



C.R.P(MD)No.762 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 02.04.2026

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN**

C.R.P(MD)No.762 of 2026
and
CMP(MD) No.3474 of 2026

T.Chandra

... Petitioner

vs.

1.M.Paramaraj

2.M.Nagaraj

3.P.Vijayalakshmi

4.A.Chitra

5.G.Nagalakshmi

6.G.Monisha

7.T.Mayee

8.The President
Azhgarnayakkanpatti Panchayat
Melamangalam Village
Periyakulam
Theni District.

9.The Superintending Engineer
Tamil Nadu Electricity Distribution Theni Circle



C.R.P(MD)No.762 of 2026

Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution
Corporation Limited
Tamil Nadu.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set-aside the Petition and order passed in I.A.No.4 of 2026 in O.S.No.201 of 2024 dated 13.02.2026 passed by the Learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Periyakulam.

For Petitioner : Ms.M.Mahalakshmi
For R9 : Mr.B.Ramanathan
standing counsel
For R1 : Mr.K.Gani Kalyan Rao

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition challenges the imposition of cost by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge at Periyakulam on 13.02.2026.

2.I heard Ms.M.Mahalakshmi for the Civil Revision Petitioner, Mr.K.Gani Kalyan Rao for the first respondent and Mr.B.Ramanathan, standing counsel, for the 9th respondent.



C.R.P(MD)No.762 of 2026

WEB COPY

3.I called for a report from the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge at Periyakulam as to who was responsible for the adjournments on 05.01.2026, 12.01.2026 and 21.01.2026. It is not in dispute that on 13.02.2026, the counsel for the Civil Revision Petitioner had sought adjournment.

4.It is the case of Ms.Mahalakshmi that the Civil Revision Petitioner did not ask for adjournment on the first three dates of hearing, but she concedes that adjournment was sought on 13.02.2026 for making submissions. She urged that imposition of cost for asking adjournment on one occasion is excessive.

5.Taking into consideration the plea raised by Ms.Mahalakshmi, I issued notice to the contesting respondent. Mr.K.Gani Kalyan Rao has entered appearance for the first respondent. He states that consistently the suit is being dragged on by the Civil Revision Petitioner. Originally, the defendants were set *ex parte* and the *ex parte* order was set aside on 17.11.2025 and on the very same day, the plaintiff had made submissions on the application filed for return of plaint.



C.R.P(MD)No.762 of 2026

WEB COPY

6.He further adds that the matter was adjourned thereafter only at the instance of the Civil Revision Petitioner. He pleads that the first respondent, Mr.Paramaraj, is an Octogenarian and has been forced to travel from Madurai to Theni for every date of hearing. It was, taking into consideration all those circumstances, that the Court had imposed cost of Rs.3,000/-. He states that the imposition of cost is reasonable. In addition, he adds that the intention of the Civil Revision Petitioner is only to drag on the matter and not argue the application filed for return of plaint.

7.I have carefully considered the submissions made by both sides. I have gone through the records as well as the report submitted by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge at Periyakulam.

8.Ms.Mahalakshmi states that it is not the intention of the Civil Revision Petitioner to seek time.

9.The learned Trial Judge had imposed costs, taking into consideration that the matter had been adjourned for four times and the Civil Revision Petitioner did not make submissions. Since Ms.Mahalakshmi states that, on the next date of hearing, submissions will be made and that



C.R.P(MD)No.762 of 2026

the Civil Revision Petitioner will co-operate for disposal of the proceedings,

I am inclined to order this revision on the following conditions:-

i) On **15.04.2026**, the Civil Revision Petitioner shall make her submissions.

ii) In case on **15.04.2026**, the Civil Revision Petitioner does not make her submissions, the cost imposed by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge at Periyakulam would not only revive, but it will be enhanced to Rs.10,000/-. Further, if arguments are not addressed, the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge at Periyakulam, is requested to close the petition and reserve orders in the same.

iii) If the submissions are made on **15.04.2026**, the cost will stand deleted.

No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Index :Yes / No
Internet :Yes / No
NCC :Yes / No

02.04.2026

To

The Additional District and Sessions Judge, Periyakulam.



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.762 of 2026

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

mm

C.R.P(MD)No.762 of 2026

02.04.2026