



CRP(MD). No.3737 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 11.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

**CRP(MD). No.3737 of 2025
and
CMP(MD) No.19677 of 2025**

Veeneshwari

... Petitioner

Vs

1.Vijayalakshmi

2.Padmavathi

... Respondents

PRAYER :-Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of The Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 23.06.2025 made in I.A. No. 4 of 2024 in O.S. No. 69 of 2016 on the file of Learned Subordinate Court, Valliyoor, Tirunelveli.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Rajeshwaran

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order dated 23.06.2025 made in I.A.No.4 of 2024 in O.S.No.69 of 2016 on the file of the Subordinate Court, Valliyoor, Tirunelveli.

1/5



CRP(MD). No.3737 of 2025

2.The petitioner is the first defendant in the suit in O.S.No.69 of 2016 pending on the file of the Subordinate Court, Valliyoor, Tirunelveli. The suit was filed by the first respondent/plaintiff for the relief of decreeing the suit, directing the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs. 2,47,480/- and for other reliefs. Pending suit, the petitioner filed an application in I.A.No.4 of 2024 to send the suit promissory note, dated 13.08.2015, for expert opinion and to compare the signature thereon with the registered sale deed of the first defendant, dated 29.07.2013. The said petition was dismissed. Challenging the same, the petitioner has filed the present Civil Revision Petition.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the signature found in the suit promissory note, Ex.A1, is a forged one and to prove that the signature found in Ex.A1 is not her signature, it is necessary to compare the signature of the petitioner found in the alleged suit promissory note with the registered sale deed of the first defendant, dated 29.07.2013. However, the trial Court, without considering all these aspects, rejected the application filed by the petitioner. Hence, he prays for appropriate orders.



CRP(MD). No.3737 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. Since no adverse order is going to be passed in this petition as against the respondents, notice to the respondents is dispensed with.

5. The facts in the present case are not in dispute. Admittedly, the first respondent/plaintiff filed a suit for declaration as against the petitioner/first defendant and the second respondent/second defendant. It is to be noted that the suit was filed in the year 2016 and the suit promissory note was marked as Ex.A1 in the suit itself. Though the petitioner has filed the written statement as early as on 14.11.2017, the petitioner has not taken any effective steps for the past 9 years for such comparison. The petitioner sought comparison of signature only at the stage, when the case was posted for DWs. Further, the application has been filed after the examination of P.W1 and P.W2 and after extensively cross-examining them and also about the execution of pro-note. Now, after a lapse of 9 years, the petitioner sought to compare the signature found in the suit promissory note, Ex.A1, which is not sustainable. The issue was rightly appreciated by the trial Court and the order dismissing the application filed by the petitioner need not be interfered with.



CRP(MD). No.3737 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. Since the suit is of the year 2016, the learned Subordinate Judge, Valliyoor, Tirunelveli, is directed to dispose of the suit in O.S.No.69 of 2016 as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Speaking : Yes / No
NCC : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
mm

11.12.2025

To

The Subordinate Judge, Valliyoor, Tirunelveli.



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.3737 of 2025

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

mm

CRP(MD). No.3737 of 2025

11.12.2025