



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1687 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 1687 of 2026

AND

**CMP NO. 8394 OF 2026,CRP NO. 1868 OF 2026,CMP NO. 7775 OF
2026,CMP NO. 7786 OF 2026,CRP NO. 1693 OF 2026**

1. D.Pratish alias Pratish Vedhapuddi
Having Office at, No.Y-222, Kimberly
Towers, 2nd Avenue, Anna Nagar,
Chennai 40.

2. VGN Projects Estates Pvt.Ltd,
Rep.by its Director, 1st Defendant, 153,
Wallace Garden. 2nd St,
Nungambakkam, Chennai 6

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. T.S.Muruganandam
S/o.T.S.Sampoornam, T34, Gnanaoli St,
Thiru Nagar, Jafferkhanpet, Chennai
83.


2.D.Padma
No.55/3, Chelliah St, T.A.S.Enclave,
Near A.K.Block, Shanthi Colony,
Chennai 40.

Respondent(s)

CRP No. 1868 of 2026

1. D.Pratish also called Pratish
Vedhapuddi
Having office at, No-Y-222, Kimberly
Towers, 2nd Avenue, Anna Nagar,
Chennai-40.

2.VGGN Projects Estates Private



Limited,
Rep. by its Director, 1st Defendant,
153, Wallace Garden, 2nd Street,
Nungambakkam, Chennai-06.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. T.S.S.Valli,
W/o. T.S.Sivanandam, No.50/20,
Maddox Street, Choolai, Chennai-112.

2.D.Padma
No.55/3, Chelliah Street,
T.A.S.Enclave, NEar A.K.Block,
Shanthi Colony, Chennai-40.

Respondent(s)

CRP No. 1693 of 2026

1. D. Pratish also called Pratish
Vedhapuddi
having office at No.Y-222, Kimberly
Towers, 2nd Avenue, Anna Nagar,
Chennai 040.

2.VGN Projects Estates Pvt Ltd.,
Rep by its Director, 1st Defendants,
153, Wallace Garden, 2nd Street,
Nungambakkam, Chennai 6.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. M. Anandhi
W/o. T.S. Muruganandam, T34,
Gnanaoli St, Thiru Nagar,
Jafferkhanpet, Chennai 083.

2.D. Padma
No.55/3, Chelliah St, T.A.S. Enclave,
Near A.K. Block, Shanthi Colony,
Chennai 040.

Respondent(s)

**CRP No. 1687 of 2026****PRAYER**

To set aside the order and decreetal order made in IA.No.9/2025 in OS.No. 8746/2022 dated 3.2.2026 on the file of the XII Assistant Judge City Civil Court at Chennai.

CRP No. 1868 of 2026**PRAYER**

To set aside the order and Decreetal order made in IA No. 8 of 2025 in OS No. 9097 of 2022 dated 03.02.2026 on the file of the XII Assistant Judge City Civil Court at Chennai and there by allow the CRP and thus render justice.

CRP No. 1693 of 2026**PRAYER**

To set aside the Order and Decreetal order made in IA No.9 of 2025 in OS No.8747 of 2022 dated 03.02.2026 on the file of the XII Assistant Judge City Civil Court at Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): MR.S.Saravanakumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.T.Srikanth

COMMON ORDER

Challenging the impugned order passed in IA.No.9/2025 in OS.No. 8746 of 2022, IA No. 8 of 2025 in OS No. 9097 of 2022 and IA No.9 of 2025 in OS No.8747 of 2022, respectively dated 03.02.2026 on the file of the XII Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai, the defendants 1 and 3 have preferred these revisions.

2. The learned counsel for the revision petitioners submitted that before the trial Court, the plaintiff marked Exhibits A2 and A3, which were not



enclosed along with the plaint at the time of filing the suit, nor was any permission sought to produce those additional documents. Without such permission, the documents were marked as Exhibits A2 and A3. Hence, he filed an application to de-mark those documents, which was not considered by the learned trial Judge, and therefore this revision has been preferred.

3. The learned counsel further argued that as per Order VII Rule 14 CPC, if any document is in the custody of the plaintiff, it must be produced along with the plaint at the time of filing the suit. Otherwise, leave of the Court must be obtained to produce such documents. In the present case, without obtaining leave, the plaintiff produced the documents along with the proof affidavit of PW1 and had them marked as Exhibits A2 and A3. Such an erroneous procedure adopted by the learned trial Judge is liable to be set aside.

4. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that in the leave to defend application filed by the revision petitioner in I.A. No.2 of 2023, these documents were already marked as Exhibits A2 and A3. Since the documents were already produced and marked before the Court, the trial Court was entitled to receive them at the time of PW1's proof affidavit. Therefore, the dismissal of the application requires no interference.



5. Considering the submissions on both sides and upon perusal of the records, it is seen that the revision petitioners had filed I.A. No.2 of 2023 seeking leave to defend, and in that application, the documents were marked as Ex.R2 and Ex.R3 on the side of the plaintiff (who is the respondent in that application).

6. It is further seen that the revision petitioners raised objections by filing a memo to receive those documents. Upon considering the objections, the learned trial Judge permitted the marking of those documents. This also reveals that during the enquiry in I.A. No.2 of 2023, the learned trial Judge, after considering the objections, permitted the marking of those documents. The documents in question are the plaintiff's bank statement and Form 26AS (Income Tax Department statement), which, according to the plaintiff, corroborate the plaintiff's averments.

7. Considering that the suit pertains to a money claim between the parties, the production of the plaintiff's bank statement and IT particulars is relevant to establish the source of income. These are not new or irrelevant documents. Though objections were raised by the defendants at the time of the leave to defend application in I.A. No.2 of 2023, the documents were received. Therefore, the order requires no interference.



WEB COPY

8. Liberty is granted to the defendants to file an additional written statement and to cross-examine PW1 in that regard within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Now, the evidence is closed. Therefore, the defendants are permitted to adduce evidence.

9. In **CRP Nos. 1868 of 2026 & 1693 of 2026**, the defendants partly cross-examined PW1 and thereafter failed to continue the proceedings. Consequently, he was set ex parte and the matters were posted for arguments. The trial Court is directed to give one more opportunity by reopening the case and permitting the defendants to cross-examine PW1 with regard to Exhibits A2 and A3. If required, he may also file an additional written statement. Thereafter, the trial Court shall proceed with the evidence in accordance with law.

10. Accordingly, all the Civil Revision Petitions are disposed of. The documents are permitted to be received. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

08-04-2026

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



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1687 of 2026



To

1. The XII Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.
2. The Section Officer, VR Section, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1687 of 2026



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.
rri

**CRP No. 1687 of 2026
AND CMP NO. 8394 OF
2026,CRP NO. 1868 OF
2026,CMP NO. 7775 OF
2026,CMP NO. 7786 OF
2026,CRP NO. 1693 OF
2026**

08-04-2026