



C.R.P(MD) No.2807 of 2025

WEB COPY

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

This matter has been listed under the caption for being mentioned.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that in the order passed on 07.01.2026, in paragraph No.2, Section 8 of the Hindu Succession Act is found missing. Further, he has filed a memo stating that the first petitioner S.R.M.Packirirajan is died on 17.11.2025. However, the death of the first petitioner not reflected in the cause title portion.

3. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioners, Registry is directed to issue a revised order copy by printing the name of the first petitioner as **S.R.M.Packirirajan (Died)** instead of S.R.M.Packirirajan and by incorporating the following paragraph instead of paragraph No.2 of the order dated 07.01.2026 in CRP(MD) No.2807 of 2025.



WEB COPY

“ 2. The revision petitioners are the defendants 1 and 3 in the suit. The learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioners contended that the impugned order passed by the trial Court is not in consonance with the settled principles of law. He placed reliance on Section 8 of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 and the same is extracted hereunder:

8. General rules of succession in the case of males.-The property of a male Hindu dying intestate shall devolve according to the provisions of this Chapter:-

(a) firstly, upon the heirs, being the relatives specified in class I of the Schedule;

(b) secondly, if there is no heir of class I, then upon the heirs, being the relatives specified in class II of the Schedule;

(c) thirdly, if there is no heir of any of the two classes, then upon the agnates of the deceased; and (d) lastly, if there is no agnate, then upon the cognates of the deceased.

29.01.2026

Indu



WEB COPY



N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

Indu

C.R.P(MD) No.2807 of 2025

29.01.2026