



WEB COPY

CRP No. 708 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 708 of 2026 & CRP NO. 722 OF 2026

AND

CMP NO. 3775 OF 2026 & CMP NO. 3734 OF 2026

P.Vengatachalam
S/o. Pandurangan,
No.1, Ellaiamman Kovil Street,
Polangam, Thirumalairayan Pattinam,
Karaikal - 609606.

..Petitioner(s) in
both C.R.P.s

Vs

S. Sunmugam
S/o. Selvaraj,
No.11, Periyathambi,
2nd Lane, Royappuram,
Chennai - 600 013.

..Respondent(s) in
both C.R.P.s

PRAYER IN CRP No. 708 of 2026

Civil Revision Petition filed under Art. 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 10.12.2025 passed in IA.No.14/2025 in OS.NO. 4740/2018 on the file of XX Additional City Civil Court at Allikulam, Chennai.

PRAYER IN CRP No. 722 of 2026

Civil Revision Petition filed under Art. 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 10.12.2025 passed in IA.No.13/2025 in OS.NO. 4740/2018 on the file of XX Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.

**In Both CRP.s**

For Petitioner(s): Mr. I Abrar Mohamed Abdullah

WEB COPY For Respondent(s): Mr.C.R.Malarvannan

COMMON ORDER

Challenging the impugned common order passed in I.A.Nos.14 and 13 of 2025 in O.S.No.4740 of 2018 by the learned XX Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Allikulam, Chennai, Rasipuram, the Revision Petitioner/defendant preferred these Civil Revision Petitions.

2. Before the trial court, the Revision Petitioner/defendant filed applications under Sec.151 of C.P.C. to reopen plaintiff side evidence and under Order XVIII Rule 17 of C.P.C. to recall P.W.1 as he wanted to cross-examine P.W.1 with regard to certain documents. But the trial judge dismissed the applications holding that though sufficient opportunity was given to them, he has not cross-examined P.W.1. Aggrieved over the same, the Revision Petitioner/defendant preferred these Civil Revision Petitions.

3. The learned counsel for Revision Petitioner/defendant would submit that with regard to certain documents, he wanted to cross-examine P.W.1, but the trial judge failed to consider the same. Hence, he prayed to set aside the findings of trial judge.

4. The learned counsel for respondent pointed out that no sufficient reason was assigned to recall P.W.1. Hence, the trial judge has rightly dismissed the applications, which needs no interference.



5. Heard and considered rival submissions made by learned counsel for Revision Petitioner as well as Respondent and perused the materials available on record.

6. On perusal of records, the fact reveals that the suit was filed in the year of 2018. If suitable opportunity is not given to the Revision Petitioner, his valuable defence to defend his case will be defeated. So, a final chance is to be given to the Revision Petitioner. But, the trial judge erroneously dismissed the applications. Therefore, this Court is inclined to set aside the findings rendered by the XX Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Allikulam, Chennai in I.A.No.14 and 13 of 2025 in O.S.No.4740 of 2018. The Revision Petitioner is permitted to cross-examine P.W.1 and to conclude the same on the same day. The trial judge is directed to complete the trial and dispose the case within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. Accordingly, these Civil Revision Petitions are allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected civil miscellaneous petitions are closed.

12-03-2026

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

RPP

To
The XX Additional Judge, City Civil Court, Allikulam, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 708 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

RPP

**CRP No. 708 of 2026 & CRP NO. 722 OF 2026
AND
,CMP NO. 3775 OF 2026,CMP NO. 3734 OF 2026**

12-03-2026