



A. No. 594 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-06-2026

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE A.D.MARIA CLETE

A. No. 594 of 2026

in

C.S. No. 670 of 2016

S.Saravanan
Son of M.Sambandam
63/56, Sri Lakshmi Nagar,
1st Main Road, Vinayagapuram,
Kolathur, Chennai-600099.

..Applicant(s)

Vs

Ms.Radhika
D/o.D.Parthasarathy,
234 B, Lakeview Road,
Surya Nagar Extension,
Medavakkam,
Chennai 600 100.

..Respondent(s)

To grant permission and direct the Cross Examination of the Petitioner/Plaintiff herein as PW1., i.e. through Video Conferencing as per the guidelines and rules laid down by this Hon'ble Court in the above C.S.No.670 of 2016.

For Applicant(s): M/s. E.Ezhil Caroline
J.Suresh
K.Ethiraj

For Respondent(s): Mr.K.Shankar.



A. No. 594 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This application has been filed by the applicant/plaintiff seeking permission to have his cross-examination as P.W.1 recorded through video conferencing.

2. The suit is of the year 2016. The applicant/plaintiff has already filed his proof affidavit and documents have been marked. His cross-examination has also commenced. The applicant states that he is residing and working in Dubai and that repeated travel to Chennai would affect his employment and cause financial hardship.

3. The respondent/defendant opposes the application stating that the applicant is avoiding physical cross-examination and that the application is intended to delay the trial. It is also stated that the defendant and her counsel were ready to cross-examine P.W.1.

4. The party seeking permission for recording evidence through video conferencing must strictly comply with the Madras High Court Video Conferencing in Courts Rules, 2020 and the relevant Practice Directions.



A. No. 594 of 2026

5. Rule 4(2) of the Madras High Court Video Conferencing in Courts Rules,

2020 requires that an application for video conferencing shall be supported by an affidavit showing justifiable circumstances and all relevant particulars of the proposed remote site.

6. Practice Direction 6.3 requires that, in civil cases, the party seeking recording of evidence through video conferencing must confirm the location of the person, the willingness of such person to be examined through video conferencing, and the availability of technical facilities at the agreed time and place.

7. Where the remote site is overseas, Practice Direction 3.3.1 provides that the remote site coordinator shall preferably be an official of the Indian Consulate, Embassy or High Commission. Practice Direction 3.4 gives discretion to the Court, for reasons to be recorded, to appoint any other fit and proper person. If the proposed remote site is a private location such as an advocate's office or any other place, Practice Direction 3.3.10 and Practice Direction 4.2 require proper satisfaction regarding the technical requirements and coordination at both the Court site and the remote site.



A. No. 594 of 2026

8. In the present case, though the applicant states that he is in Dubai and has difficulty in travelling to Chennai, the affidavit does not furnish the mandatory particulars. It does not clearly state the exact remote venue, remote site coordinator, whether the remote site is the Indian Consulate/Embassy/High Commission or any other approved place, the technical arrangements available, the agreed time and place, and the safeguards to ensure proper and effective cross-examination.

9. In the circumstances, this Court finds that this application is liable to be dismissed on account of non-compliance with the Madras High Court Video Conferencing Rules, 2020. However, the petitioner is at liberty to file a fresh application, if so advised, upon strict compliance with the requirements of the said Rules.

10. Accordingly, A.No.594 of 2026 is dismissed. No costs.

22-06-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

AY

4/5



WEB COPY



A. No. 594 of 2026

DR.A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

AY

**A. No. 594 of 2026
in
C.S. No. 670 of 2016**

22-06-2026