



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1397 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-03-2026

CORAM

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

CRP No. 1397 of 2025

AND

CMP NO. 8279 OF 2025, CMP NO. 24603 OF 2025

Karunanidhi
S/o. Gopal,
No.23, Edatheru, Thiruvarur Town and District
Munsifi, Thiruvarur Dt.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Sakthivel
S/o. Murugaiyan,
Uzhani Village, Thiruvarur Town and District
Munsifi, Thiruvarur Dt.
2. Meera
W/o. Karunanidhi,
No.23, Edatheru, Thiruvarur Town and District
Munsifi, Thiruvarur Dt.
3. Kavinnilavan
S/o. Karunanidhi,
No.23, Edatheru, Thiruvarur Town and District
Munsifi, Thiruvarur Dt.
4. Nidhinila
D/o. Karunanidhi,
No.23, Edatheru, Thiruvarur Town and District
Munsifi, Thiruvarur Dt.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Art. 227 of Constitution of India,
praying to set aside the Fair and Decretal order dated 02.12.2024 made in IA



No.3 of 2024 in OS No.17 of 2017 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Thiruvarur by allowing this CRP.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. C.Munusamy

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.K.Samy for
Mr.Adithya Sarangarajan for R1

R2 to R4 – No appearance

ORDER

Challenging the impugned order passed in I.A.No.3 of 2024 in O.S.No.17 of 2017 by the learned Principal District Judge, Thiruvarur, the Revision Petitioner/1st defendant preferred this Civil Revision Petition.

2. Before the trial court, the Revision Petitioner/1st defendant filed an application to receive additional written statement, but the trial court refused to grant permission to file additional written statement stating that after closure of plaintiff evidence and when the matter was posted for defendant side evidence, the Revision Petitioner had filed additional written statement. Accordingly, it was dismissed. Aggrieved over that, the Revision Petitioner/1st defendant preferred this Civil Revision Petition.

3.The learned counsel for Revision Petitioner would submit that with regard to suit schedule property, the 1st defendant stated that it is a old tiled house, no value was mentioned in the sale deed, however, they are residing in the suit property. To that effect, he wanted to file additional written statement, but the trial court failed to consider the same. Hence, he prayed to set aside the findings of trial judge.



4. The learned counsel for 1st respondent/plaintiff argues that already trial was commenced and after completion of evidence of P.W.1, to drag on the proceedings, 1st defendant came forward with additional written statement, but those contentions were already stated in the written statement. Therefore, the filing of additional written statement is unnecessary one. Hence, the trial court has rightly dismissed the application, which requires no interference.

5. Heard and considered rival submissions made by both learned counsel for Revision Petitioner as well as 1st respondent and perused the materials available on record.

6. As on date, the 1st respondent/plaintiff has claimed that he is purchaser of property and also contended that the Revision Petitioner/1st defendant is the tenant under him and also paid rent. But, the tenancy as well as right of plaintiff is disputed by the 1st defendant. Now the trial is also commenced. Pending proceedings, he wanted to file additional written statement with regard to the averments made in the sale deed stands in the name of 1st respondent/plaintiff. Though in respect of sale deed, he raised allegation, now he wanted to file additional written statement with regard to the value of the property mentioned in the sale deed. If suitable opportunity is not given to him, his right to defend his case will be defeated. Therefore, this Court is inclined to set aside the findings rendered in I.A.No. 3 of 2024 in O.S.No. 17 of 2017 by the Principal District Judge, Thiruvarur. The Revision Petitioner/1st defendant is directed to



file additional written statement and liberty is granted to the 1st respondent/plaintiff to file his reply statement. On receipt of the same, the trial judge is directed to complete the trial and dispose the case within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is allowed. No costs. Consequently, connected civil miscellaneous petition is closed.

11-03-2026

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

RPP

To

The Principal District Judge, Thiruvarur.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1397 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

RPP

**CRP No. 1397 of 2025
AND
CMP NO. 8279 OF 2025, CMP NO. 24603 OF 2025**

11-03-2026