



C.R.P.No.165 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.165 of 2026

and

C.M.P.No.717 of 2026

1.Meenatchi Arvind

2.N.Arvind

... Petitioners

vs.

1.K.Ravikumar

2.K.Balachandran

3.K.Vijayakumar

4.D.Punithavathy

5.J.Revathy

6.Madhanika Madhavan

7.Kanchanamala

8.M.Muthukumar



C.R.P.No.165 of 2026

9.Vijayanthi Mala

10.Anusuya

11.S.Venkateswaran

... Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the order dated 06.11.2025 made in I.A.SR.No.60724 of 2024 in O.S.No.5473 of 2017 on the file of the Court of the XVII Additional City Civil Judge at Chennai and allow this Civil Revision Petition.

For Petitioners : Dr.A.Thiyagarajan
Senior Advocate
for M/s.A.Kanagasabapathy

ORDER

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the XVII Additional City Civil Judge, Chennai in I.A.SR.No.60724 of 2024 in O.S.No.5473 of 2017, dated 06.11.2025 rejecting the application filed by the petitioners seeking to prosecute the respondents for perjury.

2. The 1st respondent herein filed a suit for partition against the petitioners and other respondents. The petitioners herein claiming



C.R.P.No.165 of 2026

themselves as Agreement Holder under father of the 1st respondent-
K.Ravikumar.

3. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners vehemently contended that in the Sale Agreement entered between 1st respondent's father-Krishnamurthy and the 2nd petitioner, the respondents 1 and 2 signed as witnesses. However, they falsely claimed in the suit, as if they were not aware of the contents of the agreement. Therefore, the same would amount to perjury.

4. Whether the respondents 1 and 2 signed Suit Sale Agreement as a witness after knowing the contents of the agreement or not, is a matter to be decided based on evidence. The petitioners already raised the defence and suit for partition filed by the 1st respondent is pending. The rights of the parties have to be decided based on evidence in the main suit. Till the controversy between the parties is decided based on evidence by the Trial Court, we cannot come to a conclusion as to whether the respondents 1 and 2 signed Suit Sale Agreement after knowing the contents of the agreement. Therefore, the Trial Court rightly dismissed the application filed by the petitioners seeking to prosecute the respondent for perjury as pre-matured.



C.R.P.No.165 of 2026

I do not find any error in the impugned order passed by the XVII Additional City Civil Judge, Chennai in I.A.SR.No.60724 of 2024 in O.S.No.5473 of 2017, dated 06.11.2025.

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

19.01.2026

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



C.R.P.No.165 of 2026

To

The XVII Additional City Civil Judge, Chennai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.165 of 2026

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

dm

C.R.P.No.165 of 2026

19.01.2026