



C.R.P.No.63 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.63 of 2026
and
C.M.P.No.187 of 2026

S.Alagirisamy

... Petitioner

vs.

1.Shanthi Balaji Tatachari,
(Canada Passport No.GM889199),
Wife of Mr.Tatachari Balaji,
No.8812, Chalkstone Road, Chariotte, NC 28216,
Rep. by her Power of Attorney Agent,
Mrs.K.Kamala,
No.5/7, West Mada Street,
Srinagar Colony, Saidapet,
Chennai – 600015.

2.Tatachari Bajaji Ramanujam

... Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the Fair and Decretal Order made in M.P.No.4 of 2025 in R.L.T.O.P.no.466 of 2024 on the file of the learned XII Small Causes Court at Chennai dated 04.11.2025 by allowing this Civil Revision Petition.



C.R.P.No.63 of 2026

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Padmanabhan

WEB COPY

ORDER

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the XII Small Causes Court/Rent Court, Chennai allowing the application for impleadment filed by the 1st respondent herein seeking to implead her husband/2nd respondent herein as a 2nd petitioner in the petition for repossession filed by her against the petitioner under Section 21 (2) (a) of the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Rights and Responsibilities of Landlords and Tenants Act, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as 'TNRRLT Act' for brevity).

2. It is not in dispute the 1st respondent herein filed a petition for repossession against the petitioner under Section 21 (2) (a) of TNRRLT Act on the ground that the petitioner failed to enter into agreement as per the provisions of the said Act.

3. The 1st respondent was represented by her Power Agent-K.Kamala in the Rent Court proceedings. Now, the instant application has been filed by the 1st respondent seeking impleadment of the 2nd respondent as 2nd petitioner in the original petition on the ground that she settled the subject



C.R.P.No.63 of 2026

matter of the original petition in favour of the 2nd respondent. The said application was opposed by the petitioner. In spite of the same, the impleading application has been allowed by the Rent Court. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has come before this Court.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner vehemently contended that even before filing of main original petition, the subject property said to have been settled by the 1st respondent in favour of the 2nd respondent. Therefore, the original petition filed in the name of the 1st respondent was not maintainable and hence, the 1st respondent is not entitled to seek impleadment of 2nd respondent now.

5. It is settled law in order to maintain a petition for repossession under the provisions of TNRRRLT Act, the landlady need not be owner of the premises. If he or she is authorised to receive rent, they can very well maintain a petition for repossession. Therefore, merely because properties said to have been settled in favour of the 2nd respondent prior to main original petition, the petitioner is not entitled to complain that petition filed by the 1st respondent was not at all maintainable.



C.R.P.No.63 of 2026

6. Further, the impleadment of 2nd respondent in whose favour the subject property was settled by the 1st respondent will not cause any prejudice to the petitioner and the same will not affect the adjudication of the controversy involved in original petition. Therefore, I do not find anything to interfere with the impugned order passed by the Rent Court.

7. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected civil miscellaneous petition is closed.

08.01.2026

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
dm



C.R.P.No.63 of 2026

To

The XII Small Causes Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.63 of 2026

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

dm

C.R.P.No.63 of 2026

08.01.2026