



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1596 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. 1596 of 2026

AND

CMP NO. 7507 OF 2026

Rajendran
Ground Floor,
New D.No.24, Old D.No.17,
Ramasamy Pillai Street,
Purasaiwalkam,
Chennai - 600084.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

Chandraprakasmlu
S/O. Late. Venugopal,
Plot No.68, D.No.12/16A,
Third Cross,
Appavu Nagar,
Hosur - 635109.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Art. 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside the Fair and decree dated 20.02.2026 made in MP. No.3 of 2025 in RLTOP No.435 of 2025 on the file of the X Court of Small Causes at Chennai consequently permit the petitioner to cross examine the PW-1.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.B.Manoharan

For Respondent(s): Mr.B.K. Sreenivasan

ORDER

Challenging the impugned order passed in M.P.No.3 of 2025 in RLTOP No.435 of 2025 by the learned X Court of Small Causes at Chennai, the Revision Petitioner/petitioner preferred this Civil Revision Petition.



2. Before the trial court, the Revision Petitioner filed the petition under Sec.36(2) of TNRRRLT Act, 2017 and r/w 151 of C.P.C., to permit him to cross-examine the landlord with regard to payment of rent and other connected aspects. The said petition was submitted by revision petitioner/tenant stating that already he had paid the rents to the bank account of respondent/landlord. To that effect, he produced bank statement. On considering both side submissions, the trial judge has held that as a coowner, he filed the petition for eviction as there is no rental agreement as mandated under the Act. Admittedly, the revision petitioner is the tenant and the bank statement also reveals that the rent was deposited by the tenant in the account of respondent/landlord herein, which proves the jural relationship between them. Therefore, there is no necessity for cross-examination and the question of cross-examination would not arise. Accordingly, the said petition was dismissed. Aggrieved over that, the present Civil Revision petition.

3. The learned counsel for Revision Petitioner would submit that he wanted to cross-examine the respondent/landlord with regard to the claim of eviction made by him stating that he has no locus standi to proceed with the eviction proceedings. To that effect, he wanted to put questions. But the trial judge failed to consider the same and erroneously dismissed the said petition. Therefore, he prayed to set aside the findings of trial judge.



4. On perusal of findings of the trial court, the fact reveals that the respondent/landlord has filed eviction proceedings in RLTOP No. 435 of 2025, wherein the revision petitioner has produced the bank statements, which were marked as Ex.P4 and Ex.P6, in which the revision petitioner had deposited the monthly rent to the account of respondent/landlord. Since he deposited the rent voluntarily in the account of respondent/landlord, the jural relationship between landlord and tenancy is prima facie established. Therefore, trial judge has rightly dismissed the petition holding that the cross-examination of respondent/landlord would not arise and with regard to admitted jural relationship between the landlord and tenant requires no interference. Hence, the reason assigned by the trial judge is sustainable one. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed as no merit. Both the parties are directed to cooperate with the trial proceedings and since the landlord and tenant are aged about more than 65 years, the trial judge is directed to proceed with the trial and dispose the case as early as possible without influence of the order passed by this court. No costs. Consequently, connected Civil Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

18-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
RPP
To
The X Judge, Court of Small Causes, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1596 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

RPP

**CRP No. 1596 of 2026
AND
CMP NO. 7507 OF 2026**

18-03-2026