



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V. KARTHIKEYAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

AS No.466 of 2012

1. Manjula Narashimachar (died)
2. Vaidhehi Rangachari
3. Neela Parthasarathy
4. Geetha Srinivasan

..Appellant(s)

Vs

1. S.Venkatachari (died)
2. S.Varadhan
3. S.Pattabiraman
4. Nirmala Raghunathan
5. V.C.Govindaraj
6. Suresh Govindaraj
7. Ramesh Govindaraj
8. N.Sadagopachari
9. D.N.Raghu



10.Rangamani

11.Balaji Venkatachari

12.Bharath Venkatachari

13.Sudarshan Venkatachari

(R1 died. RR10 to 13 are brought on record as
LRs. of deceased 1st Respondent, vide order of
Court dated 27/09/2023 made in
CMP.No.17125 of 2023 in AS.No.466 of 2012)

(RR8 and 9 are brought on record as LR's of the
deceased first appellant Mrs.Manjula
Marashimachar vide Order of Court, dated 14.07
2020, made in CMP.No.6325 of 2020 in
AS.No.466 of 2012)

..Respondent(s)

Appeal against the judgment and decree dated 10.02.2012 passed in
O.S.No.75 of 2007 on the file of District Judge, Tiruvannamalai.

For Appellant(s): Mr.S.Parthasarathy,
Senior Advocate, and
Mr.C.T.Mohan,
Senior Advocate,
for Mr.S.Annakkodi

For Respondent(s): Mr.T.R.Rajagopalan,
Senior Advocate,
for Mr.T.M.Hariharan,
for R2, R3, R10 to R 13

R1 - Died (Steps taken)



Mr.R.Vijayaraghavan
for R8 and R9

R-4 Nirmala Raghunathan

R-5 Died

R-6 Suresh Govindaraj
R-7 Ramesh Govindaraj
R-8 N.Sadagopachari
R-9 D.N.Raghu

JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by C.V.Karthikeyan J.)

This appeal had been filed by the plaintiffs in O.S.No.75 of 2007 on the file of District Court, Tiruvannamalai, aggrieved by the judgment and decree, dated 10.02.2012.

2. The appellants and the respondents 2,3 and 4 are the legal heirs of late A.K.Srinivasa Varadan, a Senior Member of Vellore Bar, who was also Government Pleader and Public Prosecutor.

3. The suit had been filed seeking partition and separate possession of the properties listed out in the schedule to the plaint. By judgment dated 10.12.2012, the suit was dismissed by District Court at Tiruvannamalai.

4. It is to be noted that in the plaint, the plaintiffs had listed out one house property at Kazhinjur Village or more commonly at Gandhi Nagar, Katpadi, Vellore District, measuring about 20020 sq.ft. as first item in 'A' Schedule and three houses at Perumal Koil Street, Dusi Village, Cheyyar Taluk, as second



item in 'A' Schedule. There were agricultural lands described in 'B' Schedule, which stood in the name of Mr.A.K.Srinivasa Varadhan totally measuring 5.43 acres and agricultural lands again in Dusi Village, Cheyyar Taluk, in 'C' Schedule, of which Item No.1 stood in the name of Singarammal, totally measuring 3.04 acres and Item No.2 in the name of Pushpa Ammal totally measuring 2.92 acres. The plaintiffs had also listed 'D' Schedule, containing movables, including bank deposits, gold jewels and diamonds.

5. We, unhesitatingly, place our appreciation for the efforts taken by Mr.T.R.Rajagopalan, learned Senior Counsel, Mr.S.Parthasarathy, learned Senior Counsel, and Mr.T.M.Hariharan, learned counsel, who had applied their experience and prevailed upon the parties to come to an amicable settlement. Accordingly, a Joint Memo of Compromise has been presented before us today, signed by the appellants and the respondents, and also the learned counsel on record.

6. The third appellant is present in person in Court and the second and fourth appellants are present through video conferencing. The first appellant had died and her legal representatives had been brought on record as respondents 8 and 9 and they are present in Court. Among the respondents, Respondents 2,3,4,8,9,11,12 and 13 are present in Court. The fifth respondent had died and his legal representatives had been brought on record as sixth and seventh respondents, who appeared through WhatsApp video call to the mobile number of their counsel. It is also to be noted that the tenth respondent and the



thirteenth respondent have authorised their son/brother the eleventh respondent to represent them in the compromise.

WEB COPY

7. We are confident that all the parties are aware of the sanctity of the Compromise signed and affirmed by them in Court today and would abide by the same. The Compromise primarily revolves around the equitable division of Item No.1 in 'A' Schedule, which is the house property at Gandhi Nagar in Katpadi, admeasuring 20020 sq.ft. With respect to other items mentioned in Schedule to the plaint, the plaintiffs affirm the decree passed by the trial Court and they place no claim over the same.

8. We had also sought the opinion of each one of the parties who are present either in person or through video conferencing and they agreed to abide by the terms of the Compromise.

9. In view of the above, this Appeal Suit stands decreed and final decree is to be passed in terms of the Joint Memo of Compromise, dated 06.04.2026, presented before us. The Joint Memo of Compromise, including the Sketch, shall form part of the decree. No order as to costs.

(C.V.K.,J.) (K.R.S.,J.)
06-04-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

DIXIT



AS No. 466 of 2



To

1. District Court,
Tiruvannamalai.

2. V.R. Section,
High Court,
Madras.



WEB COPY

AS No. 466 of 2



**C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
AND
K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

DIXIT

AS No.466 of 2012

06-04-2026