



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1773 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-04-2026

CORAM

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

**CRP No. 1773 of 2025
and CMP.No.10212 of 2025**

1. Sanam Parvathy
W/o.Raja Sekara Reddy, Residing at No.15
Vivekananda Salai, Rajajipuram II, Thiruvallur
Tk and Dist.
2. Sanam Varada Ananda Kumar Reddy
S/o.Raja Sekara Reddy, Rep. by his mother and
natural Guardian 1st petitioner, Residing at
No.15 Vivekananda Salai, Rajajipuram II,
Thiruvallur Tk and Dist.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Rajasekara Reddy
S/o.Raghuram Reddy, Inspector, 0301070030,
C.I.S.F., NRSC, Balanagar, Dist-Medchal,
Malkajgiri, Hyderabad, Telengana - 500 037.
2. Ambati Teja
D/o.A.Venkatarami Reddy, Allagadda Post,
Allagadda Tehsi, Kurnool District, Andhra
Pradesh State.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside the order and decree passed in IA.No.22/2024 in OS.No.2/2019 on the file of the Family Court, Tiruvallur dated 25-02-2025.

For Petitioner(s): MR.S.Prabhu

For Respondent(s): RESPONDENTS- NO APPEARANCE



ORDER

Challenging the impugned order passed by the Trial Judge in I.A.No.22 of 2024, the plaintiffs have preferred the present revision.

2. Before the trial Court, the plaintiff filed an application seeking permission to amend the plaint by incorporating an additional prayer as well as certain averments pertaining to Contempt Petition No.2013 of 2024. Upon hearing both sides, the Trial Judge dismissed the said application holding that the proposed amendment was not necessary, since the relevant facts were already available on record, and further held that the prayer sought by the plaintiff was not maintainable due to the inordinate delay in seeking such amendment. Aggrieved by the same, the present revision has been filed.

3. The learned counsel for the revision petitioner/plaintiff submitted that the 1st respondent is the husband of the plaintiff and is working as an Inspector of Police. After the marriage, they begot children, and thereafter the husband deserted the plaintiff, compelling her to file the suit. Pending suit proceedings, the plaintiff came to know that the first defendant had married one Ambati Teja on 12.06.2020 as a second marriage, as reflected in the entries found in his service register. Therefore, she filed an application in I.A.No.8 of 2023 to implead the said Ambati Teja as the second defendant, and the same was



allowed. Thereafter necessity arose to seek a declaration in respect of the child born through the relationship between the first defendant and the second defendant. However, the Court below failed to grant such opportunity.

4. Considering the facts and circumstances which arose subsequently to the filing of the suit, it appears that, according to the plaintiff, the first defendant contracted a second marriage with the second defendant and a child was born through the said relationship. Therefore, the plaintiff sought amendment of the plaint by incorporating an additional prayer as well as consequential pleadings.

5. Originally, the plaintiff had filed the suit seeking a declaration that she is the legally wedded wife of the first defendant. Pending proceedings, the second defendant was impleaded, alleging that she was living with the first defendant. The subsequently facts now disclose that a child was born through the said relationship. Therefore, the plaintiff seeks to incorporate an additional consequential prayer in the plaint.

6. Considering the nature of the prayer already sought in the plaint, the proposed amendment appears to be only consequential in nature and is just and necessary for the purpose of effectively adjudicating the issues involved between the parties. Further, the proposed amendment would not alter the character of the suit and would only enable the plaintiff to work out her proper



remedy before the Trial Court.

WEB COPY

7. Therefore, the findings of the Trial Court are set aside, and the application in I.A.No.22 of 2024 stands allowed. Accordingly, the civil revision petition is allowed.

8. Liberty is granted to the defendants to file additional written statements, if any. The trial Court is directed to dispose of the suit within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

28-04-2026

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

MPA

To

1. The Family Court, Tiruvallur.

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



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1773 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

MPA

**CRP No. 1773 of 2025
and CMP.No.10212 of 2025**

28-04-2026