



C.R.P(MD)No.3831 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: **02.02.2026**

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

C.R.P(MD) No.3831 of 2025

and

C.M.P(MD) No.20168 of 2025

1.G.Mohanmurali

2.K.Balajothi

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.Jagadeesan

2.Ramesh

3.Mahesh

4.Thamilazahan

5.Dr.R.Chokkaiyan

6.P.Lavankumar

... Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the fair and decreetal order passed by the Sub Judge, Vedasanthoor in I.A.No.3 of 2024 in O.S.No.129 of 2017 dated 29.08.2025.



C.R.P(MD)No.3831 of 2025

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Arulmurugan

For R2, R3 and R4 : M/s.R.K.Rajeshwari (Legal aid counsel)

For R5 : Mr.K.Muthukumar

For R6 : Mr.S.Harish

ORDER

The Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the fair and decreetal order, dated 29.08.2025 passed by the learned Sub Judge, Vedasanthoor, in I.A.No.3 of 2024 in O.S. No.129 of 2017, whereby the application filed by the revision petitioners to implead themselves as parties to the suit was dismissed.

2. M/s.R.K.Rajeshwari, learned Legal Aid Counsel appearing for the respondents 2 to 4 submitted that the dispute pertains only to a small extent of the suit schedule property and that the revision petitioners have no independent right to seek impleadment. It was further contended that the vendor of the revision petitioners is already a party to the suit and therefore, their interest is sufficiently represented.

3. The learned counsel for the revision petitioners submitted that since their vendor is already a party to the suit, the petitioners, who claim



C.R.P(MD)No.3831 of 2025

through the said vendor, have a subsisting interest in the subject property and their presence is necessary for effective adjudication of the issues involved.

4. This Court is of the view that the petitioners, claiming through their vendor who is already a party to the suit, have a direct interest in the subject matter and their right cannot be denied. Their presence would be necessary for complete and effective adjudication of the dispute. Hence, the finding of the trial Court that the petitioners are not necessary parties is not sustainable.

5. Accordingly, the order passed by the trial Court is set aside and the revision petitioners are impleaded as contesting defendants in the suit. Hence, this Civil Revision Petition is allowed. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. No costs.

6. This Court places on record its appreciation for the effective assistance rendered by the learned Legal Aid Counsel appearing on behalf of respondents 2 to 4. The High Court Legal Services Committee attached to this Bench is directed to pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- as additional



C.R.P(MD)No.3831 of 2025

remuneration to the said Legal Aid Counsel, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

02.02.2026

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

Indu

To

The Sub Judge, Vedasanthoor.



WEB COPY



C.R.P(MD)No.3831 of 2025

N.SENTHILKUMAR,J.

Indu

C.R.P(MD)No.3831 of 2025

02.02.2026