



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1696 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 1696 of 2026

and

CMP.No.7798 of 2026

1. K.Ammer John
S/o.Kassim, Proprietor of A.R.Rahaman
Biriyan A/c Restaurant, Res.at No.109,
Thambu Chetty St, Mannady, Chennai
001. Carrying on Business at Door
No.5, Andiappan St, Govindan Road,
West mambalam, Chennai 33

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Amitharaj
S/o.Abraham Nadar, No.10/23,
Kodambakkam Road, 1st Floor,
Mettupalayam, Chennai 33

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To set aside the fair and decretal order dated 5.3.2026 made in MP.No.2/2026 in RLTOP.NO.635/2025 on the file of the XV Small Causes Court, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): MR.N.Naganathan

For Respondent(s): Mr.M.Venkadesh Kumar



ORDER

Challenging the impugned order passed in M.P. No.2 of 2026 in RLTOP.NO.635/2025 on the file of the XV Small Causes Court, Chennai, the tenant has preferred this revision.

2. Before the Trial Court, the petitioner filed an application seeking leave to cross-examine the landlord. The Trial Court dismissed the application by relying the ratio laid down by this Hon'ble Court in *The Proprietor, Bhavani Fancy Store Vs. M/s. Mayur Promoters Pvt. Ltd., reported in 2025(1) CTC 281*, wherein it was held that the grant of permission to cross-examination is a matter within the discretion of the Court. It was further held that the jural relationship between the landlord and tenant is admitted and that there is no registered tenancy agreement between the parties. Hence, the Court declined the request for cross-examination.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there exists a subsequent agreement under which an additional advance of Rs.4,75,000/- was paid, and therefore, cross-examination is necessary. He also contended that the provisions of the new Act would not apply to the facts of the case.



4. The respondent opposed the same, contending that eviction proceedings have been initiated under Section 21(2)(a) of the new Act due to arrears of rent. Admittedly, the jural relationship is not in dispute and there is no registered tenancy agreement as required under Section 4(2) of the TNRRRLT Act.

5. The Trial Court has rightly exercised its discretion and relied upon the settled legal principles. This Court finds no merit in the revision, and accordingly, the same is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

24-03-2026

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



CRP No. 1696 of 2026



1. The XV Small Causes Court,
Chennai.

2. The Section Officer, VR Section,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1696 of 2026



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.
rri

CRP No. 1696 of 2026

24-03-2026