



CRP(MD). No.3918 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 05.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

CRP(MD). No.3918 of 2025

and

CMP(MD) No.20443 of 2025

Chella Nadachi

... Petitioner

Vs

1.Nisha

2.Harsha (Minor)

... Respondents

PRAYER :-Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to call for the records of the fair and decretal order passed in I.A.No.12 of 2025 in O.S.No.64 of 2023 dated 29-10-2025 on the file of the learned Principal Subordinate Judge Court, Eraniel and set aside the same.

For Petitioner

: Mr.K.Vamanan

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order made in I.A.No.12 of 2025 in O.S.No.64 of 2023 on the file of the Principal Subordinate Judge Court, Eraniel, dated 29.10.2025.



CRP(MD). No.3918 of 2025

WEB COPY

2.The petitioner/plaintiff has filed a suit in O.S.No.64 of 2023 for declaration and for partition as against the respondents/defendants. Pending suit, the petitioner/plaintiff filed an interlocutory application in I.A.No.12 of 2025 under Order XI Rule 14 of CPC for production of bank account statements of her deceased son, namely, Manikandan, from the respective banks for the period commencing from 01.01.2011 to 30.06.2025 and the said application was dismissed, vide order dated 29.10.2025. Challenging the same, the present Civil Revision Petition has been filed.

3.It is the main contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that when the petitioner's son, Manikandan, was undergoing treatment for cancer, the first respondent/who is the wife of the deceased, used the amount from the savings bank account of the petitioner's son and not from her own pocket. To prove such contention, it is necessary to produce the bank account statements of her deceased son, Manikandan, from the respective banks for the aforesaid period. However, the trial Court, without considering the facts and circumstances of the case



CRP(MD). No.3918 of 2025

properly, had dismissed the application, which warrants interference of this Court. He would therefore pray for appropriate orders.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner. Since no adverse order is going to be passed as against the respondents, notice to the respondents is dispensed with.

5. I perused the entire records. From the perusal of the order impugned herein, it is seen that the petitioner sought production of bank account statements of her deceased son, namely, Manikandan, in an application filed under Order 11 Rule 14 CPC. The trial Court rightly held that the petitioner has not at all explained as to why she had approached the Court for production of such bank account statements, when the same can be secured by her by properly approaching the bank authorities. The order is in line with settled principles.

6. Further, Order 11 Rule 14 CPC requires sufficient grounds for production of documents. The trial Court considered the petitioner's application and found no justification for production of the bank account



CRP(MD). No.3918 of 2025

statements. The trial Court rightly applied the principles laid down under Order 11 Rule 14 CPC, requiring the petitioner to show relevance and necessity. The petitioner did not make out a case for interference with the order impugned herein, which does not suffer from any infirmity and is valid.

7.In fine, the Civil Revision Petition stands dismissed for want of merits. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

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

05.01.2026

To

The Principal Subordinate Judge, Eraniel.



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.3918 of 2025

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

mm

CRP(MD). No.3918 of 2025

05.01.2026