



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-04-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP No. 2220 of 2026

AND

CMP NO. 9681 OF 2026,CRP NO. 2225 OF 2026,CRP NO. 2221 OF 2026

1. D.Dhanalakshmi

Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021

2. P.Varalakshmi

Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021

3. R.Bhuvaneswari

Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. R. Madhusudanan

Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

2.M.Perinbaraj

Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

3.M.Jayaraj

Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

Respondent(s)



CRP No. 2225 of 2026

1. D.Dhanalakshmi
Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021

2.P.Varalakshmi
Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021

3.R.Bhuvaneswari
Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. R.Madhusudanan
Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

2.M.Perinbaraj
Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

3.M.Jayaraj
Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

Respondent(s)

CRP No. 2221 of 2026

1. D.Dhanalakshmi
Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021

2.P.Varalakshmi
Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021



3.R.Bhuvaneswari
Res at Old No.31, New No.22,
Appaswamy Lane, Tonidarpet, Chennai
600 021

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. R.Madhusudanan
Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

2.M.Perinbaraj
Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

3.M.Jayaraj
Res at Old No.4/77, New No.4/4,
M.A.Koil Street, M.A.Nagar, Red Hills,
Chennai 600 052

Respondent(s)

CRP No. 2220 of 2026

PRAYER

To set aside the order and decreetal order dated 12.03.2026 in IA.No.6 of 2025 in OS.No.54 of 2015 on the file of the Honble Additional District Court, Chengalpattu by allowing this Revision and pass such further or other orders as deemed fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

CRP No. 2225 of 2026

PRAYER

To set aside the order and decreetal order dated 12.03.2026 in IA.No.7 of 2025 in OS.No.54 of 2015 on the file of the Honble Additional District Court, Chengalpattu by allowing this Revision and pass such further or other orders as deemed fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

CRP No. 2221 of 2026

PRAYER

To set aside the order and decreetal order dated 12.03.2026 in IA.No.8 of 2025 in OS.No.54 of 2015 on the file of the Honble Additional District Court,



Chengalpattu by allowing this Revision and pass such further or other orders as deemed fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner(s): MR.K.J.Parthasarathy

For Respondent(s):

COMMON ORDER

The revision petitioner has filed these revisions, to set aside the order and decretal order dated 12.03.2026 in IA.Nos.6,7 & 8 of 2025 in OS.No.54 of 2015, respectively, on the file of the Additional District Court, Chengalpattu.

2. Before the trial Court, the plaintiff filed applications in I.A.Nos.6, 7 and 8 of 2025 to reopen the case, recall the witness and receive additional documents. All the applications were dismissed by the learned trial Judge holding that the original documents were not produced and that the pleadings did not support the facts sought to be established. Those applications were dismissed after hearing both sides. Aggrieved by the same, the present revisions have been filed.

3. The learned counsel for the revision petitioner submitted that the revision petitioners, being the plaintiffs, filed a suit in O.S.No.54 of 2015 before the trial Court seeking the relief of partition and declaration to declare the settlement deed dated 13.02.2014, registered as Document No.1522 of 2014 on



the file of the Sub-Registrar Office, Red Hills, executed by the first defendant in favour of the second and third defendants in respect of Item No.II of the suit schedule property, as illegal, null and void and not binding on the plaintiffs, along with other consequential reliefs in respect of the two items of the suit properties described in the plaint schedule.

4. The defendants contested the suit stating that their claim is based on a Will alleged to have been executed by one Ramadas Naidu. According to the defendants, the said Will was not traceable and had been misplaced. However, based on the said Will alone, they are claiming rights over Item No.II of the suit property. According to the plaintiffs, no such Will exists.

5. Now, the trial has commenced and both parties have adduced evidence. At this stage, the plaintiffs traced certain documents dated 29.10.1996, namely the proceedings of the Special Tahsildar, Natham, Ponneri, wherein there is a recital stating that the alleged Will relied upon by the defendants had not been produced. In order to mark the said document before the trial Court, the necessity arose for the plaintiffs to file applications to reopen the case, recall the witness and receive the additional documents. However, the learned trial Judge erroneously dismissed those applications. Even before the trial Court, the plaintiffs had assured that the original documents would be produced.



6. When the matter was taken up, the learned counsel produced the original documents said to have been issued by the Special Tahsildar, Natham, Ponneri, dated 29.10.1996. The plaintiffs are in possession of the said documents and the documents are also old records pertaining to the year 1996, much prior to the filing of the suit in the year 2015. Therefore, an opportunity has to be given to the plaintiff to produce those documents.

The finding of the trial Court that the original documents were not produced, despite the assurance given by the plaintiffs, is erroneous, especially when the originals have now been produced before this Court. If an opportunity is not given to the parties to prove their case, their valuable right to prosecute and defend the case would be defeated.

7. Therefore, the orders passed by the learned trial Judge in I.A.Nos.6, 7 and 8 of 2025 in OS.No.54 of 2015, respectively, on the file of the Additional District Court, Chengalpattu, are set aside and the said applications are allowed. Liberty is also granted to the defendants to cross-examine the witnesses with regard to the said documents.

8. The maintainability and admissibility of the documents shall be decided only at the time of completion of evidence and at the time of final disposal of the suit. With the above liberty and observations, all the applications are allowed.



9. Accordingly, the Civil revision petitions are allowed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

16-04-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rri

To

1. The Additional District Judge, Chengalpattu.

2. The Section Officer, VR section, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 2220 of 2026





WEB COPY

CRP No. 2220 of 2026



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.
rri

**CRP No. 2220 of 2026
AND CMP NO. 9681 OF
2026,CRP NO. 2225 OF
2026,CRP NO. 2221 OF
2026**

16-04-2026