



CRP No. 3260 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15-06-2026

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

CRP No. 3260 of 2026

AND

CMP NO. 14176 OF 2026

1. Murugakumari @ M. Kumari

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Haribabu

2. Subramani

3. Sundrammal

4. Sekar

5. Sumathi

6. Manjula

7. Venda

8. Sudha

9. Chinna Pappa

10. Munusamy


11. Balwinder Singh

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the fair and decretal order dated 28.01.2026 in IA No.1 of 2025 in OS No.42 of 2021 on the file of the Subordinate Judge at Tirutani.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Sathiyaraj




ORDER

WEB COPY

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed, seeking to set aside the order dated 28.01.2026 passed by the Sub Court, Tiruttani in I.A. No. 1 of 2025 in O.S. No. 42 of 2021.

2. In the aforesaid order, the application filed by the first respondent/plaintiff, seeking leave of the Court to receive additional documents and to condone the delay in filing the said documents has been allowed by the trial Court. The petitioner in this Civil Revision Petition is the 11th defendant in the suit O.S. No. 42 of 2021. The petitioner claims that if the documents are allowed to be received, it will alter the nature of the suit.

3. Further, it is the contention of the petitioner that even at the time of institution of the suit by the first respondent/plaintiff, the first respondent/plaintiff was very much aware of the additional documents and, therefore, he could have filed the same along with the suit. According to the petitioner, there are also no pleadings made by the first respondent/plaintiff in the plaint to enable the first respondent/plaintiff to file an application, seeking leave of the trial Court to file additional documents. Therefore, according to the petitioner, erroneously, the trial Court has allowed the application filed by the first respondent/plaintiff in I.A. No. 1 of 2025.




WEB COPY

4. The trial Court, while allowing the application, in paragraph No. 9 of the impugned order, has observed that the first respondent/plaintiff should be given an opportunity to produce all documents and no prejudice will be caused to the petitioner/11th defendant if the additional documents are allowed to be received by the Court and only in the interest of justice, I.A. No. 1 of 2025 has been allowed.

5. The contentions raised by the petitioner before this Court can also be raised in the main suit. If the Civil Revision Petition is entertained at this stage, it will only delay the disposal of the suit. After all, the application allowed by the trial Court is only an application filed, seeking to condone the delay in filing additional documents. The trial Court has exercised its discretion and has allowed the same by giving reasons.

6. Pleadings are complete in the suit. The petitioner/11th defendant has also filed her written statement in the suit. Any Civil Revision Petition is entertained by this Court only in exceptional circumstances. Therefore, entertaining this Civil Revision Petition at this stage will not be in the interest of justice and will not be in the interest of early disposal of the suit.



WEB COPY

7. For the foregoing reasons, this Court does not find any merit in this Civil Revision Petition. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed.

No Costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

15-06-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

ab

To

1. The Subordinate Judge, Tirutani.

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



WEB COPY

CRP No. 3260 of 2026



ABDUL QUDDHOSE J.

ab

**CRP No. 3260 of 2026
AND CMP NO. 14176
OF 2026**

15-06-2026