



WEB COPY



CRP No. 624 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-02-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.B. BALAJI

**CRP No. 624 of 2026
and CMP No.3429 of 2026**

1. Annadurai

S/o. Soundararajan, Sri Devi Medicals, Door
No.122, Venkatarangam Pillai Street, Facing
Dr.Besant Road, Triplicane, Chennai-600 005.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. M.Parthasarathy

S/o. Ranganathan, Flat No.3C, Liberty
Residences, New No.7, United India Colony,
First Main Road, Kodambakkam,
Chennai-600 024.

Respondent(s)

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the order (web copy) dated 09.01.2026 passed by XV Additional City Civil Court, Chennai, in R.L.T.A.No.148/2025, confirming the order dated 23.04.2025 passed in RLTOP No.591/2023, on the file of XVI Court of Small Causes, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. M.Murali

For Respondent(s): M/s S.S.Swaminathan

ORDER

Heard Mr.M.Murali, the learned counsel for the petitioner/tenant and
Mr.S.S.Swaminathan, the learned counsel for the respondent/landlord.



CRP No. 624 of 2020

2. The petitioner is on revision under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the judgment of the Rent Tribunal dismissing RLTA No.148 of 2025 confirming the order of recovery of possession passed in RLTOP No.591 of 2023 on the file of Rent Court.

3. Mr.M.Murali, learned counsel for the petitioner would state that the petitioner was not even permitted to adduce evidence in support of the submissions made in the counter affidavit and there has been denial of fair opportunity. He would further states that the properties are not belonging absolutely to the respondent's family and there is a civil dispute pending in CS No.178 of 2024 and according to the petitioner, Arulmigu Parthasarathy Temple, Triplicane is the owner of the property and the petitioner is not entitled even to invoke the provision of TNRRRLT Act to seek eviction. He would further state that the respondent was not entitled to invoke Section 21(2)(a) of TNRRRLT Act and contend that there is a failure to enter into a tenancy agreement.

4. Per contra, Mr.S.S.Swaminathan, learned counsel for the respondent would state that the Rent Court as well as Rent Tribunal have come to a definite finding that there is jural relationship between the petitioner and the respondent and the dispute



with regard to the temple pertains only to land and it is not open to the petitioner to contend that the respondent is not entitled to invoke the provisions of TNRRRLT Act.

He also takes me through the order of the Rent Court as well as Rent Tribunal with regard to the findings that there exist the relationship of landlord and tenant between the petitioner and the respondent and there has also been clear failure to enter tenancy agreement under Section 21(2)(a) of the Act.

5. I have independently gone through the order of the Rent Court as well as Rent Tribunal. The judgment of the Rent Tribunal renders finality to the proceedings under TNRRRLT Act. There is no right of statutory revision made available under the Act. In such circumstances, unless the petitioner makes out a case of grave error, patent illegality or miscarriage of justice, then alone, this Court would be entitled to interfere under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

6. I do not see any of these grounds arising in the facts of the present case. Both the Rent Court as well as the Rent Tribunal have applied their mind to the facts presented. Mere denial of opportunity to the petitioner to lead evidence is not a ground to interfere under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, especially in the light of the judgment of this Court in the case of *J.Thennarasu vs Anita Nalliah reported in 2022*



CRP No. 624 of 2020

5 CTC 519 (CRP (PD) No.2532 of 2021 dated 05.08.2022) where this Court held that the tenant does not have an automatic right to lead evidence when an application is filed under Section 21(2)(a) of TNRRRLT Act. Therefore, even on this ground, I do not see any merit in the revision petition.

7. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner sought for one year time to vacant and hand over vacant possession. However, the said request is strongly opposed by the learned counsel for the respondent who invites my attention to the photographs to show that the building is in a very highly dilapidated and dangerous condition and the other portions have already been demolished to avoid Corporation authorities from pulling up the respondent/landlord for continuing to retain the old building which is dangerous to bye-passers.

8. However, considering the fact that the petitioner is running Medical Shop, I am inclined to grant time till 31.08.2026, however, this is subject to the condition that the petitioner clears entire arrears of rent of Rs.1,26,900/-(Rupees One Lakh Twenty Six Thousand Nine Hundred Only) within one week from today.

9. In the event of the petitioner paying the said sum of Rs.1,26,900/- on or



CRP No. 624 of 2020

before 05.03.2026, then, the petitioner shall be entitled to continue to do business and vacate on or before 31.08.2026.

10. The affidavit of undertaking filed in this regard is also dated 24.02.20226 is also recorded. It is needless to state that the petitioner shall continue to pay the rent from March 2026 till end of August 2026 or till such time he vacates prior to August 2026 without any default on or before 10th of succeeding month excepting for August 2026, it shall be paid in advance on or before August 2026.

11. It is made clear that the issue regarding refund of advance is also settled and there is no excess advance available in the hands of the respondent.

12. With the above direction, the civil revision petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.02.2026

sr

Index:yes/no

Website:yes/no

Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order



WEB COPY



CRP No. 624 of 2026

P.B.BALAJI.,J

To

sr

- 1.XV Additional City Civil Court, Chennai
- 2.XVI Court of Small Causes, Chennai

CRP No.624 of 2026

27.02.2026