



WEB COPY

CMP No. 10115 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

CMP No. 10115 of 2026

IN

CRP NO. 3188 OF 2011

Dr.T.Velayudam

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Tmt. Thilakavathi Santhaseelan
2. Selvi Narmadha Santhaseelan
3. Selvi Vedha Santhaseelan
4. S.Santhanlatchumy
5. Sumathradevi
6. Munisamy
7. Soudagar
8. Colonel C.K.Gangadharan (Retd.)
9. Suganya
- 10.C.Essoudasse
- 11.S.Adhikesavan(A)
- 12.M.Malini Cambusier
- 13.Julia Cambusier
- 14.Karthikeyan
- 15.S.Shankar
- 16.Rohini Gangadharan
- 17.Tamilarasi
- 18.Mohammed Macoloom
- 19.D.K.Sharma
- 20.Gowrimani
- 21.Purushothaman
- 22.Mohammed Macoloom
- 23.S.Radhakrishnan
- 24.Malathy
- 25.Sivasankaran
- 26.Suriyamurthy
- 27.Indiradevi
- 28.Velmurugan

..Respondent(s)



Prayer : This petition to restore CRP No. 3188 of 2011 dismissed on 23.01.2023 on the file of this Court.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Kishore Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Vadivel – RR4,5,6,8,19,21,22,25,26, & 27.
Mr.T.M.Naveen for Mr.J.P.Jotheeswaran – RR11, 12 & 17
Ms.G.Sumitra – R15
No appearance – RR1 & 2
Sd-N/A for RR10,23,13,14,16,18, 24 & 28
No ready in notice reg.-RR3, 7, 9 and 20.

ORDER

This petition has been filed to restore CRP No. 3188 of 2011 dismissed on 23.01.2023 to the file of this Court.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for both sides and perused the materials placed on record.

3. The learned counsel for the respondents vehemently opposed the restoration by contending that the claim of the petitioner under the Agricultural Tenancy Laws of the Puducherry Union [The Puducherry Cultivating Tenants Protection Act, 1970] itself is not maintainable as he does not have title to the entire property and what he was purchased only a plot, which could be used only for residential purposes. Having not diligently prosecuted the Revision, the petitioner cannot be entitled for restoration of the Revision Petition.



WEB COPY

4. A perusal of the affidavit filed in support of this petition would indicate that the age of the petitioner would be about 80 years and he had indicated that due to his old age and bare health condition, he had chronic disease, which had intervened with the diligence in prosecuting the Revision. When the petitioner had granted substantial reasoning, which had also been supported by the medical records filed along with the typed set of papers and also taking into consideration his age, this Court is inclined to allow this miscellaneous petition.

5. As the sequence, this Civil Miscellaneous Petition stands allowed and the Revision Petition is restored to file. No order as to costs.

16-04-2026

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

Maya



WEB COPY

CMP No. 10115 of 2



K.KUMARESH BABU, J.

Maya

**CMP No. 10115 of 2026
in
CRP No. 3188 of 2011**

Dated : 16-04-2026
2/3