



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1482 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 1482 of 2026

and

CMP.No.7061 of 2026

1. K.Rudharakumar
S/o. Kothandan, Rest.at Pillaiyar Koil
Street, Kizhottivakkam village,
Rajampet post, Kancheepuram Dist.

2. K.Dhinakaran
S/o.Kothandan, Rest.at Pillaiyar Koil
Street, Kizhottivakkam village,
Rajampet post, Kancheepuram Dist.

3. Pooncholai
w/o.Kothandan, Rest.at Pillaiyar Koil
Street, Kizhottivakkam village,
Rajampet post, Kancheepuram Dist.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. E.Padmavathi
W/o.Inbasekaran, Rest.at no.33/8A,
Singaperumal Koil Sannadhi Street,
Kancheepuram Town.

2.Inbasekaran
S/o.Thandavaraya Mudaliar, Rest.at
no.33/8A, Singaperumal Koil Sannadhi
Street, Kancheepuram Town.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, prays to set aside the order dated 04.02.2026 made in I.A.No.7 of 2025 in O.S.No.112 of



2011, passed by the learned Additional District Munsif, Kancheepuram.

For Petitioner(s): R.Sreedhar

For Respondent:

ORDER

Challenging the impugned order passed in I.A. No. 7 of 2025, the defendants have preferred this revision.

2. Before the trial court, the respondents / plaintiffs filed an application under Order I Rule 10(2) and Section 151 of CPC to implead one Poonjolai as D7, who is the mother of the petitioners 1 and 2. The said application was allowed, against which the present revision has been filed by the defendants.

3. The learned counsel for the revision petitioners / defendants 2 and 3 submitted that at the time of filing the written statement in the year 2011 itself, they had clearly stated that the property was purchased by their mother Poonjolai in the year 1996. For all these years, the plaintiffs had not taken any steps to implead her. After completion of the evidence of DW1, the plaintiffs filed the present application only to drag on the proceedings. He also contended that the application is barred by limitation and the trial court, without appreciating the same, erroneously allowed the petition.



4. It is seen that in paragraph 5 of the written statement filed in the year 2011 itself, defendants 1 to 3 have contended that Poonjolai is the owner of the property as per the settlement deed Doc. No. 4340/2006. Even at the time of amendment of the plaint in the year 2018, the plaintiffs had not taken any steps to implead the said Poonjolai. After a lapse of nearly 14 years, the present application has been filed only to fill up the lacuna.

5. Admittedly, based on the settlement deed of the year 2006, Poonjolai claims to be the absolute owner of the suit property, whereas the plaintiffs claims title based on the sale deed of the year 1990. Since the suit is one for declaration, the rights of the parties have to be adjudicated and all necessary parties have to be impleaded.

6. Though there is delay, Poonjolai, who claims title over the property, is a necessary party to the proceedings. Eventhough, the objections raised by the revision petitioners are sustainable to some extent since the impleading of 7th respondent is absolutely necessary for adjudication of the rights of the parties, **this Civil Revision case is dismissed.** Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.



7. However, the respondents are directed to cooperate for early disposal of the suit. The learned trial Judge is directed to dispose of the case within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, without unnecessary delay.

12-03-2026

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



CRP No. 1482 of 2026



1. The Additional District Munsif,
Kancheepuram.
2. The Section Officer, VR Section,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1482 of 2026



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.
rri

CRP No. 1482 of 2026

12-03-2026