



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1099 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 17.04.2026

CORAM

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

C.R.P.(MD)No.1099 of 2026

and

C.M.P.(MD)No.5168 of 2026

Muthukumar

... Petitioner

vs.

Anbu

... Respondent

**PRAYER:** Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decreetal order made in I.A.No.13 of 2026 in R.L.T.O.P.No.31 of 2023 on the file of Principal District Munsif, Trichirappalli, dated 18.02.2026, by allowing this Civil Revision Petition.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Sundar

For Respondent : Mr.Suriya Narayanan  
For Mr.S.Saravana Kumar

### **ORDER**

Heard Mr.R.Sundar for the Civil Revision Petitioner and Mr.Suriya Narayanan representing Mr.S.Saravana Kumar for the respondent.



C.R.P.(MD)No.1099 of 2026

2. The civil revision petitioner is the tenant and the respondent is the landlord.

3. The tenant's attempt to implead the erstwhile landlord was nixed by the learned Principal District Munsif cum Rent Court at Tiruchirappalli. Hence, this revision.

4. R.L.T.O.P.No.31 of 2023 has been presented for eviction on the grounds of failure to enter into an agreement (Section 21(2)(a)) and wilful default (Section 21(2)(b)). Counter has been filed and the matter has proceeded for trial.

5. At that stage, the tenant filed an application in I.A.No.13 of 2026, to implead the erstwhile landlord to the proceedings. The plea being that the tenant had entered into a lease agreement with the erstwhile landlord and that he had paid a sum of Rs.32,00,000/- to him. Despite the same, the erstwhile landlord had sold the property to the present landlord. In order to bring forth this fact to the Court, the tenant filed an application to implead the erstwhile landlord.

6. This application was stoutely opposed by the landlord stating that the presence of the erstwhile landlord is neither essential nor



C.R.P.(MD)No.1099 of 2026

necessary. The learned Rent Controller agreed with the landlord and dismissed the petition. Hence, the revision.

7. Mr.R.Sundar reiterated the contentions raised in the Court below. In addition, he added that there is a document evidencing the payment of Rs.32,00,000/- by the tenant to the erstwhile landlord. It was in those circumstances that he seeks impleading.

8. I have carefully considered the submissions of both sides and have gone through the records.

9. This is a simple case of eviction invoking Act 42 of 2017. The scope of the grounds raised is specific, namely, Sections 21(2)(a) and 21(2)(b). Such proceedings cannot be expanded to include claims that the tenant may have had against his erstwhile landlord. Such claims must be agitated in separate proceedings. If such kind of impleadments are permitted, perhaps, the tenant may seek to implead the Almighty himself; followed by the Nawab of Arcot, and even Queen Victoria, who, at some point in the distant past, were ruling as sovereigns over Tiruchirappalli.



C.R.P.(MD)No.1099 of 2026

10. The petition itself is vexatious and has been rightly dismissed by the Trial Court. If the tenant has any grievance against his erstwhile landlord, it is for him to work out his rights separately before a Civil Court, and not try to muddle the clear waters flowing before the Rent Controller.

11. With the above observations, the Civil Revision Petition stands **dismissed**. No cost. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

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

**17.04.2026**

To:

The Principal District Munsif, Trichirappalli.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.(MD)No.1099 of 2026

**V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.**

Nsr

Order made in  
C.R.P(MD)No.1099 of 2026

17.04.2026