



WEB COPY

CRP No. 5904 of 2
and CMP No.29156 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-03-2026

CORAM

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

**CRP No. 5904 of 2025
and CMP No.29156 of 2025**

P.Jeeva

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. V. Haridoss
2. V.Natarajan
3. Prakash
4. The Sub Registrar
Sembium Register Office,
Chennai – 600 011.
5. The Tahsildar
Ayanavaram Tk office,
Ayanavaram, Chennai – 600 023.
6. The Assistant Engineer
Kolathur, Chennai – 600 099
7. V.Raj Kumar
8. K.Shanmugugam
9. Housing Development and
Finance Corporation Ltd
HDFC, 2nd Floor, ITC Centre 760 Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 002.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to set aside the order dated 18-08-2025 dismissing IA.No.3 of 2023 in OS.No.6000 of 2014 before the VII Assistant City Civil, Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY



For Petitioner(s): M.J.Jaseem Mohamed
For R1 & R2 : Mr.M.Saravana Kumar
For R4 & R5 : Mr.C.Sathish
Government Advocate
For R3 & R8 : No appearance
For R6 : Want Of Department Name
For R7 : No such person
For R9 : Mr.K.J.Parthasarathy

ORDER

Challenging the impugned order dated 18.08.2025 passed in I.A.No.3 of 2023 in O.S.No.6000 of 2014 on the file of the VII Asst. Judge City Civil, Court, Chennai, the revision has been preferred by a third party.

2. Before the Trial Court, the revision petitioner, as third party, filed an application to implead him as seventh defendant in the suit, as he is a purchaser of the portion of the suit property. The said application was dismissed by the Trial judge by holding that already the purchase made by the petitioner was cancelled by the District Registrar after due enquiry on 06.08.2025. Therefore, as on date he has no right to claim ownership over the property based on the alleged sale deed. Therefore, he is not a necessary party to the proceedings, accordingly, the said petition was dismissed. Aggrieved over the same, the present revision petition is filed.



WEB COPY

3. Heard Mr.M.J.Jaseem Mohamed, learned counsel for the revision petitioner, Mr.M.Saravana Kumar, learned counsel for the respondents 1 and 2, Mr.C.Sathish, learned Government Advocate for the respondents 4 & 5 and Mr.K.J.Parthasarathy, learned counsel for the ninth respondent.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as a bonafide purchaser, he purchased the property around 6000 sq.ft. from one Rajkumar / fifth defendant, represented by his Power of Attorney / sixth defendant through sale deed in Doc.No.1273/2016. Ever since he is in possession and enjoyment of the said property and he is also running a wind mill project and he has spent huge amount and he is a bonafide purchaser and he is a necessary party to the suit proceeding without which if the plaintiffs obtained any order, the same would cause grave prejudice and hardship to the revision petitioner and therefore, they want to implead but the court below failed to consider the same and also contended that the order of the District Registrar with regard to cancellation of the document cannot be considered at the stage and only after full fledged Trial, whether he is a bonafide purchaser or not could be the decided by the Civil Court. Therefore, he is necessary party to the proceedings.



5. The learned counsel appearing for the plaintiffs / respondents 1 and 2 raised objections stating that by fabricating the records he claimed right over the property to the alleged sale deed and admittedly the said sale deed was also cancelled by the said District Registrar. Therefore, as on date he has no right and title over the suit property nor can he make any claim based on the alleged sale deed. Therefore, he is not a necessary party to the proceedings which was rightly observed by the Trial judge.

6. Considering the submissions of both side, the fact reveals that the petitioner purchased property from the fifth defendant through Power Agent / sixth defendant through sale deed in Doc.No.1273/2016 and also in that property, he is doing wind mill project. According to the plaintiffs, the suit property is purchased way back in the year 2016, however through the sale deed he claimed as a bonafide purchaser. However, the District Registrar cancelled the sale deed in respect of the entire suit property including that of the revision petitioner. But as on date, whether he is a bonafide purchaser or not has to be decided by the civil court. Therefore, by adding him as party would not cause any prejudice. After full fledged trial, the right and title of the parties will be decided.



WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is Allowed. Therefore, the impugned order dated 18.08.2025 passed in I.A.No.3 of 2023 in O.S.No.6000 of 2014 on the file of the VII Asst. Judge City Civil, Court, Chennai, is set aside. No costs. Consequently, connected Civil Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

24-03-2026

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

MTL

To

1. The VII Asst. Judge City Civil, Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 5904 of 2
and CMP No.29156 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

MTL

**CRP No. 5904 of 2025
and CMP No.29156 of 2025**

24-03-2026