



WEB COPY

CRP No. 794 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

CRP No. 794 of 2026 and

CMP No.4108 of 2026

1. N.Baskar, S/O. Nagalingam,
No.13, Vivekanandapuram,
Opp. Palaniyandi Hospital,
Ammapettai, Salem – 3.
2. N.Kirubakar, S/o.Nagalingam,
No.102, C Block,
Sri Krishna Brindavan Apartment,
Moogambigai Nagar, Nerkundram,
Ambattur, Tiruvallur Dist 107
3. N.Malathi, D/o.Nagalingam,
W/o.Rajkumar, No.23, 2nd Floor,
Salim Icon Enclave,
Venkatesa Nagar 1st St,
Virugambakkam, Chennai 92.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

A.Pannerselvam
S/O. late Nagalingam Arumugamudaliar,
1st Floor. D.No. 15/81, Thangasengodan Street,
Ammapettai, Salem - 5.

..Respondent(s)



Prayer: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India seeking to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 19.11.2025 made in IA.No.5/2025 in RLTOP.No. 8/2024 on the file of the II Additional District Munsif/ Rent Court, Salem.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Prabakar

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the rent court, dismissing the application filed by the petitioners, seeking their impleadment in RLTOP No.8 of 2024, filed by the respondent seeking eviction of tenant.

2. The respondent herein/landlord filed the above said OP seeking eviction of one G.Gnanavel under various grounds enumerated under Section 21 of Tamil Nadu Regulation of the Rights and Responsibilities of Landlord and Tenants Act. According to the respondent, there was a lease arrangement between him and the said G.Gnanavel on 02.05.2023 and he committed default in payment of rents for 5 months together. It is further stated by the respondent that the said G.Gnanavel had erected permanent structures in the premises and thereby caused damage to the premises. Therefore, the respondent filed the eviction petition against the said tenant G.Gnanavel.



3. The petitioners herein claiming themselves as real owners of the property, filed the instant application seeking their impleadment in the main OP.

The said impleading petition was dismissed by the rent court and aggrieved by the same, the petitioners have come before this court.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are the real owners of the property and the respondent falsely claiming himself as a owner of the property, filed the said main OP and hence, the same is not maintainable. The eviction petition has been filed by the respondent, based on the jural relationship between the landlord and tenant. The procedure before the rent court is summary in nature and the rent court can only consider the question whether the respondent is a landlord within the meaning of Tamil Nadu Regulation of the Rights and Responsibilities of Landlord and Tenants Act and as to whether there exists a jural relationship between the respondent and G.Gnanavel as landlord and tenant.

5. The petitioners claim title over the property. However, the rent court cannot decide the question with regard to the title. Whether the petitioners are the real owners of the property or the respondent is the owner of the property is alien issue in the application filed by the respondent, based on the tenancy arrangement. Therefore, the rent court rightly dismissed the instant impleading petition and I do not find any error to interfere with the same.



6. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is dismissed. It is made clear that the dismissal of this civil revision petition will not come in the way of the petitioners pursuing any other remedy available under law. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

18-02-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MST

To

The II Additional District Munsif /Rent Court,
Salem.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 794 of 2



S.SOUNTCHAR, J.

MST

CRP No. 794 of 2026

18-02-2026