



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1190 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-04-2026

CORAM

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

CRP No. 1190 of 2026

AND

CMP NO. 6013 OF 2026

1. P.Sujatha
2. Y.P.Shiravan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Sujatha Agencies
Rep by its Proprietor R.Sujatha,
Rep by its Proprietrix R.Sujatha
Having office at
No 60, New No 82,
Collectorate Colony,
Aminjikarai, Chennai 600 029.
2. M/s. Saravana Stores Gold Palace Pvt. Ltd.
No.28, Ranganathan Street
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

Y.Pallakudurai (deceased)

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decretal order dated 06.02.2026 made in IA No.8 of 2026 in OS No.3480 of 2021 on the file of the XXIII Assistant City Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY



For Petitioner(s):

Mr.N.V.Prakash

For Respondent(s):

Ms.G.Jaya Shruthi For R1

Mr.N.V.Prakash For R2

ORDER

Challenging the impugned order passed in IA No.8 of 2026 in OS No.3480 of 2021 dated 06.02.2026 on the file of the XXIII Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai, the defendants 3 and 4 have preferred the present revision petition.

2. The petitioners / defendants filed application before the trial court to return the plaint under Order VII Rule 10 CPC stating that the Court has no jurisdiction due to lack of pecuniary jurisdiction and only the Commercial Court has jurisdiction to decide the issue. The said application was dismissed by the trial judge by elaborately discussing about the jurisdictional aspect. Aggrieved over the same, the defendants 3 and 4 have preferred the present revision petition.

3. The learned counsel for the revision petitioners submits that the claim comes around Rs.4,66,000/- for which the trial court has no jurisdiction to decide the issue and only the Commercial Court have to decide the issue.



4. The learned counsel for the first respondent / plaintiff submits that the *ex parte* decree was passed on 17.11.2021 and thereafter only, the constitution of Commercial Court was implemented, as per circular dated 06.12.2021. On the date of the implementing of the Commercial Court, the suit was not pending before the Court and it was already decreed.

5. The learned counsel for the revision petitioner submits that it is only a *ex parte* decree. But it is a decree. Furthermore, the learned counsel for the respondent also pointed out that as per direction given by the Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No.51000/2025, six months time was granted to dispose of the case and notice also served to the revision petitioner and they were aware of the said direction.

6. Instead of cooperating with the trial proceedings, they come forward with the false claim. Therefore, the trial court has rightly dismissed the application which requires no interference. Hence, the respondents are directed to cooperate with the proceedings and already six months time was granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and therefore, the trial judge shall also consider the said time limit and dispose of the case as early as possible.



WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is disposed of. No costs.

Consequently, connected Civil Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

06-04-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MTL

To

1. The XXIII Assistant City Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1190 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

MTL

**CRP No. 1190 of 2026
AND
CMP NO. 6013 OF 2026**

06-04-2026