restraining the respondent/ defendant from enforcing the order dated 02.09.2025. In the said application, arguments were already heard and the matter was adjourned for passing orders. In these circumstances, the respondent herein filed an instant application seeking re-opening of IA.No.2 of 2025 on the ground that subsequently they passed revised order on 22.09.2025 reducing the period of suspension to 45 days instead of 3 months. The said application was opposed by the petitioner on the ground that the revised order passed by the respondent was contrary to the by-laws of the Tamil Film Producers Council.



WEB COPY

3. The Court below, without considering the objection raised by the petitioner, allowed the re-opening application. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has come before this Court.

4. The learned counsel for the Petitioner vehemently contended that the revised order passed by the respondent dated 22-09-2025 was not in accordance with the by-laws of the Respondent Council. Therefore, the same cannot be valid for re-opening IA.No.2 of 2025.

5. Whether the revised order passed by the respondent is valid and in accordance with the law or not is a matter to be argued before the trial court in IA.No.2 of 2025. Now, by virtue of impugned order, the petition seeking interim order filed by the petitioner was reopened and the petitioner is entitled to raise all his objections on merits at the time of arguments in IA.No.2 of 2025. I do not find any error in the impugned order re-opening IA.No.2 of 2025 based on the documents filed by the respondent. The validity of the documents can very well be questioned by the petitioner at the time of advancing arguments in IA.No.2 of 2025.



CRP.No.5138 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. The Civil Revision petition stands dismissed with the above observations. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

No costs.

27.10.2025

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

nr

To
The XXII Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai.

-



WEB COPY



CRP.No.5138 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

nr

**CRP.No.5138 of 2025 and
CMP.No.25888, 25893 and 25895 of 2025**

27.10.2025