

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
COIMBATORE**

Present: Tmt. G. VIJAYA, B.A., M.L., PGDCFS
Principal District Judge, Coimbatore.

Wednesday, this the 11th day of March, 2026

(திருவள்ளூர்வராண்டு, 2057, விசுவாவசு ஆண்டு மாசி திங்கள் 27-ஆம் நாள் புதன்கிழமை)

TRANSFER ORIGINAL PETITION No.350/2023
(CNR No.TNCB010074592023)

G. Duraisamy
S/o. Gopalakrishnan

... Petitioner

//vs//

1. A.R. Venugopal (Died)
2. M. SasiKalappan
3. R. Natarajan
4. Rohinikumar
5. Mrs.V. Rajeshwari
6. A.V. Ragul Ramadass
7. A.V. Manoj

(Amended as per order in I.A.No.3/2025 dated 27-03-2025)

... Respondents

This petition came before me for final hearing on 06-02-2026 in the presence of **Tvl. C.D. Francis, R. Balaji, R. Umamaheswari, N. Bavithran and P. Ravivarma**, Advocates for the petitioner and 1st respondent died and though the respondents No.2 to 4 received notice, they have not chosen to appear before this Court, no representation for the respondents No.2 to 4, respondents No.2 to 4 were called absent and set exparte, and of **Tvl. M.V.Vijayaragavan, J. Shrihari, S. Sopna and G. Sahitha Aathithan**, Advocates for the respondents No.5 to 7 and upon perusing the petition, counter and other relevant records and hearing the arguments of both sides and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court passes the following:

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioner, u/s.24 and Sec.151 of CPC, praying to transfer the suit in O.S.No.1326/2012 which is pending on the file of the V Additional District Munsif Court, Coimbatore to be tried jointly before the IV Additional District Munsif, Court, Coimbatore, in O.S.No.1261/2012 simultaneously.

2. Averments contained in the petition :

(i) The Petitioner had filed a suit seeking relief to declare the Will dated 21-09-2007 vide Doc.No.221/2007 executed by one A.K. Parvathammal, who is the Grandmother of Petitioner against the 1st Respondent as Null & Void and the said suit is now pending before the learned IV Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore and meanwhile the 1st Respondent and 2nd Respondent had filed a separate suit against the 3rd and 4th Respondent seeking relief of Declaration, they were owner of the property as per Will dated 21-09-2007 executed by A.K. Parvathammal and the same is before the learned V Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore in O.S.No.1326/2012 and during the pendency of the suit, the Petitioner had impleaded him as the 3rd Defendant and the same was allowed and both the suits are now pending before the respective Courts.

(ii) In the above mentioned the suits the schedules of properties are the one and the same and the parties to both the suits are same. The Petitioner vide

No.I.A.No.2/2019, O.S.No.1326/2012, impleaded himself as 3rd Defendant and the same is pending and case is posted on 25-08-2023. In the suit in O.S.No.1261/2012 and case stands posted in part. Meanwhile, 1st Respondent had filed Order 7 Rule 11 application and enquiry is pending and case posted on 17-08-2023.

(iii) Both the suits would reveal that cause of action of both the suits, are in common nature and identical questions arise for determination. The adjudication regarding title to the suit properties involved in both the cases are the one and the same. Hence, the determination of the issues involved in both the suits and the evidence to be recorded will be also one and the same and hence prays to allow the petition.

3. The 6th respondent filed counter and the same has been adopted by the respondents No.5 and 7. The averments contained in the counter are as follows:-

(a) The petition filed by the petitioner is false, frivolous, and vexatious and not maintainable on both law and facts of the case.

(b) The allegation in the Para No.2 of the petition that the petitioner had filed a suit seeking relief to declare the will dated 21-09-2007, vide Doc.No.221/2007 executed by one A.K. Parvathammal, who is the grandmother of the petitioner against the 1st respondent as null and void and the said suit is now pending

before the learned 4th Additional District Munsif Coimbatore and meanwhile the 1st respondent and 2nd respondent had filed a separate suit against the 3rd and 4th respondents seeking the relief of declaration that they are the owner of the property as per will dated 21-09-2007 executed by said A.K. Parvathammal and the same is pending before the 5th Additional District Munsif Coimbatore and during pendency of the suit the petitioner himself filed the application to implead himself as defendant and the same has been allowed by the said Court and the said suits are pending before the respective Courts concern all are admitted as true and correct, except the statement that the Petitioner is the grandson of the said A.K. Parvathammal.

(c) The allegation in the Para No.2, 3 & 4 of the petition that the above mentioned suits the schedule of properties are the one and the same and the parties to both the suits are same and both the suits would reveal that cause of action of both suits are in common nature and identical questions arose for determination and the adjudication regarding title to the suit properties involved in both the cases are the one and the same and hence the determination of the issued involved in both the suits and the evidences to be recorded will be also one and the same and in this circumstances the suits are tried by different Courts, it may result in conflicting decision being rendered and to avoid the same it is only expedient that both the suits are to be tried together in the interest of justice all are denied as false and incorrect.

(d) The petitioner, as an illegitimate son, lacks standing to sue. The claim asserted by the petitioner does not constitute a property right, and on this ground alone, the suit is liable to be dismissed in limine. It appears the Petitioner is not only confused but is attempting to mislead the Court. The petitioner, in a clear case of collusion with his close kith and kin, has fabricated documents with malafide intent to deceive the court. The suit was brought forth by the petitioner under a false and concocted narrative, claiming that he and the proposed defendant in O.S. No.1261 of 2012 are the rightful legal heirs of the late A.K.Parvathammal. As the old legal maxim goes, 'he who comes into equity must come with clean hands,' and the Petitioner's actions suggest a deliberate attempt to subvert the due process of law.

(e) The petitioner, along with his father and brothers, has initiated numerous legal proceedings against A.K. Parvathammal and the Respondent's father, A.R. Venugopal. Furthermore, the petitioner filed a suit, O.S. No. 213/1959, before the learned Subordinate Court, Coimbatore, against A.K. Parvathammal and the two other wives of the late Krishnasamy Gounder. In that action, the plaintiffs asserted their status as the legal heirs of the late Krishnasamy Gounder (husband of A.K. Parvathammal) and sought a partition and other reliefs. Following a full trial on the merits, the said suit was dismissed on April 5, 1961.

(f) The petitioner's claim is barred by the rule of "res judicata", as the matter was previously adjudicated and dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court in A.S. No.188/1962. In that judgment, the Court explicitly held that the petitioner, his father, and others were not the legal heirs of the late Krishnasamy Gounder. This conclusive determination, being a matter of record, serves as perpetual estoppels. Consequently, the relief sought in the present suit, O.S.No.1261/2012, is not maintainable, for "a case once decided is a case forever decided." The petitioner, knowing he lacks locus standi, has cunningly fabricated a false narrative in collusion with the proposed defendant to challenge the last testament of A.K. Parvathammal.

(g) Following the demise of the late Krishnasamy @ Duraisamy Gounder, and throughout the lifetime of the late A.K.Parvathammal, the petitioners took no steps to obtain a legal heir certificate in their favor. During her lifetime, A.K.Parvathammal executed a valid and registered will on September 22, 2007, in favor of A.R.Venugopal, which was registered as Document No.221/BKIV/2007 before the Sub-Registrar's Office, Thondamuthur, Coimbatore. Upon the death of A.K.Parvathammal on July 2, 2011, the said Will came into force. As per the terms and conditions stipulated therein, A.R.Venugopal and Sasikalappan duly performed all the testamentary duties, thereby acquiring all rights, title, and interest over the properties and the connected temple. It is the habitual and vexatious conduct of the Petitioner and

his father to send false complaints and lodge frivolous suits, driven by a covetous desire for the property. As the proverb says, "The truth will out," and the entire preponderance of evidence will attest to the veracity of these submissions.

(h) Following the demise of A.K. Parvathammal, only Sasikalappan (the 2nd respondent) and A.R.Venugopal's family performed the last rites. The Petitioner, with dishonest intent, arrived at the deceased's residence in an aggressive manner, accompanied by individuals described as "goons," and attempted to obstruct the funeral proceedings. This attempt was thwarted by A.R.Venugopal, Sasikalappan, and local villagers. A police complaint was subsequently lodged against the Petitioner, resulting in the registration of a First Information Report (FIR). Following this incident, the Respondent's father, the late A.R. Venugopal, filed a suit, O.S.No.1769/2011, against the HR & CE officials. The petitioner sought to be and was subsequently impleaded as a party to the said suit. In his deposition, the petitioner, examined as DW-2, admitted under cross-examination by A.R.Venugopal that Krishnasamy @ Duraisamy Gounder had three wives and that his last Will and testament was valid. This admission, wherein the petitioner conceded to the validity of the will and the fact that Krishnasamy @ Duraisamy Gounder had three wives, directly contradicts his current claim. These admitted facts clearly demonstrate the petitioner's mala fide intention in filing the present suit.

(i) The aforementioned suit, O.S.No.1769/2011, was dismissed by the learned 2nd Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore, inter alia, on the ground that A.K.Parvathammal lacked locus standi to execute the Will dated 22-09-2007, holding that the temple was maintained solely by her family as Hereditary Trustee. Therefore, the mere dismissal of the suit does not "ipso facto" vest any right in the petitioner, nor does the scope and veracity of said dismissal curtail our rights concerning her private properties. As the legal maxim states, 'Ex injuria non oritur jus' (A right does not arise from a wrong) and 'Res inter alios acta alteri nocere non debet' (A thing done between others ought not to injure another).

(j) Neither the petitioner nor his predecessors preferred any appeal before the Hon'ble Apex Court against the judgment and decree rendered by the Hon'ble High Court in A.S.No.188/1962. Concurrently, Suit O.S.No.1849/2012, filed by the petitioner in collusion with his siblings for a declaration of their status as legal heirs of the late A.K.Parvathammal, was duly dismissed by the learned Principal District Munsif, Coimbatore, on September 2, 2022. Consequently, the claim asserted in Suit O.S.No.1849/2012-that the petitioner and his siblings are the legitimate children of the late Krishnasamy Gounder and legal heirs of A.K.Parvathammal has attained finality. As such, they are not recognized as legal heirs of A.R. Krishnasamy Gounder and his wife, A.K. Parvathammal.

(k) Locus standi is a fundamental prerequisite for filing or prosecuting any suit, as enshrined under Order I Rule 1 CPC. The petitioner, having been declared not to be a legal heir of A.K.Parvathammal and her late husband, A.R.Krishnasamy Gounder, lacks the requisite standing to prefer these suits. Consequently, A.R.Venugopal filed I.A.No.4/2022 in O.S.No.1261/2012, seeking the rejection of the plaint an application currently awaiting pronouncement of orders on August 2, 2025. This transfer application by the petitioner is nothing more than an attempt to unjustly enrich them and avoid the inevitable legal battle, proving the adage that "He who comes into equity must come with clean hands. There is no merit in this petition and prays to dismiss the same.

4. 1st respondent died. Notice to the respondents No.2 to 4 served. Though the respondents No.2 to 4 received notice, they have not chosen to appear before this Court. No representation of the respondents No.2 to 4. Respondents No.2 to 4 were called absent and set exparte on 31-10-2023.

5. **The point for consideration :**

“Whether the suit in O.S.No.1326/2012 which is pending on the file of the V Additional District Munsif Court, Coimbatore, is to be transferred to the file of the IV Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore, to try jointly / simultaneously along with the suit in O.S.No.1261/2012, or not?”

POINT:-

6. Heard and perused the relevant records. This petition has been filed by the petitioner, praying to transfer the suit in O.S.No.1326/2012 which is pending on the file of the V Additional District Munsif Court, Coimbatore, to the file of the IV Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore, to try jointly / simultaneously along with the suit in O.S.No.1261/2012.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner would argue that, the petitioner had filed a suit seeking the relief to declare the Will, dated 21-09-2007 executed by one A.K. Parvathammal, who is his against the 1st respondent as null and void and the said suit is now pending before the learned IV Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore and meanwhile the 1st respondent and 2nd respondent had filed a separate suit against the 3rd and 4th respondent seeking relief of declaration, they were owner of the property as per Will, dated 21-09-2007 executed by A.K.Parvathammal and the same is before the learned V Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore in O.S.No.1326/2012 and during the pendency of the suit, the petitioner had impleaded him as the 3rd defendant and the same was allowed and both the suits are now pending before the respective Courts.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that, in both the suits, schedules of properties and parties to the proceedings are one and the same. The learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner has been

impleaded as 3rd defendant and the same is pending and case is posted on 25-08-2023 and in the suit in O.S.No.1261/2012 and case stands posted in parted and in the meanwhile, the 1st respondent has filed Order 7 Rule 11 application and enquiry is pending and case posted on 17-08-2023.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that, both the suits would reveal that cause of action of both the suits, are in common nature and identical questions arise for determination. The adjudication regarding title to the suit properties involved in both the cases are the one and the same and hence, the determination of the issues involved in both the suits and the evidence to be recorded will be also one and the same and hence, it is just and necessary that both suits are to be tried together in a same Court and prays to allow the petition.

10. 1st respondent died. The respondents No.2 to 4 were called absent and set exparte.

11. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 argued that, in both the suits, there is no common cause of action, identical question of law arose for determination and adjudication regarding title to the suit properties. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, the petitioner, as an illegitimate son, lacks standing to sue and the claim asserted by the petitioner

does not constitute a property right, and on this ground alone, the suit is liable to be dismissed in limine. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, the petitioner, in a clear case of collusion with his close kith and kin, has fabricated documents with malafide intent to deceive the court and the suit was brought forth by the petitioner under a false and concocted narrative, claiming that he and the proposed defendant in O.S. No.1261 of 2012 are the rightful legal heirs of the late A.K.Parvathammal.

12. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, the petitioner, along with his father and brothers, has initiated numerous legal proceedings against A.K.Parvathammal and the respondent's father, A.R.Venugopal. Furthermore, the petitioner filed a suit, O.S.No.213/1959, before the learned Subordinate Court, Coimbatore, against A.K. Parvathammal and the two other wives of the late Krishnasamy Gounder and in the said proceedings, the plaintiffs asserted their status as the legal heirs of the late Krishnasamy Gounder (husband of A.K. Parvathammal) and sought a partition and other reliefs. Following a full trial on the merits, the said suit was dismissed on April 5, 1961.

13. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, the petitioner's claim is barred by the rule of "res judicata", as the matter was previously adjudicated and dismissed by the Hon'ble High Court in

A.S.No.188/1962. In that judgment, the Court explicitly held that the petitioner, his father, and others were not the legal heirs of the late Krishnasamy Gounder. This conclusive determination, being a matter of record, serves as perpetual estoppels and consequently, the relief sought in the present suit, O.S.No.1261/2012, is not maintainable, for "a case once decided is a case forever decided." The petitioner, knowing he lacks locus standi, has cunningly fabricated a false narrative in collusion with the proposed defendant to challenge the last testament of A.K. Parvathammal.

14. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, after the demise of the late Krishnasamy @ Duraisamy Gounder, and throughout the lifetime of the late A.K.Parvathammal, the petitioner has not taken any steps to obtain a legal heir certificate in their favor. During her lifetime, A.K.Parvathammal executed a valid and registered will on September 22, 2007, in favor of A.R.Venugopal, before the Sub-Registrar's Office, Thondamuthur, Coimbatore. After the demise of A.K.Parvathammal on July 2, 2011, the said Will came into force and as per the terms and conditions stipulated therein, A.R.Venugopal and Sasikalappan duly performed all the testamentary duties, thereby acquiring all rights, title, and interest over the properties and the connected temple. It is the habitual and vexatious conduct of the petitioner and his father to send false complaints and lodge frivolous suits, driven by a covetous desire for the property.

15. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, after the demise of A.K. Parvathammal, only Sasikalappan (the 2nd respondent) and A.R.Venugopal's family performed the last rites. The petitioner, with dishonest intent, arrived at the deceased's residence in an aggressive manner, accompanied by individuals described as "goons," and attempted to obstruct the funeral proceedings. This attempt was thwarted by A.R.Venugopal, Sasikalappan, and local villagers and a police complaint was subsequently lodged against the petitioner, resulting in the registration of a First Information Report (FIR) and thereafter, the father of respondent namely late A.R. Venugopal, filed a suit, O.S.No.1769/2011, against the HR & CE officials. The petitioner sought to be and was subsequently impleaded as a party to the said suit. In his deposition, the petitioner, examined as DW-2, admitted under cross-examination by A.R.Venugopal that Krishnasamy @ Duraisamy Gounder had three wives and that his last Will and testament was valid. This admission, wherein the petitioner conceded to the validity of the will and the fact that Krishnasamy @ Duraisamy Gounder had three wives, directly contradicts his current claim. These admitted facts clearly demonstrate the petitioner's mala fide intention in filing the present suit.

16. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, the suit in O.S.No.1769/2011, was dismissed by the learned 2nd Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore, inter alia, on the ground that A.K.Parvathammal

lacked locus standi to execute the Will dated 22-09-2007, holding that the temple was maintained solely by her family as Hereditary Trustee. Therefore, the mere dismissal of the suit does not "ipso facto" vest any right in the petitioner, nor does the scope and veracity of said dismissal curtail our rights concerning her private properties. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, neither the petitioner nor his predecessors preferred any appeal before the Hon'ble Apex Court against the judgment and decree rendered by the Hon'ble High Court in A.S.No.188/1962. Concurrently, Suit O.S.No.1849/2012, filed by the petitioner in collusion with his siblings for a declaration of their status as legal heirs of the late A.K.Parvathammal, was duly dismissed by the learned Principal District Munsif, Coimbatore, on September 2, 2022. Consequently, the claim asserted in Suit O.S.No.1849/2012, that the petitioner and his siblings are the legitimate children of the late Krishnasamy Gounder and legal heirs of A.K.Parvathammal has attained finality. As such, they are not recognized as legal heirs of A.R. Krishnasamy Gounder and his wife, A.K. Parvathammal.

17. The learned counsel for the respondents No.5 to 7 has further argued that, locus standi is a fundamental prerequisite for filing or prosecuting any suit, as enshrined under Order I Rule 1 CPC. The petitioner, having been declared not to be a legal heir of A.K.Parvathammal and her late husband, A.R.Krishnasamy Gounder, lacks the requisite standing to prefer these suits. Consequently,

A.R.Venugopal filed I.A.No.4/2022 in O.S.No.1261/2012, seeking the rejection of the plaint an application currently awaiting pronouncement of orders on August 2, 2025. This transfer application by the petitioner is nothing more than an attempt to unjustly enrich them and avoid the inevitable legal battle, proving the adage that "He who comes into equity must come with clean hands. There is no merit in this petition and prays to dismiss the same.

18. This Court has given its anxious consideration on the submissions of both side and perused the copy of complaints in O.S.No.1326/2012 and O.S.No.1261/2012. On perusal of the same, it appears that, the petitioner herein filed the suit in O.S.No.1261/2012, against the 1st respondent, seeking the relief of declaration, permanent injunction and other reliefs. As of now, the said suit is now pending before the IV Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore.

19. It is the case of the petitioner that, one Krishnasamy Gounder @ Duraisamy Gounder and Mrs.Parvathammal are the grandparents of the petitioner. The said Parvathammal is the 4th wife of Krishnasamy Gounder @ Duraisamy Gounder. Of his four marriage, the said Krishnasamy Gounder @ Duraisamy Goudner had only one male children namely the father of the petitioner namely Gopalakrishnan, through his 2nd wife Late Rajamanickam. On 29-08-1958, the above said Krishnasamy Gounder @ Duraisamy Gounder died, leaving behind his only son Gopalakrishnan i.e., the father of the

petitioner. While so, on 31-12-1993, petitioner's father Gopalakrishnan died.

20. The further case of the petitioner is that, his father Gopalakrishnan had four sons and two daughters and out of four sons, one son namely Jayapal passed away and thereafter his wife and two daughters became the legal heirs of the deceased Gopalakrishnan. There is no cordial relationship between the petitioner and his father Gopalakrishnan. The 1st respondent is the relative of the petitioner's grandmother Parvathammal. The 1st respondent created acquaintance with Parvathammal and started to swindle the property. While so, in the year 1997, the 1st respondent induced Parvathammal to execute a registered Will in his favour and accordingly on 16-10-1997, Parvathammal had executed a Will in favour of the 1st respondent. After knowing the true character of the 1st respondent, Parvathammal cancelled the said Will, vide cancellation deed dated 30-06-2005. Further the 1st respondent had alienated or created sale agreements pertaining to many properties to the third parties without the consent of his grandmother. While so, on 02-07-2011, Parvathammal passed away and thereafter, the 1st respondent was allowed to stay in the suit property till all the issues are settled.

21. The further case of the petitioner is that, the 1st respondent filed a suit in O.S.No.1769/2011, relying upon the registered Will alleged to have executed by the petitioner's grandmother Parvathammal on 29-09-2007 and claimed right

over many properties. In the said suit, the petitioner and other legal heirs were wantonly exonerated by the 1st respondent. The above said Will is a fabricated one and hence, it has to be declared as null and void and hence, the petitioner filed the suit in O.S.No.1261/2012.

22. The respondents No.1 and 2 have filed the suit in O.S.No.1326/2012, against the respondents No.3 and 4 and the petitioner. The case of the respondents No.1 and 2 is that, the suit property was purchased by R.Krishnasamy Gounder @ Duraisamy Gounder in the name of his wife A.K.Parvathammal, vide sale deed dated 26-07-1948. During the life of R.Krishnasamy Gounder @ Duraisamy Gounder, he had executed a Will dated 21-01-1958 bequeathing the entire suit property in faovur of the A.K.Parvathammal. R.Krishnasamy Gounder died long back without any issues, leaving behind A.K.Parvathammal his wife as his only legal heir. As such, R.Krishnasamy Gounder and his wife A.K.Parvathammal died without any issues. During the life time of A.K.Parvathammal, she has executed a registered Will, dated 21-09-2007, bequeathing the item I mentioned in the suit property in favour of 1st respondent and item II mention in the suit property in favour of the 2nd respondent. The respondents No.1 and 2 are the brothers' sons of A.K.Parvathammal. After the demise of A.K.Parvathammal, her last ritual ceremonies were done by the 2nd respondent. Since the respondents No.3 and 4 who have no right or title over the property, are trying to make a claim that they

are also having share in the property, the respondents No.1 and 2 have filed the suit in O.S.No.1326/2012, seeking the relief of declaration and permanent injunction. As of now, the said suit is pending before the V Additional District Munsif Court, Coimbatore.

23. On conjoint reading the averments stated in the complaints, it reveals that dispute between the parties revolves around the alleged Will, dated 21-09-2007, said to have been executed by A.K.Parvathammal. According to the petitioner, in both the suits, cause of action, property in question, issues that has to be decided, oral and documentary evidence that has to be adduced are one and the same and hence, in order to avoid arising of conflict of judgment, it is just and necessary to try both the suits in a single Court. Further the petitioner has sought for transfer of the suit which is pending before the V Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore to the file of the IV Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore. The objection raised by the respondents No.5 to 7 is that, the claim of the petitioner is barred by res judicata and the matter was already adjudicated and dismissed and furthermore, in O.S.No.1261/2012, a petition under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC is filed and is pending and at this stage, the petitioner has filed the present petition with a view to drag on the proceedings. Though the respondents No.5 to 7 raised objection to transfer the case, taking into consideration of the nature of dispute between the parties, considering the aspect that the transferee Court is same cadre and no prejudice caused to the

parties by allowing the petition, as in both the suits, parties to the proceedings, the issues to be decided are all one and the same and with a view to avoid conflicting of judgment that may be passed, with a view avoid multiplicity of proceedings, and with a view to save precious time of the Courts as well as the parties, this Court does incline to allow this petition.

In the result, this petition is allowed. The suit in O.S.No.1326/2012 which is pending on the file of the V Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore, is ordered to be withdrawn and transferred to the file of IV Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore. The transferee Court shall decide whether the suits [O.S.No.1326/2012 and O.S.No.1261/2012] are to be tried jointly or simultaneously. No costs.

This order is dictated to steno-typist directly, typed by her in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 11th day of March, 2026.

PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
COIMBATORE.

Copy to:-

1. The V Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore.
2. The IV Additional District Munsif, Coimbatore.

//True copy//

Draft Order in
Tr.O.P.No.350/2023
Dated:11-03-2026.