



WEB COPY



C.R.P. No. 90 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Dr. JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

C.R.P. No. 90 of 2026

and

C.M.P. No. 312 of 2026

Chinnusamy

... Petitioner

Vs.

Karumana Gounder

... Respondent

Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and final order dated 20.09.2025 passed by the learned District Munsif, Paramathi in I.A.No.6 of 2025 in O.S.No.20 of 2017.

For Petitioner : Mr. L. Mouli
For Respondent : Mr. B. Jawahar

ORDER

The Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order of the learned District Munsif, Paramathi, dated 20.09.2025, passed in I.A. No. 6 of 2025 in O.S.No.20 of 2017.



WEB COPY

2. The revision petitioner, as plaintiff, had filed an application in I.A.No.6 of 2025 seeking production of certain documents by the VAO, along with permission to examine him as a witness. As the said application was dismissed, the revision petitioner has filed the present revision petition challenging the same.

3. The learned counsel for the revision petitioner submitted that the application was filed not only for production of documents but also for examining the witness. However, the learned trial Judge overlooked the said fact and dismissed the application in its entirety.

4. On perusal of the records, it is seen that the revision petitioner filed the application seeking production of documents, namely patta, chitta and 'A' register, and also to examine the VAO as a witness. On the face of it, these documents are public documents, for which the applicant could have applied for certified copies and obtained the same.

5. Even Rule 75(3) mandates that no summons shall be issued for the production of original documents unless the Court is satisfied that the party seeking such production has already filed an application and was



C.R.P. No. 90 of 2026

not furnished with the copies.

WEB COPY

6. In the instant case, the applicant has not taken any such steps by filing an application to obtain copies of the documents alleged by him. The Court has dismissed the application solely on the ground that the applicant failed to comply with the procedure prescribed before filing an application seeking production of public documents under Rule 75 of Civil Rules of Practice.

7. Though the application was filed seeking production of documents along with permission to examine the witness, examination of the witness would be consequential to the production of the documents. Once the Court has chosen not to allow the production of documents, granting permission to examine the witness becomes unnecessary.

8. As I find no procedural or legal infirmity in the order passed by the learned District Munsif, Paramathi, dated 20.09.2025, I do not feel that the revision petitioner has made out any ground to sustain the Civil Revision Petition.



C.R.P. No. 90 of 2026

WEB COPY

9. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

27.01.2026

AT

Index : Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

To

The District Munsif, Paramathi.



WEB COPY



C.R.P. No. 90 of 2026
Dr. R.N.MANJULA, J.

AT

C.R.P. No. 90 of 2026 and
C.M.P. No. 312 of 2026

27.01.2026