



REV APLW(MD).Nos.104 and 105 of 2019

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 11.02.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

REV.APLC(MD)Nos.104 and 105 of 2019

in

S.A.MD)Nos.261 and 262 of 2012

1.Gangadevi

2.Kumudha

... Petitioners in REV.APLC(MD)No.104 of 2019

1.Kumudha

2.Gangadevi

... Petitioners in REV.APLC(MD)No.105 of 2019

vs.

1.Venugopal

2.Kannan

3.Logakannan

4.Vedavalli

5.Renuka

6.Krishnaprashath

1/6



REV APLW(MD).Nos.104 and 105 of 2019

7.Deepaga
(R5 to R7 have been impleaded vide
order dated 20.11.2024)

... Respondents in REV.APLC(MD)No.104 of 2019

1.Venugopal

2.Logakannan

3.Kannan

4.Vedavalli

5.Renuka

6.Krishnaprashath

7.Deepaga
(R5 to R7 have been impleaded vide
order dated 20.11.2024)

... Respondents in REV.APLC(MD)No.105 of 2019

COMMON PRAYER: Review Applications filed under Order XLVII Rule 1 and 2 of CPC., to review the judgment and decree passed in S.A. (MD) Nos.261 and 262 of 2012 on the file of this Court, dated 01.04.2015.

REV.APLC(MD)No.104 of 2019:

For Petitioners : Party-in-person

For R1 & R4 to R7: Ms.Shwathini
legal aid counsel



REV APLW(MD).Nos.104 and 105 of 2019

For R3 : died
For R2 : No appearance
For R5 : Mr.R.Murali

REV.APLC(MD)No.105 of 2019:

For Petitioners : Party-in-person
For R4 : No appearance

COMMON ORDER

These Review Applications have been filed to review the judgment made in S.A.(MD) Nos.261 and 262 of 2012, dated 01.04.2015.

2.When the matter is taken up for hearing today, it is submitted that the petitioners/party-in-person have not served the papers upon the Court appointed legal aid counsel as well as the other counsel appearing for the respective respondents.

3.When the same was questioned to the petitioners/party-in-person, they refused to serve the papers upon the respective counsel stating that they are not in a position to take copies of the typed set of papers and to serve the same upon the respective counsel, as they are facing some difficulty.



WEB COPY

4.The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Shri Ram Sahu (Dead) through Legal Representatives and Others vs. Vinod Kumar Rawat and Others*** reported in ***(2021) 13 SCC 1***, referring to an earlier Full Bench decision in ***Shivdev Singh vs. State of Punjab*** reported in ***AIR 1963 SC 1909*** has noted that:

"the power of review may be exercised on the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the person seeking the review or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made; it may be exercised where some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record is found; it may also be exercised on any analogous ground. But, it may not be exercised on the ground that the decision was erroneous on merits."

5.In such view of the matter and also considering the fact that from the perusal of papers, it is seen that the grounds raised by the petitioners/party-in-person to review the judgment made in S.A.(MD) Nos. 261 and 262 of 2012, dated 01.04.2015, are factual in nature and the petitioners/party-in-persons have not even come forward to serve the



REV APLW(MD).Nos.104 and 105 of 2019

papers upon the respective counsel, this Court is not inclined to entertain these Review Applications.

6.In fine, these Review Applications stand dismissed. No costs.

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

11.02.2026

mm



WEB COPY



REV APLW(MD).Nos.104 and 105 of 2019

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

mm

REV.APLW(MD)Nos.104 and 105 of 2019

11.02.2026