



CRP(MD). No.2615 of 2022

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.2615 of 2022

and

C.M.P(MD) No.12766 of 2022

1.Ramila

2.Kannan

3.Gunavathi

4.Menaka

5.Manjula

6.Ganesan

7.Vanniappan

... Petitioners

Vs

1.Pushpavalli

2.Pottimuthu

3.Narayanamurthy

4.Moolaporul

...Respondents



CRP(MD). No.2615 of 2022

PRAYER:-Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to call for the records relating to the impugned fair and decreetal order dated 01.11.2022 and made in I.A.No.3 of 2022 in O.S.No.14 of 2019 on the file of the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thiruppuvanam and to set aside the same and allow this petition.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Mohammed Parvesh
for Mr.V.Janakiramalu

For R2 to R4 : Mr.Vijayakumar
for Mr.V.Nagendran

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the impugned order, dated 01.11.2022 passed in I.A.No.3 of 2022 in O.S.No. 14 of 2019 on the file of the District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Thiruppuvanam.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the revision petitioners are the defendants in the suit and they filed an application seeking appointment of an Advocate Commissioner to obtain an expert opinion for comparing the signatures found in Ex.B.1 and Ex.B.2.



CRP(MD). No.2615 of 2022

3. Mr.Vijayakumar, learned counsel appearing for the respondent, submitted that Ex.B.1 contains both a signature and a thumb impression, whereas Ex.B.2 does not contain the thumb impression of one Rasu and Mani. Therefore, comparison of the documents is not feasible.

4. The said factum was rightly taken into consideration by the trial Court. The only point for consideration is whether, while seeking expert opinion for comparison of signatures, the applicant has produced a contemporaneous and comparable document.

5. According to the revision petitioners, they seek comparison of the signatures found in Ex.B.1 and Ex.B.2. However, the trial Court has rightly observed that the thumb impression of Rasu, which is available in Ex.B.1, is not found in Ex.B.2. In the absence of such comparable material, the request to send the documents for expert opinion does not arise.

6. This Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the order passed by the trial Court.



CRP(MD). No.2615 of 2022

7. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed.

Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. No costs.

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

09.01.2026

Indu



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.2615 of 2022

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

Indu

CRP(MD). No.2615 of 2022

09.01.2026