



CRP(MD). No.171 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 27.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

**CRP(MD). No.171 of 2026
and
CMP(MD) No.682 of 2026**

1.Rajamanickam

2.Pandian

3.Kaviya

4.Saraswathi

5.Sathish

6.Yzhini

... Petitioners

Vs

1.S.Soundarrajan

2.S.Annadurai

3.Ranjini

4.Indhuji

5.The District Collector
District Collectorate
Pudukkottai.

1/8



CRP(MD), No.171 of 2026

6.The Tahsildar
Tahsildar Office
Manamelkudi.

7.The Sub Registrar
Sub Registrar Office
Manamelkudi.

... Respondents

PRAYER :-Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the impugned Judgment and Decree dated 25.10.2025 in CMA No.3 of 2025 on the file of the Principal District Court, Pudukkottai.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Paranjothi for
Mr.KBS.Law Office

For R5 to R7 : Mr.F.Deepak
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned
Special Government Pleader for the respondents 5 to 7.

2.This Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed
in C.M.A.No.3 of 2025, dated 25.10.2025, on the file of the Principal
District Court, Pudukkottai.



CRP(MD), No.171 of 2026

3.The petitioners are the defendants 1 to 4, 7 and 8 in the suit filed by the respondents 1 and 2/plaintiffs in O.S.No.148 of 2024 for declaration of documents bearing Doc.Nos.1910, 1911 and 1915, dated 15.11.2023, and the document bearing Doc.No.1998, dated 30.11.2023, as null and void and for permanent injunction. In that suit, the respondents 1 and 2/plaintiffs filed an application in I.A.No.3 of 2024 for interim injunction under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of CPC. The trial Court by its order dated 19.03.2025 had allowed the said application. Challenging the said order, the petitioners filed an appeal in C.M.A.No.3 of 2025. The said appeal was also dismissed. Challenging the same, the present Civil Revision Petition has been filed.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioners reiterated all the contentions set out in the memorandum of grounds of Revision and called upon this Court to set aside the impugned order and grant relief as prayed for.

5.Since no adverse order is going to be passed as against the respondents, notice to the respondents 1 to 4 is dispensed with.



CRP(MD), No.171 of 2026

6.It is to be noted that, admittedly, there is a dispute with regard to the title over the property in question pending between the parties. At this stage, the petitioners have come forward before this Court seeking declaration that the documents as mentioned above as null and void. When there exists a serious dispute with regard to the title between the parties, which is yet to be adjudicated in the main suit, the trial Court, upon considering the pleadings and materials placed before it, had granted an order of interim injunction, restraining the defendants from putting up any construction in the suit property until disposal of the suit. The defendants 1 to 4, 7 and 8/petitioners, being aggrieved by the said order of interim injunction, have preferred an appeal in C.M.A.No.3 of 2025 and the same was rightly entertained by the Court below, which is under challenge herein.

7.This Court finds that the question relating to title and possession of the suit property is a matter to be decided only after a full-fledged trial based on evidence. At the interlocutory stage, the trial Court has exercised its discretion by granting an order of temporary injunction in order to preserve the *status quo* of the property and to prevent any



CRP(MD), No.171 of 2026

irreversible change, such as construction, which may complicate the issues involved in the suit. Also, the order passed by the trial Court is a discretionary order, made on appreciation of the *prima facie* materials placed before it. Unless such discretion is seen to be arbitrary, perverse, or contrary to the settled principles governing the grant of interim injunction, the same does not warrant interference in the Revisional jurisdiction.

8. In the case on hand, the petitioners/defendants 1 to 4, 7 and 8 have not made out any valid ground to interfere with the order of the trial Court. Since the title dispute is still pending adjudication, permitting construction at this stage may alter the nature and character of the property and may lead to multiplicity of proceedings. Therefore, this Court finds no illegality or infirmity in the order passed by the trial Court granting interim injunction, which was also confirmed in the appellate stage.

9. The Civil Revision Petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid observations.



CRP(MD), No.171 of 2026

10.At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that there is possibility of settling the matter amicably between the parties and as such, prays this Court to issue appropriate direction to the trial Court to refer the matter for mediation.

11.In view thereof, the learned Principal District Judge, Pudukkottai, is hereby directed to refer the matter for mediation by fixing a particular date and if there is no settlement is made between the parties on the date to be specified, the Mediation Centre is directed to refer the matter back to the trial Court for continuation of trial.

No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

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

27.01.2026

To

1.The Principal District Judge, Pudukkottai.

6/8



CRP(MD), No.171 of 2026

2.The District Collector
District Collectorate
Pudukkottai.

3.The Tahsildar
Tahsildar Office
Manamelkudi.

4.The Sub Registrar
Sub Registrar Office
Manamelkudi.



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.171 of 2026

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

mm

CRP(MD). No.171 of 2026

27.01.2026