



WEB COPY

CRP No. 889 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-04-2026

CORAM

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

CRP No. 889 of 2026

AND

CMP NO. 4800 OF 2026

Prabhakaran Mathiyazhgan,
Sathyam Homes No.25,
ASK Nagar,
3rd Cross, Madambakkam,
East Tambaram,
Chennai -600 126.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Sri Ramachandra Educational and Health Trust,
Represented by Its Managing Trustee,
New No.24(Old No.25),
Sir C.V.Raman Road,
Alwarpet,
Chennai -600 018.
2. Sri Ramachandra Institute of Higher Education
and Research,
Represented by its General Manager (HR),
(Deemed University) Porur,
Chennai -600 116.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Art. 227 of Constitution of India, praying to allow this Civil Revision Petition by setting aside the impugned order passed by the learned Judge on 06.01.2026 in I.A.No.3 of 2025 in O.S.No.1440 of 2024 pending on the file of the XXIII Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai,



WEB COPY

For Petitioner(s):

Mrs. V.S.Usharani

For Respondent(s):

Mr.Arun C.Mohan
for R1 & R2**ORDER**

Challenging the impugned order passed in I.A.No.3 of 2025 in O.S.No.1440 of 2024 by the learned XXIII Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai, the Revision Petitioner/plaintiff preferred this Civil Revision Petition.

2. Before the trial court, the respondents/defendants filed an application under Sec.72 of BSA r/w Sec.39 and 41 of BSA, praying to direct the document No.2 (alleged confirmation order dated 22.01.2020) and documents of and prior to the year 2020 that are submitted before this court along with the present application be sent to the Forensic Science Department, Government of Tamil Nadu for expert opinion on the authenticity of signatures, handwriting and seal impression. On hearing both sides, the trial judge allowed the application and by appointing an Advocate Commissioner, the documents were directed to be sent for expert opinion, which is under challenge by the revision petitioner/plaintiff before this court.

2. The learned counsel for revision petitioner raised objections stating that the court ought not to have allowed the application directing to refer the



disputed document along with the reply notice which is filed as document No.5 for comparison as all those documents are not been marked before this court so far as an exhibit before this court. The learned counsel submitted that the court has also arrived into pre-matured conclusion that if the document is found forged, then the application filed by the respondents for perjury could be processed and this revision petitioner would be held liable for the offence of perjury, which is totally out of the scope of the suit. He would also submit that he filed a suit only to recover his service benefits from the respondent college, for which, he had been dragged on from pillar to post with an intention to frustrate him and thereby to quit the proceedings. The learned counsel would further submit that the documents, which were sought for comparison have not been marked before the trial court, without which, it cannot be taken for comparison. Hence, he prayed to set aside the findings of trial judge.

3. Heard and considered rival submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.

4. On perusal of records, the fact reveals that respondents/plaintiffs have filed an application to compare the signature found in the document No.2 i.e. the confirmation letter along with contemporaneous period of document since they are doubting the genuineness of the said document pertaining to the year 2022, which was rightly considered by the trial judge. Furthermore, they are



disputing the genuineness of document No.2, for which they are entitled to find out the truth and genuineness of the documents and also to adjudicate the issue, the comparison of documents is just and necessary, since they are being the parties to the suit. Therefore, the reasons assigned by the trial judge is sustainable one, which requires no interference. Accordingly, the findings rendered in in I.A.No. 3 of 2025 in O.S.No.1440 of 2024 by the XXIII Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai is confirmed and this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected civil miscellaneous petition is closed.

08-04-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

RPP

To

The XXIII Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 889 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

RPP

**CRP No. 889 of 2026
AND
CMP NO. 4800 OF 2026**

08-04-2026