



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1012 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-04-2026

CORAM

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

**CRP No. 1012 of 2026
and CMP.No.5437 of 2026**

Kovi Revathy
W/o Kovi Janardhan Naidu,
P.No 30, Gopuram Prakash Apts,
Sivanthi Avenue,
2nd Main Road,
Nerkundram,
Koyambedu 600107

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

G.Arun Kumar
S/o Gandhi,
No 9/20,
Sastri Nagar,
1st Floor,
Koyambedu,
Chennai 600 107

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside order and Decreetal order dated 29.01.2026 made in IA No.4 of 2024 in OS No. 394 of 2024 on the file of the Learned VII Assistant City Civil Court at Chennai, and allow the present

For Petitioner(s):	MR.M.Rajasekar
For Respondent(s):	MR.M.VENKADESH KUMAR



ORDER

Challenging the impugned order passed by this trial Judge in I.A.No.04 of 2024 dated 29.01.2026, the defendant had filed this revision.

2. Before the Trial Court, the revision petitioner/defendant/landlord filed a petition seeking a direction to the plaintiff/respondent to deposit the arrears of rent. The same was dismissed by the Trial Judge holding that, for a certain period, the shop had remained under lock and no business was conducted by the plaintiff/respondent. It was also alleged that the defendant/landlord, through her henchmen, caused disturbance and unnecessarily locked the premises. In view of such observations, the Court below was not inclined to issue a direction for deposit of rent and dismissed the petition. Aggrieved by the same, the defendant/landlord has preferred the present revision.

3. The facts reveal that the defendant/landlord has already taken steps to recover possession by filing O.S. No.4992 of 2024 before the City Civil Court, Chennai. In the meanwhile, the revision petitioner had also filed O.S. No.394 of 2024 seeking protection against eviction except by due process of law. During the pendency of the proceedings, according to the landlord, the tenant has not paid rent and the arrears have accumulated to about Rs.9,00,000/-.



4. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent/tenant submitted that the premises had been unlawfully locked, due to which the tenant was unable to run the business, which aspect was rightly taken note of by the Trial Court.

5. The facts further reveal that the suit for recovery of possession is also pending trial. However, there is no proof to show that the tenant has continuously paid rent. At the same time, having regard to the dispute relating to the premises having been kept under lock for a certain period, and in order to avoid further complications, this Court directs the tenant to deposit a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- before the Trial Court within a period of eight weeks, failing which he shall not be entitled to proceed further with O.S. No.394 of 2024. The tenant is further directed to pay the subsequent monthly rent regularly hereafter. The Trial Court is directed to dispose the case within a period of 12 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. Accordingly, this Civil Revision petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

24-04-2026

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



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1012 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

mpa

To

1. The VII Assistant City Civil Court at Chennai.
2. The Section Officer, VR section,
High Court of Madras.

**CRP No. 1012 of 2026
and CMP.No.5437 of 2026**

24.04.2026