



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1496 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

**CRP No. 1496 of 2025 and
CMP No.8781 of 2025**

1. Velmurugan
2. Nithaya Devi
3. Ishwarya
4. Mohanapriya

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. Kannammal
2. Saravanan
3. Radhamani
4. Senthilkumar
5. Sridhar
6. Sasikumar
7. Gomathi
8. Dr.Ganesan
9. Rajasekaran
10. The District Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Kumarapalayam, Namakkal.
11. The Tahsildar, Kumarapalayam Taluk,
Office of the District Collector,
Kumarapalayam, Namakkal.
12. The District Revenue Officer,
Kumarapalayam Taluk,
Office of the District Revenue Officer,
Kumarapalayam, Namakkal.
13. The Village Administrative Officer,
Kumarapalayam Agraharam Village
Kumarapalayam Town, Namakkal.



14. The District Registrar,
Office of the District Registrar,
Namakkal.

15. The Sub Registrar,
Office of the Sub Registrar,
Namakkal.

16. The Commissioner,
Kumarapalayam Municipality,
Kumarapalayam, Namakkal.

... Respondents

Prayer: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to set aside the docket order dated 13.02.2025 passed in I.A.No.3 of 2025 in OS No.98 of 2024 and dismiss the I.A.No.3 of 2025 by allowing the civil revision petition.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr.K.S.Jeyaganeshan

For Respondent(s) : Mr.M.Guruprasad for R1 and R2

Mr.R.Vigneswaran, Govt.Advocate
for R10 to R15.

For R3, 5, 7 to 9 and 16 – No appearance
No representation for R4 and R6.

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the Trial Court, taking the petition for rejection of plaint on file, filed by the respondents 1 and 2 as against the petitioners/plaintiffs alone.



2. The petitioners herein filed a suit in O.S.No.98 of 2024 seeking declaration that the sale deed executed by Radhamani/ 1st defendant in favour of the 2nd defendant dated 28.12.2023 and the sale deed executed by the 1st defendant in favour of the 3rd defendant on 28.12.2023 were null and void. They also sought for a declaration that the power of attorney deed executed by the 2nd and 3rd defendants in favour of the 1st defendant was null and void. As a consequence, they also sought for a declaration that the sale agreement executed by the 1st defendant in favour of the 9th defendant dated 29.12.2023 was null and void. The petitioners also sought for permanent injunctions restraining the defendants from interfering with their alleged possession of the suit property and also from encumbering the suit properties.

3. The respondents 1 and 2, who were arrayed as defendants 2 and 3 in the suit filed I.A.No.3 of 2025 seeking rejection of plaint on various grounds. The trial court passed the impugned order, taking the petition to file only against the plaintiffs, namely the petitioners herein by observing that in a petition for rejection of plaint, the co-defendants are not necessary parties. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners have come before this court.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the respondents 1 and 2 have taken a stand that other defendants are necessary



parties in the other interlocutory application filed by the petitioners in I.A.No.2 of 2025. Therefore, the Trial Court committed an error by taking the application to file as against the petitioners alone.

5. In a petition for rejection of plaint, the aggrieved parties shall be the plaintiffs. The co-defendants, who have not filed a petition for rejection of plaint need not be impleaded, as the rejection of plaint will not have any impact upon the other defendants. Hence, I do not find any error in the impugned order passed the Trial Court.

6. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

23-02-2026
(¹/₂)

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

MST

To

The District Munsif, Kumarapalayam.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1496 of 2



S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

CRP No. 1496 of 2025

23-02-2026
($\frac{1}{2}$)