

**IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF, TIRUTTANI**

**Present : Tmt. R.D. Gurulakshmi, M.A., M.L., P.G.D.I & C.L.,**

**District Munsif, Tiruttani.**

Dated the Thursday of 7<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2025

I.A.No.3/2025 in OS.No.34/2020

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000047-2020)

Samidoss

... Petitioner /Proposed defendant No.5

/Versus/

1. S. Venkatesan

2. V. Jagadesh

3. V. Kavitha

... 1 to 3 Respondents/Plaintiffs

4. M. Naresh

5. The Tahsidar, Tiruttani

6. Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruttani

7. The District Collector, Tiruvallur

...4 to 7 Respondents/ Defendants

This petition came up before me for the final hearing on 16.07.2025 in the presence of M/s. R. Rajeshwara Babu, S.V. Sandhya, Advocates for Petitioner/Proposed defendant, M/s.C.A. Natarajan, Advocates for 1 to 3 Respondents/ Plaintiffs, R4 exparty in suit, M/s. Government Pleader for 5 to 7 Respondents/ 2 to 4 defendants, counter not filed, hence R5 to R7 were set exparty. Upon hearing both sides and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

This petition is filed under Order 8 Rule 1A(3) to receive the additional document.

**1. The averments of the petition in brief are as follows:-**

The petition mentioned documents could not be filed at the time of filing written statement since some of the documents were traced recently. As per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras. The petitioner has given his representation before the 3 to 5 respondents. The said 3 to 5 respondent takings steps to remove the encroachment. This High court order as a documentary evidence. It is a necessary documents to prove his case. These documents are essential document to prove his case for complete adjudication. Therefore the petitioner filed this petition.

**2. The counter filed on behalf of the Respondents No.1 to 3 in brief:-**

This petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts of the case. The Suit

property is Anadeenam land is true and he land in S.No.122/4 and 122/7 is extent of 0.84 cent is not known to them. He has constructed house in a limited extent and living for more than statutory period. He is paying house tax in his name. The petitioner has no right or possession over the suit property. There is no bonafide merit in this petition. Hence this petition is liable to be dismissed.

**3. Point for determination:**

Whether the petitioner is entitled to the relief as sought for? or not?

4. According to petitioner, the petitioner obtained the petition document recently. Hence the petitioner prays to allow this petition. The 1 to 3 Respondents resisted the petition by contending that the petitioner has no right or possession over the suit property. There is no bonafide merit in this petition. Hence the respondents pray to dismiss this petition.

5. Heard both sides. On perusal of record, on 05.11.2024 defendants side evidence closed and the case was posted on 15.11.2024 for arguments. From 21.11.2024 to 05.03.2025 the case was adjourned for argument. On 05.03.2025 at the stage of argument the petitioner filed this petition to receive the additional documents. Even though considering the fact and circumstances, no prejudice would be caused to the respondents, as the respondents will have opportunities to cross examine the witness as to the document sought to be filed by the petitioner. Hence, in the interest of justice, to prevent multiplicity of proceedings, to provide the petitioners an opportunity to prove his case and for proper adjudication of the case, this petition has to be allowed.

In the result, this petition is allowed. No cost.

Dictated to my Steno – Typist, typed by her directly in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 7<sup>th</sup> day of August 2025.

District Munsif,  
Tiruttani.

Petitioner and Respondents side Exhibits and witness: NIL

District Munsif,  
Tiruttani.