

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 Friday of 10th Day of April 2026

I.A.No.8/2026 in OS.No.32/2018

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000033-2018)

...

S. Ameer Sahib

...Petitioner/Plaintiff

/Versus/

1. The District Collector, Tiruvallur

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruvallur

3. The Tahsildar, Tiruttani

4. S. Gopi

5. Venkatachalapathy

6. Radhakrishnan

7. Vasu

8. Nagaraj

...1 to 8 Respondents/1 to 8 Defendants

9. The BDO, Tiruvalangadu Panchayat

10. The Panchayat Primary Government School, Jageer Mangalam

11. The Chief Educational Officer, Tiruvallur

12. The District Educational Officer, Tiruvallur

... 9 to 12 Respondents/

Proposed 9 to 12 Defendants

This petition came up before me for final hearing on 30.03.2026 in the presence of M/s. A. Fazhurullaih, Counsel for Petitioner/ Plaintiff, M/s Government Pleader appeared for R1 to R3, R9 to R12 and R1 to R3, R9 to R12 were set exparty for not filing the counter, M/s. C.A. Natarajan, Counsel for 4 to 8 Respondents/4 to 8 Defendants. 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 1 Rule 10 of CPC to implead the proposed parties as 9 to 12 Defendants in the suit.

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

The petitioner's Senior advocate while filing this case, omitted the

proposed parties in this case. Fortunately the said Senior advocate died, now the present counsel informed that the proposed parties are the necessary parties in this case. Even though this suit is for bare injunction and disturbing party are enough, the proposed parties are having government building and they himself maintaining, expanding, renovating and implementing further. So Defendants 9 to 12 are most necessary parties to implead them as necessary parties in this suit. The petitioner has good and better title in this suit property. Hence this petition is filed.

2. The counter filed on behalf of the 4 to 8 Respondents in brief:-

The petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts of the case. The senior advocate omitted to include the proposed parties in this suit. This defendant filed written statement in which he stated that the government is the necessary parties. But the petitioner not cared about it. After 8 years, the petitioner wants to implead the proposed parties which is barred by limitation. So in this stage the above petition to implead them as parties is not lie as the suit is posted for argument after closing both side evidence. There is no bonafide merits in this petition. Hence the petition is liable to be dismissed.

3. Point for determination:

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

4. Heard both side. According to petitioner, the petitioner's previous counsel omitted to include the proposed parties who are the necessary parties in this case. So the R9 to R12 have to be implead as a necessary parties in this suit. Therefore the counsel for petitioner prays to allow this petition. The 4 to 8 Respondents resisted the petition by contending that after a lapse of 8 years, the petitioner wants to implead the proposed parties which is barred by limitation. There is no bonafide merits in this petition. Hence the counsel for respondents prays to dismiss this petition.

5. Heard both sides. On perusal of records, in this case both side evidence was closed on 14.11.2025 and this case was posted for argument. At the stage of argument, this petition was filed. Without any valid reasons petitioner filed this

petition. The main objection of the respondent is that after a lapse of 8 years, the petitioner wants to implead the proposed parties which is barred by limitation. This suit is filed in the year 2018 and pending for more than 8 years. Explanation given by the petitioner is not satisfactory. Even though considering the fact and circumstances of this case, this Court is of view that the proposed parties are the proper and necessary parties to the suit and they have to be impleaded for proper adjudication of the case. Hence, in the interest of justice, to prevent multiplicity of proceedings and for proper adjudication of the case, this petition has to be allowed on terms.

In the result, this petition is allowed on condition that the Petitioner has to pay a cost of Rs.1000/- to the 4 to 8 Respondents on or before 20.04.2026 failing which this petition stands dismissed. Call on 20.04.2026.

Dictated to my Steno – Typist, typed by her directly in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 10th day of April 2026.

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.

Petitioner and Respondents side Exhibits and witness: NIL

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.