



CRP No. 2154 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04-06-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

CRP No. 2154 of 2026

AND

CMP NO. 9426 OF 2026

1. R.Leelavathi @ Leela

2. R. Dhineswaran

3. R. Easwaran @ Haribalaji

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. A.Mohanasundaram

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the fair order and decretal order passed in IA.No.6/2024 in OS.NO.198/2021 dated 27.11.2025 on the file of the IV Additional District Judge, Tiruvallur at Ponneri by allowing this appeal.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.B.Govindaprabu

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Munuswamy

ORDER

This civil revision petition has been filed, challenging the impugned order dated 27.11.2025 passed by the IV Additional District Judge, Tiruvallur at Ponneri in I.A. No. 6 of 2024 in O.S. No. 198 of 2021.



2. The aforesaid application was filed by the defendants in the suit, seeking to eschew one of the documents, which was marked as an exhibit on the side of the plaintiff. The said document was marked as Exhibit A-8.

3. The petitioners claim that being a document insufficiently stamped, the said document ought not to have been marked as an exhibit by the trial court.

4. Admittedly, the said document was allowed to be marked as an exhibit earlier. However, according to the petitioners, the document was marked as an exhibit in the presence of the junior counsel of the counsel on record for the defendants. According to the petitioners, the trial court ought to have convinced itself that the document could be marked and only thereafter ought to have marked the same as an exhibit. According to the petitioners, the trial court failed to appreciate that the document cannot be marked as an exhibit as the said document has been insufficiently stamped.

5. Having allowed the document to be marked as an exhibit, the petitioners cannot subsequently file an application, seeking to eschew Exhibit A-8. The contentions that have been raised by the petitioners before this court in this civil revision petition can very well be raised at the time of final arguments



in the main suit.

WEB COPY

6. If such kind of revision petitions are entertained, it will only lead to delay in the finality of any litigation. Therefore, this court is not entertaining this civil revision petition, as the trial court has rightly rejected the petitioners' application. However, this court grants liberty for the petitioners to raise all contentions with regard to the inadmissibility of Exhibit A-8 in the final arguments to be made in the main suit. However, it is for the trial court to decide whether there is any merit in the petitioners' contention while deciding the main suit.

7. This court is not expressing any opinion on the merits of the petitioners' contentions as raised before this court in this civil revision petition.

8. For the foregoing reasons, this civil revision petition is disposed of by granting liberty for the petitioners to raise all contentions that have been raised in this civil revision petition in the main arguments to be made in the main suit, leaving it open for the trial court to decide whether the said contentions deserve merit or not while deciding the final suit. No Costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

04-06-2026



CRP No. 2154 of 2026



Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ab

To

1. The IV Additional District Judge,
Tiruvallur at Ponneri.

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



WEB COPY

CRP No. 2154 of 2026



ABDUL QUDDHOSE J.

ab

**CRP No. 2154 of 2026
AND CMP NO. 9426 OF
2026**

04-06-2026