



WEB COPY

CRP Nos. 2869, 3825 & 4840 of 2
and CMP Nos.16207, 20296 & 24393 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-04-2026

CORAM

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

CRP Nos. 2869, 3825 & 4840 of 2025
and CMP Nos. 16207, 20296 & 24393 of 2025

1. S.Uma
2. S.Narasinga Rao
3. S.Sharini
4. S.Sharanth
5. K.Sulochana

(Petitioners 1 to 5 are legal heirs of the Late
K.Sudeendar)

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

M.Logeswari

..Respondent(s)

COMMON PRAYER in CRP Nos.2869 & 3825 of 2025 : Civil Revision Petitions are filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 01-10-2024 passed in IA.No.9 of 2022 in OS.Nos.398 & 397 of 2021, on the file of the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu District.

PRAYER in CRP No.4840 of 2025 : Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decreetal order dated 07-04-2025 passed in IA.No.6 of 2022 in OS.No.151 of 2022, on the file of the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu District.



In all CRPs :

For Petitioner(s): Mr.J.Ravikumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.M.A.Mudimannan
for Mr.K.Mani

COMMON ORDER

Challenging the impugned order dated 01-10-2024 passed in IA.No.9 of 2022 in OS.Nos.398 & 397 of 2021 and the order dated 07-04-2025 passed in IA.No.6 of 2022 in OS.No.151 of 2022, on the file of the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu District, the defendants in the said Suits have filed the present Civil Revision Petitions.

2. Before the trial court, they filed applications under Order 26 Rule 10-A of Civil Procedure Code to appoint an Advocate Commissioner to send the plaint document to get expert opinion. The said applications were dismissed by the trial judge on hearing both sides. Aggrieved over the same, the defendants have preferred these revision petitions.

3. The learned counsel for the revision petitioners submits that the defendants are the legal heirs of one K.Sudeendar, who was running a civil construction business as a proprietor, wherein the plaintiff was employed as a



computer operator. The said Sudeendar died during Covid-19 in the year 2020 and taking advantage of the Covid period, the plaintiff manipulated all the records as if she was offered a post of Head Task Execution and Management in the building construction in the name and style of 'Sri Krishna Construction'. She claimed that she also fabricated the MOU as if she was given share in the said business and after the demise of the said Sudeendar, now she has come forward with the three suits with false claim against the legal heirs of the deceased Sudeendar and all the suits are contested by them by denying the plaintiffs' claim as well as the alleged MOU and other documents relied by them. In order to prove the manipulation of the records committed by the plaintiff, they filed the applications to send the documents along with the admitted signatures of the deceased Sudeendar. But the court below failed to give such opportunity and therefore, they prayed to set aside the order of the trial court.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent / plaintiff submits that the business was started not only in the Covid period, even in the year of 2016 onwards the plaintiff is also a Managing Partner with the deceased Sudeendar and he was a working partner and after his death, the amounts have not been settled, therefore she has come forward with the suit for a suit claim. The signatures which sought to be sent for expert opinion are not relevant to the facts of the present case and they have not produced any original documents for



comparison. Therefore, the court below rightly dismissed the application, which requires no interference.

WEB COPY

5. Considering both the submissions, the facts reveals that the plaintiff was originally employed under the deceased Sudeendar. Now she is claiming that she is the Managing Partner. However, the deceased Sudeendar was running a civil construction as a proprietor, but now the plaintiff based on alleged MOU she is said to be a Managing Partner and also made a money claim against the legal heirs of the deceased Sudeendar. As on date, the MOU as well as the claim made by the plaintiff is under challenge. Admittedly, it is a proprietor concern. She mainly relied on the MOU, which was said to be executed between herself and the deceased Sudeendar. Therefore, the said documents ought to have been sent to the forensic lab for comparison to get the report in respect of the signatures found in the documents. Since the defendants are contending that those documents are manipulated by the plaintiff for unlawful gain, but the court below failed to give such opportunity, therefore, the applications are ordered to be allowed.

6. Accordingly, all the Civil Revision Petitions are allowed and the order dated 01-10-2024 passed in IA.No.9 of 2022 in OS.Nos.398 & 397 of 2021 and the order dated 07-04-2025 passed in IA.No.6 of 2022 in OS.No.151 of 2022, on the file of the Principal District Court, Chengalpattu District are set aside.



The trial court is directed to appoint an Advocate Commissioner to send the documents to the forensic lab for comparison of the documents with the admitted signatures of the deceased Sudeendar, in the manner known to law.

The trial court is directed to dispose of the cases within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, the connected Civil Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

16-04-2026
(1/2)

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

MTL

To

1. The Principal District Court, Chengalpattu District.



WEB COPY

CRP Nos. 2869, 3825 & 4840 of 2
and CMP Nos.16207, 20296 & 24393 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

MTL

CRP Nos. 2869, 3825 & 4840 of 2025
and CMP Nos. 16207, 20296 & 24393 of 2025

16-04-2026