



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1632 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26-03-2026

CORAM

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

CRP No. 1632 of 2024

AND

CMP NO. 8685 OF 2024

S.Annalakshmi
W/o.P.S.Pravin Paul,
No.67 and 68, D.No. 131 and 132,
MPM St, Perambur, Chennai 39.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Mr.R. Ilango
S/o.B.Ramasamy,
No.20, Kavimani Desiga Vinayagam Pillai St,
Shanthi Nagar, Lawspet, Pondicherry 605008.
2. Paulsons Beauty and Fashion Pvt Ltd
Master Franchisee of Esentuals Spa, Tony and
Guy London, Rep.by its Managing Director,
Mr.Sam Paul,
NO.12, Halls Road, Kilpauk, Chennai 10

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Art. 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside the docket order in dated 19.3.2024 in OS 1013/2023 on the file of XVIII Additional City Civil Court, Chennai and direct the learned Judge to send for Exhibits A-1 and A-2 for impounding under the stamp act and for costs.



WEB COPY



For Petitioner(s): Mr.G.S.Bala Murugan

For Respondent(s): Mr.Vimal.B.Crimson For R1
Mr.K.Vijayaragavan For R2

ORDER

Challenging the impugned docket order dated 19.03.2024 passed in O.S.No. 1013 of 2023 by the learned XVIII Additional Judge, XVIII Additional Court, Chennai, the Revision Petitioner/1st defendant preferred this Civil Revision Petition.

2. Before the trial court, the Revision Petitioner/1st defendant remained exparte vide docket order dated 15.09.2023. Based on that, the trial judge examined P.W.1 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A6 were marked. After setting aside the exparte order, the 1st defendant raised objections with regard to marking of Ex.A1 and A2 said to be unregistered lease agreement. Beyond the period of 11 months, it requires valid registration, but the trial judge has made observation stating that if at all, any document requires registration, the same would be considered subsequently. Accordingly, the case was proceeded further. The observation made by the trial judge to that effect is now under challenge. But, on seeing the facts, it reveals that P.W.1 was cross-examined by the 1st defendant and the case is posted for defendant side evidence. As per the contention of 2nd defendant, he is only a formal party and he claimed that he was not signatory of the alleged second lease agreement.



3. On considering all those submissions, the fact reveals that P.W.1 was cross-examined and the case was posted for defendants side evidence. In respect of Ex.A1 and A2, whether it requires registration or not would be decided at the time of submission of his evidence. Therefore, liberty is granted to the 1st defendant to raise his submissions at the time of argument. As he completed the cross-examination of P.W.1, the relief claimed in the revision as such became infructuous. With the aforesaid observation, this Civil Revision Petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected civil miscellaneous petition is closed.

26-03-2026

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

RPP

To

The XVIII Additional Judge, XVIII Additional Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1632 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

RPP

**CRP No. 1632 of 2024
AND
CMP NO. 8685 OF 2024**

26-03-2026