



CRP Nos.6168 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

**CRP No. 6168 of 2025 and
CMP No.30289 of 2025**

1. Mohamed Salia
W/o. Abdul Waheed, D.No.16/3, Small
Mosque Street, Polur,
Tiruvannamalai District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. VIJAYAKUMAR
S/o. Annamalai, D.No.77, Pudhu Kula
Street, Kilpadur Village, Chengam,
Tiruvannamalai District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to set To allow the above Civil Revision Petition by setting aside the fair and decreetal order dated 25.10.2025 passed in IA.No.01 of 2025 in OS.No.146 of 2020 on the file of Principal District Court, Tiruvannamalai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr K. GOVI GANESAN

ORDER

This civil revision petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Trial Court, allowing the application filed by the respondent seeking reception of documents, which were not filed along with the written statement.



2. The petitioner /plaintiff filed a suit for recovery of money based on the promissory note. The respondent resisted the suit by denying the execution of suit promissory note. Subsequently, instant application has been filed by the respondent seeking to receive certain documents, which were not filed along with the written statement. It was case of the respondent that the documents mentioned in the application were found by him only recently and therefore, he was constrained to file the application. The said application was allowed by the Trial Court. Challenging the same, the petitioner has come before this court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the documents sought to be produced by the respondent are irrelevant to the suit transactions. Therefore, those documents would not be helpful to decide the issues involved in the suit.

4. The instant application filed by the respondent to receive documents has been allowed by the Trial Court. At this stage, we need not go to the question of relevancy of the said documents. If the respondent attempts to mark the documents, which were ordered to be received, it is always open to the petitioner to raise objection with regard to the relevancy. Even then, the court can mark documents, subject to the proof and relevancy. The relevancy and usefulness of the documents can be decided by the Trial Court only at the time



CRP Nos.6168 of 2025

of final disposal. The impugned order does not cause any serious prejudice to the petitioner. Therefore, I do not find any error in the impugned order.

5. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to raise the question of relevancy of the documents at the time of final disposal of the suit. There shall be no order as to costs. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

03.12.2025

MST

To

The Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai.



WEB COPY



CRP Nos.6168 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

CRP No.6168 of 2025

03.12.2025