



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1053 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 1053 of 2026

1. Parvathi (Died), 1.Murugan
Vada Anadappattu Village, Kilipattu
Post, Tiruvannamalai Taluk and
District.

2. Selvi
W/o. Murugan, Vada Anadappattu
Village, Kilipattu Post, Tiruvannamalai
Taluk and District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Subramani
S/o. Muthaiya Naidu, Kilipattu Post,
Vada Anadappattu Village,
Tiruvannamalai District.

2.Parasuraman
S/o. Perumal Naidu, Kilipattu Post,
Vada Anadappattu Village,
Tiruvannamalai District.

3.Srinivasan
S/o. Perumal Naidu, Kilipattu Post,
Vada Anadappattu Village,
Tiruvannamalai District.

Respondent(s)

**CRP No. 1053 of 2026****PRAYER**

To set aside the fair and final order dated 18.11.2022, made in I.A.No.3 of 2022 in O.S.No.212 of 2014 passed by the Additional District Munsif Court, Tiruvannamalai and thus render justice.

CRP No. 1053 of 2026

For Petitioner(s): B.Jawahar
B.Yoga Priya
P.Ruthistra

For Respondent:

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed seeking to set aside the fair and final order dated 18.11.2022, made in I.A.No.3 of 2022 in O.S.No.212 of 2014 passed by the Additional District Munsif Court, Tiruvannamalai.

2. The brief facts of the case:

The petitioners herein filed I.A.No.3 of 2022 in O.S.No.212 of 2014 on the file of the Additional District Munsif Court, Tiruvannamalai, seeking revisit by the Advocate Commissioner with the help of surveyor and to measure schedule A, B and C properties and to submit a report. Upon hearing both sides, the Trial Court dismissed the said application. Challenging the same, the petitioner filed this Civil Revision Petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the Advocate Commissioner had measured the property without fixing the boundary stones and also filed their objection as early as in the year 2016 itself. However, the



Trial Court failed to consider the same. Hence, he prays to allow this petition.

4. Heard the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. The petitioners alleged that while surveying the suit property there is no survey stone available on ground. Hence, the petitioner filed the petition seeking revisit by the Advocate Commissioner with the help of surveyor and to measure schedule A, B and C properties and to submit a report. However, on perusal of records, it shows that the properties was already measured with the help of surveyor. Near about 8 years later the petitioner has come forward with application. Considering the fact, this Court is not inclined to allow this petition. The petitioners are directed to work out their remedy before the Trial Court. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No Costs. Pending petition, if any, is /are closed.

03-03-2026

pbl

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1. The Additional District Munsif Court, Tiruvannamalai.

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



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1053 of 2026



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.
pbl

CRP No. 1053 of 2026

03-03-2026