



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-03-2026

CORAM

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

**CRP No. 6326 of 2025
and CMP No.31381 of 2025**

M.Suchitra,
D/o.K.Mani,
No.9/10 C4, First Floor,
Mahaniyum Apartments,
Arunachalapuram Street,
Aminjikarai, Chennai -600 029.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

S.Shiva,
S/o.Selvarajan,
No.7/18, Second Floor,
Infinity Apartments,
Kaveri Street,
Devi Karumariamman Nagar,
Velachery, Chennai -600 042.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to set aside the condition imposed in the Order dated 19.08.2025 in I.A.No.6 of 2025 in O.P.No.3995 of 2019 passed by the I Additional Family Court, Chennai, which restricts the scope of cross-examination of PW-1 only to the documents filed by the Wife and pass such further or other orders as this Honourable Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.J.R.K.Bhavanandham

For Respondent(s): Mr.G.V. Sridharan



ORDER

Challenging the impugned order dated 19.08.2025 in I.A.No.6 of 2025 in O.P.No.3995 of 2019 passed by the I Additional Family Court, Chennai, which restricts the scope of cross-examination of PW-1 only to the documents filed by the Wife, present Civil Revision Petition has been filed by the wife.

2. Before the trial court, he filed an application to recall PW1 and the same was granted with limited scope to cross examine with regard to the documents as per the order in IA No.7 of 2025. Aggrieved by the restricted permission granted, the wife has preferred this revision.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that they want to cross examine with regard to the documents and also connected circumstances to the documents. But the trial judge restricted the cross examination only with regard to the documents alone, as such is not acceptable. By way of reply, the counsel appearing for the respondent / husband submits that already PW1 evidence was closed long back and now the case was posted for arguments at the stage he come forward with such application. The learned counsel further submits that after production of the documents, necessity arose for that to cross examine PW1. Therefore, she filed the application.



4. As on date, to give one more opportunity, she is permitted to cross examine PW1 by recalling him probably in the first week of English Calendar month during working day for all the trial courts and she is also instructed to cross examine PW1 at first instance or second instance or more than that PW1 need not be recalled and the revision petitioner being the wife also instructed to cooperate with the trial proceedings and the trial judge is directed to dispose the original petition within three months. However, already revision petitioner has also filed the application to recall herself, which is also pending before the trial court. The trial judge shall take up both applications, give opportunity to both the parties and complete the trial proceedings within three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected Civil Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

25-03-2026

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

To
1. The I Additional Family Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 6326 of 2
and CMP No.31381 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

MTL

**CRP No. 6326 of 2025
and CMP No.31381 of 2025**

25-03-2026