



WEB COPY

SA No. 682 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

**SA No. 682 of 2015
and
M.P.Nos.1 & 2 of 2015
and
C.M.P.No.20522 of 2016**

1. Panchanathan

S/o.Sivalingam

2. Jeeva

W/o Panchanathan

..Appellant(s)

Vs

Kathiresan

S/o Duraisamy, Puthagaram,

Pandoor Post, Mayiladuthurai Taluk,

Nagapattinam District.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:

Second Appeal filed under Section 100 of C.P.C., praying to set aside the Judgment and decree of the Principal Sub Court, Mayiladuthurai, dated 24.07.2013 in A.S.No.89 of 2012 reversing the Judgment and Decree of the Principal District Munsif Court, Mayiladuthurai, made in O.S.No.193/2008 dated 06.09.2010.



For Appellant(s): No appearance
For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Giritharan

JUDGMENT

The Second Appeal has been filed to set aside the Judgment and decree of the Principal Sub Court, Mayiladuthurai, dated 24.07.2013 in A.S.No.89 of 2012 reversing the Judgment and Decree of the Principal District Munsif Court, Mayiladuthurai, made in O.S.No.193/2008 dated 06.09.2010.

2. Earlier, a memo was filed by the learned counsel for the appellants, indicating that the learned counsel for the respondent had represented that the matter had been settled between the parties. However, it was further represented by the learned counsel for the appellant that he had sent a communication to the appellant regarding the statement made by the learned counsel for the respondent, but there was no response. Indicating the said fact, he had also filed the memo.

3. Hence, this Court directed deletion of the name of the learned counsel appearing for the appellants and print the name of the parties and listed the matter for hearing on 06.02.2026. On the said date, there has been no representation on the side of the appellants and hence, the matter was directed to be listed under the caption “For Dismissal” today.



4. Even today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, there is no representation on the side of the appellants and they are called absent.

5. This Court is of the view that the appellants are not diligent enough in prosecuting the appeal and hence, the Second Appeal stands dismissed for non-prosecution. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

13-02-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

kak

To

1.The Principal Sub Court, Mayiladuthurai.

2. The Principal District Munsif Court, Mayiladuthurai.

3.The Section Officer,
V.R.Section, High Court,
Madras.



WEB COPY

SA No. 682 of 2



K.KUMARESH BABU, J.

kak

SA No. 682 of 2015

13-02-2026