



C.R.P.No.6089 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 28.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.6089 of 2025

and

C.M.P.No.29979 of 2025

V.Ranganathan

... Petitioner

Vs.

E.Manikandan

... Respondent

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed Article 227 of Constitution of India, pleaded to strike off the plaint in O.S.No.96 of 2025 pending on the file of the Principal District Munsif Court, Villupuram.

For Petitioner : Ms.S.Kanmani Annamalai

ORDER

1/5



C.R.P.No.6089 of 2025

WEB COPY This Civil Revision Petition has been filed seeking a direction to strike off the plaint filed by the respondent herein in O.S.No.96 of 2025 on the file of the Principal District Munsif Court, Villupuram.

2. The respondent herein filed a suit in O.S.No.96 of 2025 for a bare injunction restraining the petitioner/defendant from interfering with his peaceful possession over the suit property. Immediately upon receiving the suit summons, the petitioner approached this Court seeking to strike off the plaint on the ground that, although the respondent/plaintiff claimed to be in possession of the suit property, he had also admitted in his plaint averments that the suit premises was locked by the petitioner/defendant.

3. Therefore, according to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/defendant that the respondent/plaintiff is not in possession of the



C.R.P.No.6089 of 2025

suit property, which is also evident from the inconsistent averments made by him. Hence, the plaint does not disclose a clear cause of action and is liable to be struck off.

4. If it is the case of the petitioner that the averments made in the plaint do not disclose any cause of action for the respondent to maintain a suit for a bare injunction, the petitioner has an effective remedy of filing an application for rejection of the plaint under Order VII Rule 11 of Code of Civil Procedure. Without availing such an effective remedy before the trial Court, the petitioner is not entitled to rush to this Court by invoking its supervisory jurisdiction.

5. In *Virudhunagar Nadargal Dharma Paripalana Shabha Vs Tuticorin Educational Society* reported in *MANU/SC/1365/2019*, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that availability of alternative remedy before



C.R.P.No.6089 of 2025

regular Courts, is near total bar for exercise of supervisory power by High

Court. Hence, this Court is not inclined to exercise its supervisory jurisdiction.

6. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed.

However, it is open to the petitioner to file an application for rejection of the plaint, if he so advised. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition stands closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

28.11.2025

Index:Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

ms/ep

To
The Principal District Munsif,
Villupuram.

4/5



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.6089 of 2025
S.SOUNTHAR, J.
ms/ep

C.R.P.No.6089 of 2025
and
C.M.P.No.29979 of 2025

28.11.2025