



WEB COPY



CRP.No.6443 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 10.03.2026

Coram:

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE N.MALA

CRP.No.6443 of 2025

1.Vijayalakshmi Enterprises
Rep.by its Managing Partner
Lakshmi Rajkumar,
No.36, First Floor,
MIT Colony, GST Road
Urapakkam, Vandalore
Chennai 603 210.

2.Lakshmi Rajkumar
3.Vijaya Kaveri

... Petitioners

Vs.

S.R.Bhaskar

... Respondent

PRAYER: This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to allow the Civil Revision Petition and set aside the docket order dated 21.06.2025 passed in Memo No.2063 of 2025 in E.P.No.1 of 2025 in RLTOP.No.4 of 2023, on the file of the District Munsif Judge at Chengalpattu and direct restitution of the possession of the premises U/s.144 of CPC.



WEB COPY



CRP.No.6443 of 2025

For Petitioners : Mr.D.Arun Kumar

For Respondent : Mr.T.Karunakaran

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed to set aside the docket order dated 21.06.2025 passed in Memo No.2063 of 2025 in E.P.No.1 of 2025 in RLTOP.No.4 of 2023, on the file of the District Munsif Judge at Chengalpattu and direct restitution of the possession of the premises U/s.144 of CPC.

2. The respondent/landlord filed RLTOP.No.4 of 2023, seeking eviction of the petitioner under Section 21(2)(a) and Section 21(2)(b) of the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Rights and Responsibilities of Landlord and Tenants Act, 2017. By order dated 30.09.2024, the Rent Control Court allowed the said RLTOP for recovery of possession. Pursuant to the said order, the respondent filed E.P.No.1 of 2025 and the said Execution Petition was terminated after delivery of possession was effected to the respondent on 21.06.2025.

3. The petitioner filed a Memo No.2063 of 2025 in E.P.No.1 of 2025 stating that, without any order of the Court, the Senior Bailiff broke open the door of the shop premises and effected possession. The petitioner contended



CRP.No.6443 of 2025

that in the absence of a specific order of the Court, the door of the shop premises ought not to have been broken. However, the learned District Munsif Judge, rejected the memo without considering the petitioner's objection that the possession was illegally handed over. Aggrieved by the rejection of the memo, the present Civil Revision Petition has been filed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Senior Bailiff without the order of the Court broke open the door of the shop premises and delivered possession of the property to the respondent and hence, the Lower Court erred in terminating the EP.

5. When the matter was taken up for admission, this Court on 12.02.2026, directed the District Munsif, Chengalpattu, to conduct an enquiry after calling for a report from the Senior Bailiff, who went to the spot on 03.06.2025, to ascertain whether the premises was locked or left open for the Senior Bailiff and the respondent to enter, in order to execute the warrant.

6. Pursuant to the said order of this Court, the District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu, filed a report in D.No.100/2026 dated 27.02.2026, stating that the Senior Bailiff was enquired by the Court in the presence of both counsels and as per the statement of Senior Bailiff, she did not break open the door of the shop



CRP.No.6443 of 2025

premises at the time of delivery. The learned District Munsif, recorded the said statement of the Senior Bailiff in the presence of both counsels.

7. This Court has gone through the report of the learned District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu, the supporting documents filed by him, and the statement of the Senior Bailiff. In open Court, this Court, viewed the photos and videos uploaded in the pen drive.

8. However, the learned counsel for the petitioners persisted in contending that the locks had been placed on the door of the shop premises and they were broken without specific orders. In support of the said submission, reliance was placed upon certain photographs annexed to the type-set of papers. A perusal of the photographs annexed at page no.52 do not disclose the date on which they were taken. In the absence of any indication as to the relevant point of time, it cannot be ascertained whether the locks were fixed prior to or subsequent to the delivery of possession. Consequently, in the absence of any cogent material to establish that the shop premises was locked before delivery, the contention advanced on behalf of the petitioner's cannot be accepted. Though the learned counsel disputed the statement of the Senior Bailiff, this Court in the absence of any material in support of the petitioner's contention is not inclined to disbelieve it.



CRP.No.6443 of 2025

WEB COPY

9. After considering the statement made by the Senior Bailiff in Court and her written submission that delivery was effected, the EP was terminated. This Court therefore finds no compelling reasons to interfere with the impugned order dated 21.06.2025 passed by the learned District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu.

10. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

10.03.2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking Order: Yes/No
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
dna

To

The District Munsif Court, Chengalpattu.



WEB COPY



CRP.No.6443 of 2025

N.MALA,J

dna

CRP.No.6443 of 2025

10.03.2026