



C.R.P.(MD)No.406 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 21.01.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE **N.SENTHILKUMAR**

C.R.P.(MD)No.406 of 2023

1.Maruthasamy
2.Subbammal

... Petitioners

-VS-

Navamani

... Respondent

PRAYER:- Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and deceetal order dated 16.06.2022 in I.A. No. 225 of 2021 in O.S. No. 20 of 2012 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Keeranur and allow this CRP.

For Petitioners : Ms. A.Banumathy

For Respondent : Mr. G.Sridharan

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition invoking Article 227 of the Constitution of India, arises out of the order, dated 16.06.2022 in I.A.No.225 of 2021 in O.S. No. 20 of 2012 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Keeranur (hereinafter referred to as the 'Trial Court' for short). The parties are hereinafter referred to as per their description in the suit in O.S.No.20 of 2012 before the Trial Court for the sake of clarity and convenience.



C.R.P.(MD)No.406 of 2023

2. Heard Ms.A.Banumathy, learned Counsel appearing for the defendants and Mr.G.Sridharan, learned Counsel appearing for the plaintiff and perused the materials placed on record, apart from the pleadings of the parties.

3.The Plaintiff had filed a suit in O.S.No.20 of 2012 before the Trial Court, in which the defendants remained *ex parte*, and the relief sought in the suit had been granted by judgment and decree dated 09.08.2018. Subsequently, the defendants had filed an unnumbered application before the Trial Court to set aside that *ex parte* decree under Rule 13 of Order IX of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (hereinafter referred to as 'the CPC' for short), along with an application in I.A.No.225 of 2021 to condone the delay of 553 days in filing it under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, which has been dismissed by the impugned order and has been challenged by the defendants in this Civil Revision Petition.

4.At this juncture, it must be highlighted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Koushik Mutually Aided Co-operative Housing Society -vs- Ameena Begum*** (Order dated 01.12.2023 in Civil Appeal @ Special Leave Petition (C) No. 5489 of 2021) has laid down the dictum that only an appeal under Rule 1(d) of Order XLIII of the CPC, would have to be preferred against



C.R.P.(MD)No.406 of 2023

an order refusing to set aside an *ex parte* decree in a suit, even when the application to condone the delay in filing it has been dismissed. It is found upon the premise that when the application to condone the delay in filing the application to set aside the *ex parte* decree gets dismissed, it would logically follow that the application to set aside the *ex parte* decree under Rule 13 of Order IX of the CPC also stands automatically dismissed, whether or not, a specific order is actually passed in that regard. It would be evident on a plain reading of Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, that it does not require filing of a separate application to condone the delay in filing an application, though there has been a long standing requirement in the Courts across the State of Tamil Nadu insisting for it. In this context, it would be relevant to notice that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***N.Balaji -vs- Virendra Singh*** [(2004) 8 SCC 312] has held that when power to condone delay has been conferred by a statute, such power could be exercised even without a separate application for it, in the absence of a mandate to the contrary. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***A.Venkatasubbiah Naidu -vs- S.Chellapan*** [(2000) 7 SCC 695] has held that in an appeal under Rule 1 of Order XLIII of the CPC would lie against the inaction of the Trial Court to dispose an application for temporary injunction under Rule 3-A of Order XXXIX of the CPC within thirty days treating it as a deemed order.



C.R.P.(MD)No.406 of 2023

WEB COPY

5. On an conspectus of the aforesaid principles, it must be held that when an application to condone the delay in filing an application to set aside a *ex parte* decree is dismissed, it shall be treated as an order rejecting the application under Rule 13 of Order IX of the CPC to set aside the *ex parte* decree that would be appealable under Rule 1(d) of Order XLIII of the CPC before the concerned Appellate Court. In view of the aforesaid authoritative pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, which now holds the field, the defendants have to be relegated to file such appeal, and it would not be possible for them to pursue a Civil Revision Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for it, though such practice has been prevalent all along in this Court.

6. In the result, the Civil Revision Petition is disposed with the aforesaid observation. No costs.

21.01.2026

Index : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No
cmr

Note: Registry is directed to return the original impugned order, if any under written acknowledgment after retaining a copy of the same for record.



C.R.P.(MD)No.406 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The District Munsif Court, Keeranur.
- 2.The Section Officer,
Vernacular Records Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.406 of 2023

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

cmr

C.R.P.(MD)No.406 of 2023

21.01.2026