



CRP(MD). Nos.3647 & 3442 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 08.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

CRP(MD). Nos.3647 & 3442 of 2025

and

C.M.P.(MD) Nos.19313, 18453, 18630 & 18426 of 2025

1.Senthilpandi
2.Dhuraipandi
3.Udhaiyapandi

... Petitioners in both C.R.Ps

Vs

Susila (died)
1.Karthikeyan
2.Balachandran

... Respondents in both C.R.Ps

PRAYER IN BOTH C.R.Ps:- Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decreetal order passed in I.A.Nos.2 & 3 of 2025, respectively, in O.S.No.115 of 2016 on the file of the Principal District Munsif Court, Dindigul dated 09.10.2025.

For petitioners : Mr. S.Sarvagan Prabhu
(in both C.R.Ps)

For respondents : Mr.G.Pitchaimani
(in both C.R.Ps)



CRP(MD), Nos.3647 & 3442 of 2025

COMMON ORDER

WEB COPY

The present petitions are filed challenging the order made in I.A.Nos.2 and 3 of 2025 in O.S.No.115 of 2016 by the learned Principal District Munsif, Dindigul, dated 09.10.2025.

2. The petitioners are defendants 1 to 3 in the suit in O.S.No.115 of 2016 filed for declaration of title before the Trial Court and the present petitions are filed to reopen and recall the examination of witnesses on the side of the said defendants, to mark certain documents, and to cross examine the witnesses.

2. The contention of the petitioners is that the property measuring an extent of 100 sq.m, stood in the name of one Arumugam Pillai, which was thereafter given in the name of the first defendant/Senthilpandi and in turn, the said property was given to one Sekar, who is the maternal uncle of the defendants, by way of a registered Doc.No.2112/2012 dated 14.09.2012. Further, the said property was purchased by the wife of the second defendant/Kannammal on 01.09.2017. The present petitions have



CRP(MD). Nos.3647 & 3442 of 2025

been filed to mark certain documents regarding the said transactions.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that several applications were filed before the trial court to reopen the evidence for marking of certain documents, which were allowed. However, they filed these applications to drag the trial. Therefore, the petitioners have not filed the present applications with *bona fide*.

4. The only point for consideration is whether the revision petitioners, who are the defendants 1 to 3 in the suit, should be given an opportunity of reopening the witnesses for marking documents by recalling the earlier evidence.

5. The document, which was registered by way of a registered deed in Doc.No.2112 of 2012 on 14.09.2012, stands in the name of V.Segar. Further, the said property was purchased by the wife of the second defendant/Kannammal on 01.09.2017. This aspect was also mentioned in the counter filed by the revision petitioners on 19.12.2016. The revision petitioners already had opportunities to cross examine the witnesses and



CRP(MD), Nos.3647 & 3442 of 2025

to mark those documents. However, without marking those documents, which were available at the time of trial, they filed these applications at the stage of arguments. Filing of these petitions at the stage of arguments after completing the trial is only for protracting the trial. The Trial Court, upon considering the rival submissions, has come to a conclusion that these applications are only to protract the trial proceedings. Hence, this Court finds no merit in interfering with the order passed by the Trial Court.

6. Accordingly, these Civil Revision Petitions stand dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet :Yes / No
apd

08.12.2025

To
The Principal District Munsif, Dindigul.



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). Nos.3647 & 3442 of 2025

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J

apd

CRP(MD). Nos.3647 & 3442 of 2025

08.12.2025