



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

**CRP No. 3307 of 2026
and C.M.P.No.14292 of 2026**

WEB COPY

1. S.Rajagopalan

2. Bharati Sharma
Head -Finance and Accounts,
M/s. Sentinels Security (P) Ltd.,
No.40/93 CR Park,
New Delhi 110 019.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. M/s.Baluserry Finance And Investment
Corporation
No.30, Singarachari Street, Triplicane,
Chennai-600 005.
Rep. by its Partner
M.V.Gowrikanthan.

2. Charanjit Lal Mago
General Manager,
M/s.Anantraj Constructions and Development
(P) Ltd.,
Faiz Road, Karol Bagh,
New Delhi 110 005.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER – This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 03-03-2026 made in IA.No.4 of 2026 in OS.No.2641 of 2020 on the file of the XXIV Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai and consequently dismiss IA.No.4 of 2026 by allowing this Revision.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.M.Sedhumadhavan



ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 03.03.2026 passed by the XXIV Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai, in I.A.No.4 of 2026 in O.S.No.2641 of 2020.

2.Under the aforesaid order, the application filed by the 1st respondent who is the plaintiff in the suit seeking for reception of additional documents namely the partnership deed has been allowed by the Trial Court. The petitioners are the defendants 1 and 2 in the said suit. The suit was filed for recovery of money against the petitioners and the 3rd respondent by 1st respondent. The petitioners have filed the Civil Revision Petition aggrieved by the impugned order on the ground that the additional documents allowed to be received was very much available with the 1st respondent at the time of filing of the suit, but they have failed to file the same and hence, cannot seek leave of the Court to file the same after cross-examination of the respondents' witness by the petitioners.

3.As seen from the impugned order as well as the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, only for the first time during the cross-examination of the respondents' witness by the petitioners' counsel, a contention was raised by the petitioners that the suit filed by the 1st respondent is not maintainable since the 1st respondent is not a registered partnership firm and did



not file the partnership deed. The 1st respondent therefore was constrained to file I.A.No.4 of 2026 in O.S.No.2641 of 2020, seeking for reception of additional documents namely the partnership deed before the Trial Court. The Trial Court has rightly allowed the said application.

4.Since it was only for the first time during the cross-examination of the respondents' witness, the petitioners have raised maintainability issue of the suit, there became a necessity for the 1st respondent to file the partnership deed as an additional document. The Trial Court has given due consideration to the same and has rightly allowed I.A.No.4 of 2026 in O.S.No.2641 of 2020. This Court does not find any infirmity in the reasoning given by the Trial Court for allowing I.A.No.4 of 2026, which has been challenged through this Civil Revision Petition. In view of the same, there is no merit in this Civil Revision Petition.

5.Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

16-06-2026

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



WEB COPY

To

The XXIV Assistant Judge,
City Civil Court, Chennai.

CRP No. 3307 of 2



ABDUL QUDDHOSE, J.

GSA

**CRP No. 3307 of 2026
and C.M.P.No.14292 of 2026**

16-06-2026