

**IN THE COURT OF THE I ADDITIONAL SUBORDINATE JUDGE,
VILLUPURAM.**

PRESENT : Tr.S.Muthu Murugan, B.A., B.L., LL.M.,

I Additional Subordinate Judge, Villupuram.

Friday the 05th day of June 2026

IA.No.138/2026

in

OS.No.313/2025

(CNR.No.TNVP02-002532-2024)

Rajavel

..... Petitioner/Plaintiff

//Vs//

1. Ramkumar
2. Premkumar
3. The District Registrar,
Registration Department,
Villupuram District,
Villupuram.
4. The Sub-Registrar,
The Sub-Registrar Office,
Thiruvannainallur Taluk,
Villupuram District.
5. The District Collector,
Villupuram District,
Villupuram.
6. The Tahsildar,
Thiruvannainallur Taluk,
Villupuram District.

..... Respondents/Defendants

This petition is filed on 16.02.2026 and taken on file and came up for final hearing on 03.06.2026, in the presence of Tmt.S.Jayasudha, counsel for the petitioner and Tr.T.S.Subramanian, counsel for the respondents and upon perusal of entire case

records and upon hearing both side and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following...

ORDER

The Petitioner filed this petition Under Order 7 Rule 14(3) of C.P.C. praying to receive the documents filed by the petitioner as plaintiff side documents.

2) Brief averments of the affidavit and petition is as follows :-

This application has been filed by the plaintiff to permit him to produce the additional documents in the trial. In the supporting affidavit he stated that he has filed the suit for declaration and permanent injunction in which he has been examined as PW1 and 20 documents were marked on 23.01.2026. At the time of marking another one document it was refused due to non produce of postal receipt. Now he traced out the receipt along with Acknowledgment card that apart the suit property is not belonged to defendants father Duraisamy Reddiar but they falsely entered the partition between them. When he issued legal notice in the reply the defendant stated that the property acquired by their father through partition but when he perused the encumbrance came to know that the defendant's father purchased the property from one Parvathi ammal on 05.05.1974. However they stated that property was not belonged to Parvathi ammal and in order to avoid future problem his father get sale deed from her. Therefore he verified the documents and found that Parvathi ammal acquired that property through settlement from one Kesava Gounder on 15.06.1966. He also got the certified copy of that document dated 18.02.1974 however the 3rd page of that certified copy not available. Hence, he got another one certified copy through online and wants to mark that documents. To prove the fact that the defendants father had no right over the suit property survey number. Therefore he prayed to allow this application.

3) Brief averments of the counter filed by respondent is as follows :-

In the counter, the respondents denied the averments in the affidavit stated that neither Kesavan nor Arumugam had any right over the suit property survey number. So, the deed in the name of Parvathi ammal will be no use to this proceedings. Further the certified copy does not contain all the page so that cannot be admitted in evidence. However they have not raised any objection with respect to the postal receipt and acknowledgment card, subject to proof and relevancy with this prayed to dismiss the application.

4. Point for consideration :-

The sole point to be decided in this application is whether the application to be allowed or not ?

5. Point :-

On careful perusal of the petition affidavit and the counter with the suit documents this Court comes to know that the suit has been filed by the plaintiff with respect of 17 cents in S.No.69/2 by stating that property belongs to his father by way of sale. The defendant denied that fact stated that the property belongs to their family and got by their father through partition along with his brothers but in the reply notice they have stated that in order to avoid the future problems their father got executed the sale deed from one Parvathi ammal. So there is a need to decide how the defendants claimed right over the property either by the way of partition in their fathers family or the sale deed executed by Parvathi ammal in favour of their father. That apart on going through the settlement deed executed by one Kesava Gounder in the name of Parvathi ammal, the 1st item property is in S.No.69/2 to an extent of 17 cents an undivided portion in the total extent of 34 cents. So, this Court feels that there is a relation to this document with the suit property. So if this documents

received in evidence it would be helpful to the Court to ascertain in what manner the defendants claim right over the property and whether the plaintiffs claim over the property through partition in his father family is correct or not. Therefore, inclined to allow this application. However the certified copy obtained in their 1974 is concerned one page was missing and the plaintiff obtained another one certified copy through online. So, the latest one is enough for marking and there is no need to mark the previous certified copy. With this condition this application is allowed. However there is no order as to cost.

In the result, this application is allowed. There is no order as to cost.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist directly, typed in computer by her, corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 05th day of June 2026.

I Additional Subordinate Judge,
Villupuram.

Enclosure :-

List of Petitioner side Witness & Exhibits :-
(Nil)

List of Respondents side Witness and Exhibit :-
(Nil)

I Additional Subordinate Judge,
Villupuram.