



CRP(MD). No.2788 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 09.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

C.R.P(MD). No.2788 of 2025

and

C.M.P(MD) Nos.16243 and 18076 of 2025

Muthukumar

... Petitioner

Vs

Anbu

... Respondent

PRAYER :-Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decree order made in R.L.T.A.No.16 of 2024 against I.A.No.3 of 2024 in R.L.T.O.P.No.31 of 2023 on the file of the III Additional District Judge, Trichirappalli, dated 01.07.2025, by confirming the order made in I.A.No.3 of 2024 in R.L.T.O.P.No.31 of 2023 on the file of the Principal District Munsif, Trichirappalli, dated 22.03.2024 by allowing this revision.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Sundar

For Respondent : Mr.H.Lakshmi Shankar



CRP(MD). No.2788 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the dismissal order dated 01.07.2025 passed in R.L.T.A.No.16 of 2024, arising out of I.A.No.3 of 2024 in R.L.T.O.P.No.31 of 2023 on the file of the III Additional District Judge, Tiruchirappalli.

2. The trial Court dismissed the application relating to the marking of documents, namely, the Bokkiam Agreement dated 25.05.2022. The matter arises under the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Rights and Responsibilities of Landlords and Tenants Act, 2017.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner contended that the respondent cannot claim himself to be the landlord, as the petitioner had paid an amount to the vendor of the respondent/landlord. It was further submitted that when the petitioner sought to mark the said document, the same was rejected, and therefore, the present Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the said rejection.



CRP(MD). No.2788 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent submitted that the application itself is not maintainable in view of the specific statutory bar under Section 21(2)(b) read with Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Rights and Responsibilities of Landlords and Tenants Act, 2017. It was further pointed out that the revision petitioner has already filed a suit in O.S.No.436 of 2023 before the District Court, Tiruchirappalli, seeking recovery of a sum of Rs.32,00,000/-. In addition, the revision petitioner has also preferred an appeal challenging the very same order before the Rent Landlord Tribunal Authority (R.L.T.A.), which order is now under challenge before this Court.

5. It is well settled that the maintainability of a revision to question the title of the landlord cannot be gone into under the provisions of the Act, particularly in the absence of any material to establish the existence of a jural relationship of landlord and tenant between the revision petitioner and the respondent. In the present case, the revision petitioner has failed to place any material to establish such a relationship.



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.2788 of 2025

6. Hence, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed for want of merits. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. No costs.

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

09.01.2026

Indu

To

The learned III Additional District Judge, Trichirappalli.



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.2788 of 2025

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

Indu

CRP(MD). No.2788 of 2025

09.01.2026