



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1245 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10-03-2026

CORAM

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

**CRP No. 1245 of 2026
and C.M.P.No.6135 of 2026**

S.Vinoth

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.P.Venkateswaran
2. S.Muthuganesh
3. M.Saravanan
4.P.Jeganathan

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India seeking direction to set aside the Fair Order and Decretal order dated 05.03.2025 passed in I.A.No.10 of 2024 in O.S.No.5283 on the file learned II Additional District Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.C.Vigneswaran

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed to set aside the Fair Order and Decretal order dated 05.03.2025 passed in I.A.No.10 of 2024 in O.S.No.5283 on the file of learned II Additional District Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner/1st defendant is no way connected with the alleged transaction with the plaintiff and also he has not received any car from the plaintiff and therefore there is no



cause of action against him. Further, there is no document to show that the defendants 1 to 3 guaranteed for repayment of loan. Hence, there is no cause of action for the above suit and the 1st defendant prayed to reject the plaint. However the learned II Additional District Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai has dismissed I.A.No.10 of 2024 holding that issue raised by the defendant can be decided only after a full fledged trial. Aggrieved by the same, the present revision petition has been filed.

3. On perusal of records, it appears that the plaintiff come forward with the suit against four defendants with very many allegations and also prayed for permanent prohibitory injunction, permanent mandatory injunction and also for recovery of money. But all the transactions were denied by the first defendant. Further, it is seen from the plaint that the plaintiff had made many allegations against the defendants and has also stated various dates and events relating to the purchase of the car, loan transaction and payment of EMI. All the allegations are denied by the first defendant on the ground that he had no transaction with the plaintiff. If at all such transactions are disputed, the same has to be decided only before the trial Court which is beyond the scope of Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the trial Court has rightly dismissed I.A.No.10 of 2024 which requires no interference.



4. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

10-03-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

sma

To

II Additional District Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai



WEB COPY

CRP No. 1245 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

sma

CRP No. 1245 of 2026

10-03-2026