



WEB COPY



CRP.No.6496 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

**CRP No. 6496 of 2025 and
CMP No.32071 of 2025**

E. Mala
D/o. P. Eganathan, W/o. (Late)
Mahenderan, No.4/43A, Thirumudi
Vinayagar Koil Street, Thiruvanniyur
Colony, Chennai - 600 041.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

Rani M
W/o. (Late) Manickam, Old No.81,
New No.25, Muthukadu Street, (ECR),
Thiruvanniyur, Chennai - 600 041.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 10.11.2025 passed in IA No.9 of 2025 in OS NO.6832 of 2014 on the file of VII Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.A.Karthikeyan
For Mr. R.S.Jain Le Sadmar



ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed, challenging the order passed by the Trial Court, dismissing the application filed by the petitioner/defendant, seeking issuance of summons to Tahsildar, Velachery to produce Adangal Register, maintained in his office for the year 1963 relating to survey No.208/2022, Thiruvannamiyur Village.

2. The respondent/plaintiff filed a suit in O.S.No.6832 of 2014 seeking recovery of possession of vacant portion of the 1st floor thatched hut in the suit property in S.No.208/2023. He also prayed for permanent injunction in respect of other portions in the suit property. When the suit was posted for defendant's side evidence, the petitioner/defendant filed the instant application, seeking issuance of summons to the Tahsildar, Velacherry to produce adangal register maintained in his office relating to survey No.208/22 before the court. The said application was dismissed by the Trial Court on the ground that the suit was filed in respect of survey No.208/23 and the instant application has been filed in respect of survey no.208/22. The Trial Court, in the impugned order, also pointed out that the application was filed belatedly, as the suit was of the year 2014.



WEB COPY

3. If the petitioner wants to produce the revenue records pertains to the suit property, she has to follow the procedure, as contemplated under Rule 76 of Civil Rules of Practice to obtain certificate from the court, in order to get certified copy of the revenue records from the officials concerned. Instead of following the said procedure, the petitioner is not entitled to seek summoning of the revenue officials for the purpose of production of revenue documents. If these kind of applications are allowed, in every suit, the revenue officials will be summoned and they will not be in a position to look after their official work. If the petitioner is able to get the certificate from the court, as per the provisions contemplated under Rule 76 of Civil Rules of Practice, based on the said certificate, he can very well get certified copy of the necessary documents from the revenue official. The petitioner instead of following the procedure as contemplated under Rule 76 of Civil Rules of Practice, is not entitled to summoning of revenue officials for production of revenue documents. I do not find any serious error in the impugned order passed by the Trial Court.



CRP.No.6496 of 2025

4. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

17.12.2025

Internet : Yes
Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
MST

To

The VII Assistant Judge,
City Civil Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY



CRP.No.6496 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

CRP.No.6496 of 2025

17.12.2025