



C.R.P.(MD)Nos.1680 to 1682 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 19.06.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

C.R.P.(MD)Nos.1680 to 1682 of 2025

and

C.M.P.(MD)No.8879 of 2025

A.Suresh Kumar

... Petitioner in all C.R.Ps.

Vs.

S.Nagasundram

...Respondent in all C.R.Ps.

COMMON PRAYER: Civil Revision Petitions are filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside the fair and executable orders dated 28.03.2025 passed in the applications in I.A.Nos.7, 8 & 9 of 2024 in O.S.No. 367 of 2011, on the file of the District Munsif Court, Melur and allow the same.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Barathan

[In all C.R.Ps.]



C.R.P.(MD)Nos.1680 to 1682 of 2025

WEB COPY

COMMON ORDER

These petitions have been filed seeking to quash the orders dated 28.03.2025 passed in the applications in I.A.Nos.7, 8 & 9 of 2024 in O.S.No. 367 of 2011, on the file of the District Munsif Court, Melur.

2.Learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the plaintiff in the suit. He filed a suit for permanent injunction as against the respondent / defendant. At the fag end of the trial, the petitioner filed three applications in I.A.Nos.7, 8 and 9 of 2024 in O.S.No.367 of 2011, for re-open, recall and receive additional documents. All those applications were dismissed. Challenging the same, these Civil Revision Petitions have been filed.

3.All the three Civil Revision Petitions are inter-connected and therefore, they are disposed of by this common order.

4.Since no adverse orders are passed, this Civil Revision Petition is disposed of, without notice to the respondent.



C.R.P.(MD)Nos.1680 to 1682 of 2025

WEB COPY

5.Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that a layout was formed in the property in S.No.265, measuring 5 acre 10 cents, in which, Plot No.162, was purchased by the petitioner from the legal heirs of Gopaldas Ramadoss. The very same legal heirs of Gopaldas Ramadoss sold two other plots to one K.Ayyanar and one Gayathri dated 17.08.2007 and 23.01.2018, respectively. These two plots are adjacent plots of the petitioner and therefore, the petitioner states that the sale deed of Ayyanar and Gayathri are necessary to be marked before the trial Court, wherein both Ayyanar and Gayathri have constructed houses in their respective plots. However, the petitioner's plot is a vacant one. Learned Counsel for the petitioner further submits that unless the said documents are marked, the petitioner's possession cannot be established, for which no prejudice is caused to the respondent / defendant. However, the trial Court dismissed those petitions. Accordingly, he prays for allowing these Civil Revision Petitions.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, admittedly, the petitioner has to prove his title by adducing documentary evidences, in which marking documents of other parties who purchased the property from the original vendor will not help the petitioner. Further, the petitions have been



C.R.P.(MD)Nos.1680 to 1682 of 2025

filed at the fag end of the trial only to drag on the proceedings. Hence, the trial

Court has rightly rejected those applications, which need not be interfered with.

However, the trial Court is directed to dispose of the suit in O.S.No.367 of 2011, without being influenced neither by the order in the I.As nor by any of the observations made by this Court in the present Civil Revision Petitions.

7.Accordingly, these Civil Revision Petitions are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

19.06.2025

Internet:Yes/No

Index:Yes/No

MR



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)Nos.1680 to 1682 of 2025

To

- 1.The District Munsif Court,
Melur.
- 2.The Section Officer,
VR Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)Nos.1680 to 1682 of 2025

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

MR

C.R.P.(MD)Nos.1680, 1681 & 1682 of 2025

19.06.2025