



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1466 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 1466 of 2026 & CMP.No.7015 of 2026

S.Hameed Ismail, S/o.M.P.Seyed Ahamed,
Old No.101/1,
New No.205/1
Vellala Street, Pulliyur,
Kodambakkam, Chennai 24.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

Paramanandham, S/o.Saminathan,
No.1919, Dashthmal Lane,
East Main ST,
Tanjavur Tk, Tanjavur 613 009

..Respondent(s)

Prayer : Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to set aside the impugned Fair and Decreetal order dated 20.2.2026 made in MP.No.4/2025 in RLTOP.NO.339/2025 on the file of the XIII Court of Small Causes, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Abhijeet Krishna

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Senthilvel



ORDER

WEB COPY

Challenging the impugned Order passed by the Rent Control Court in M.P.No.4 of 2025 in RLTOP.No.339 of 2025, the present Civil Revision Petition has been filed by the petitioner.

2. The respondent/landlord has filed the petition before the Rent Court for eviction of the petitioner /tenant on the ground that there is no rental agreement in force between the parties and that the landlord has already issued a final termination notice as per law. When the above petition is pending, the petitioner/tenant has filed a petition to re-open the evidence on the side of the respondent/landlord to cross examine the witness on the side of the respondent/landlord. The said petition has been dismissed by the Rent Controller. Aggrieved over the same, the petitioner has preferred the present revision petition.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is having valid defence, but the trial Court failed to give an opportunity to the petitioner to cross examine the witness on the side of the respondent/landlord. He would further submit that he came to know that the original landlord had sold the property to the present respondent in the year



2023 and the petitioner was not informed about the alleged transaction between the original landlord and the present landlord and to that effect he wants to cross examine the witness. But the trial Court without considering all these aspects had dismissed the petition.

4. The trial Court had dismissed the petition filed by the petitioner stating that it is a matter of summary proceedings and since the existence of jural relationship between the parties and non existence of rental agreement in accordance with the new Act stands proved and that the present petition has been filed only to protract the main RLTOP proceedings which has been filed only under Section 21[2] [a] of the TNRRRLT Act. Admittedly, it is the discretion of the Rent Controller to grant a right to cross examine on a case by case basis and it is not a mandatory requirement to assign any reason and hence, this Court is of the view that the Order of the trial Court needs no interference.

5. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

18-03-2026

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

vrc



To

The Judge,
XIII Court of Small Causes,
Chennai.

CRP No. 1466 of 2





WEB COPY

CRP No. 1466 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

VRC

CRP No. 1466 of 2026

18-03-2026