



C.R.P. No.17 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 07.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P. No.17 of 2026

and

C.M.P. No.44 of 2026

Skylakha
W/o. Durai Kumar,
No.3, Dr.Mu.Va.Street, Arumbakkam,
Chennai - 600 106.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.Indira
W/o Sivaprakasam, No 230/B, 2nd
Block, 37th Cross Street, Rajaji Nagar,
Bangalore, Karnataka.

2.Thiripurasundari
W/o. Mathiyazhagan, No.16, Nethaji
Street, Chithambaram Taluk,
Cuddalore District.

3.Dharmambal
W/o. Vaseegan, No.565, Senthangudi
Main Road, Vilanthida Samuthiram,
Sirkali Taluk, Mayiladuthurai District.

4.Bharathi
W/o. Ganesan, Thenpathi Pappaiya
Nagar, Sirkali Taluk, Mayiladuthurai
District.

5.The Sub Registrar Office,



C.R.P. No.17 of 2026

Sub Registrar, Sirkali Taluk,
Mayiladuthurai District..

6.The Tahsildar Office,
The Tahsildar, Sirkali Taluk,
Mayiladuthurai District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India praying to set aside the order dated 29.09.2025 passed in I.A. No.3 of 2024 in OS No.105 of 2023 on the file of Subordinate Judge, Sirkali.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr.P.Kumaresan
Senior Advocate
for Mr.A.D.Janarthanan

For Respondent(s) : Mr.N.Muthuvel
Government Advocate (for R5 & R6)

ORDER

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Trial Court dismissing the application filed by the petitioner seeking deletion of his name from the array of parties.

2. The respondents 1 and 2 filed a suit against the petitioner and other respondents. One of the prayer in the suit was to declare the sale deed executed in favour of the petitioner/ 2nd defendant in the Suit as null and void and the plaintiff also sought for a prayer that subsequent sale deed executed by the petitioner/ 2nd defendant in favour of the 3rd defendant be declared as null and void.

3. The learned Senior Counsel for revision petitioner submitted that the



C.R.P. No.17 of 2026

petitioner already parted with his interest in the suit property in favour of 3rd defendant and hence he is not a necessary party to the Suit.

4. Since the sale deed executed in favour of the petitioner as well as the sale deed executed by the petitioner in favour of the 3rd defendant are challenged in the Suit, the petitioner is a necessary party to the Suit and the Trial Court has rightly dismissed the I.A. seeking deletion of petitioner's name from the array of parties.

5. I do not find any serious error in the order passed by the Trial Court. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

07.01.2026

Speaking (or) Non Speaking Order

Index : Yes/ No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

mka

To:

1.The Sub-ordinate Judge,
Sirkali.

2.The Sub Registrar Office
Sub Registrar, Sirkali Taluk,
Mayiladuthurai District.

3.The Tahsildar Office
The Tahsildar, Sirkali Taluk,
Mayiladuthurai District.



WEB COPY



C.R.P. No.17 of 2026

S. SOUNTHAR, J.

mka

C.R.P. No.17 of 2026

07.01.2026