

**IN THE COURT OF JUDGE, COMMERCIAL COURT (SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE
CADRE), COIMBATORE**

PRESENT: THIRU.C.B.VEDAGIRI, B.PHARM, MS-IT (AUS)., L.L.M., Judge
Commercial Court, (Senior Civil Judge Cadre)
Coimbatore.

Dated this the 10th Day of November 2025, Monday

IA. No. 2 of 2025

in

C.OS No.363 of 2024

(CNR.No.TNCB23-001057-2024)

M/s. Sri Lakshmi Steels,
Rep by its Proprietor Mr Rajasekaran

... Petitioner/Plaintiff

//Vs//

M/s. Meghala Machine Works,

... Respondent/Defendant

This Petition coming on this day for final hearing before me in the presence of Mr. R. Sivakumar, Advocate for the Petitioner/Plaintiff and Mr. S Nandagopal, Advocate for the Respondent/Defendant. Upon hearing the counsels and on perusal of records, having stood over till this day for consideration, this Court passed the following:-

ORDER

The Petition has been filed by the Petitioner/Plaintiff under Order XI Rule 1(5) of CPC to receive the mentioned documents during the chief examination of the petitioner and thus render justice.

1.The sum and substance of the Petition:

The Petitioner/Plaintiff is the deponent herein and well aware of the facts and circumstances of the case. It is submitted that the petitioner/plaintiff have filed the above suit for recovery of amounts due from the defendant. Further, the defendant in his written statement has disputed the transactions. It is submitted the petitioner/plaintiff have come forward with the connected petition to adduce the Invoices for the period 2018 to 2020, the G.S.T. Details for the period 2018 to 2020 and the cheques issued by the defendant. The said documents were not produced at an earlier stage as the said documents got mixed up with other original documents and if the said documents are not allowed to be produced by the plaintiff, the petitioner/plaintiff would be put to serious loss and prejudice. It is therefore prayed that this Honourable Court may kindly receive the documents as mentioned in the petition.

2.The crux of the Counter:

The Respondent/Defendant submits that this petition has filed by the petitioner/plaintiff is not acceptable and is illegal. The petition is not maintainable in law and in this replies everything except the admitted facts of the respondent are false. The documents mentioned in the petition filed by the petitioner/plaintiff which are no relevance to the original case and defendant. Furthermore, the defendant has no connection with the first document Invoice filed in the list of documents

mentioned in the petition. Further the 2nd document Cheque whose signature of the defendant in the list of documents mentioned in the petition and it is not possible to become a partner in the company as mentioned in this case. This defendant has no connection with this case. Therefore, the defendant/respondent raises a strong objection to the filing of the petitioner/plaintiff's side. Further the 3rd document in the list of documents mentioned in the petition is GST has no connection with the respondent and the documents 1 to 3 mentioned in the petition have no connection with the defendant in the case. Therefore the respondent/defendant has denied the list of documents mentioned in the petition to seeking marking of documents which have no connection with the case and the defendant. Therefore the respondent/defendant prays that this petition filed by the petitioner/plaintiff be dismissed.

3. Heard both sides. Perused the record.

4. Point of determination:

The point for consideration is that whether the present petition by the petitioner / plaintiff to receive the mentioned documents during the chief examination of the petitioner is to be allowed or not?

5. It is the case of the petitioner / plaintiff that the petitioner/plaintiff have filed the above suit for recovery of amounts due from the respondent / defendant. Since the respondent / defendant has disputed the transactions in his written statement, the petitioner is before this court seeking leave of this court to adduce additional documents which are the Invoices for the period 2018 to 2020, the G.S.T. Details for the period 2018 to 2020 and the cheques issued by the respondent / defendant, account statement to substantiate the transaction amongst the parties to the *lis*.

6. The petitioner counsel contended that as the said documents were not produced at an earlier stage as the said documents got mixed up with other original documents, the petitioner is before this court and that the non-filing the petition mentioned documents along with the plaint was neither wilful nor wanton and the if the said

documents are not allowed to be produced by the petitioner /plaintiff, the petitioner/plaintiff would be put to serious loss and prejudice and prayed to allow the petition.

7. **Per contra**, the respondent / defendant counsel contended that the petition is not maintainable on law or facts.

8. The respondent counsel urged that the petition mentioned documents in invoices and GST are not relevant to the case on hand and that there was no privity for the respondent/ defendant with respect to the alleged invoices. With respect to the 2nd document Cheque, it is not possible to become a partner in the company as mentioned in this case. The respondent / defendant has no connection with this case and the alleged petition mentioned documents has no relevance to the case in hand.

9. It is from the record that the present suit is being filed by the petitioner /plaintiff against the respondent / defendant for recovery of money due from the respondent / defendant and that the petitioner / plaintiff is before this court with the petition seeking leave of this court to adduce additional documents which are the Invoices for the period 2018 to 2020, the G.S.T. Details for the period 2018 to 2020, the cheques issued by the respondent / defendant and the account statement details.

10. This court refers to the decision of the **Hon'ble Delhi High Court in Entertainment Network (India) Ltd Vs HT Media Ltd** decided on 29.08.2022 wherein it was held that:

“19. Order XI sub-rule (7) of Rule 1 CPC, as amended by the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, mandates that the Defendant shall file a list of documents in its power, possession, control or custody, pertaining to the suit, along with the written statement. Sub-rule (10) of Rule 1 of Order XI of the Act clearly stipulates that Defendant shall not be allowed to rely on documents which were in Defendant's power, possession, control or custody and not disclosed along with the written statement, save and except by leave of the Court and that such leave shall be granted only upon the

Defendant establishing 'reasonable cause' for non-disclosure along with written statement. The Brand Report is a document which beyond a doubt, existed prior to the filing of the written statement and was in power, possession, control or custody of the Defendant. Therefore, the rigours of Order XI Rule 1(10) of the Act shall apply on all four corners and the document cannot be taken on record, unless the Defendant makes out a 'reasonable cause' for its non-disclosure at the time of filing the written statement. The only ground put-forth, as noted above, by the Defendant for non-disclosure of the document, is 'inadvertence' and the observations of the Court while granting injunction against the Defendant. Unfortunately, under the Commercial Courts Act, these considerations cannot be a ground to permit filing of additional documents. The proscription against permitting such a document to be taken on record, unless a reasonable cause is made out by the Defendant, in my view, is absolute....

24. The question, however, that arises is that whether the Defendant is entitled to grant of leave for filing the said additional documents, considering the fact that the suit is at the stage of commencement of Defendant's evidence. Before alluding to the facts of the present case, I may refer to the judgment in **Polyflor Limited (supra)** where a Chamber Appeal was under consideration before the Court against an order dismissing an application preferred by the Plaintiff under Order VII Rule 14(3) CPC for taking on record additional documents, which were not filed along with the plaint and were sought to be brought on record when Plaintiff's witness was under cross-examination. The Court held as under:-

"17. Thus, the issue is, whether in the above noted facts and circumstances, the plaintiff is entitled to grant of such leave. In the present case, the plaintiff's witness PW-1 is under cross examination and has already undergone a substantial portion of his cross-examination. To grant leave to, and permit the plaintiff to file and lead in evidence additional documents at this stage would mean that the defendants would be put to serious prejudice. The defendants have not had the occasion to deal with the

said documents. Had the documents now sought to be produced, been produced at the relevant time, i.e. at the stage of filing of the suit, or at least at the time when the issues were framed, the defendants would have had the occasion to deal with the same by making appropriate pleadings and filing its own documents to counter the reliance placed by the plaintiff on the documents in question.

18. The progress of the suit cannot be interdicted on account of the blatantly casual approach of the plaintiff. The plaintiff has not given any justifiable and acceptable explanation for not filing the said documents at the earlier stage of the proceedings. If the submissions of the plaintiff were to be accepted, it would mean that in every case, a party should be permitted to lead in evidence documents not earlier filed and relied upon at any stage of the proceedings. xxx xxx xxx

21. As aforesaid, there is no cause shown, much less a reasonable cause for non-disclosure of the documents and nonfiling of the documents, or at least copies thereof along with the plaint, or even till the stage of framing of the issues.”

25. In my view, the said judgment squarely applies to the present case. Written statement was filed by the Defendant on 02.06.2016. Application for grant of injunction was heard on 27.10.2016 and the judgment was pronounced on 13.07.2018. Defendant filed an appeal against the said judgment on 26.07.2018; issues were framed on 12.11.2018 and the evidence of the Plaintiff concluded on 12.12.2019. The documents placed on record by the Defendant along with the affidavit of evidence indicate that the Annual Financial Report for the year 2016-17 was available with the Defendant before 26.09.2017, as on the said date the Report was sent to the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. Annual Financial Report for the year 2017-18 was forwarded to the Defendant by the Accounting Firm under letter dated 28.09.2018 and Annual Financial Report for the year 2018-19 was forwarded to the Defendant vide letter dated 06.06.2019. Therefore, going by these dates, there was no reason why the first two reports were not sought to be brought on record till the year 2020 when they were received in the years 2017 and 2018,

respectively. Even the report for the year 2018-19 was in possession of the Defendant in June, 2019, prior to commencement of the Plaintiff's evidence. There is no explanation worth a mention for not filing these reports until the year 2020. In any case, if leave is granted at this stage when the Plaintiff's evidence has concluded and Defendant is permitted to bring the additional documents on record, Plaintiff will not have the occasion to deal with the said documents. Had the documents been filed earlier, Plaintiff would have had an opportunity to deal with the documents by appropriately amending its pleadings and/or filing its own documents to counter the documents sought to be brought on record by the Defendant. As held in Nitin Gupta (supra), progress of the suit cannot be interdicted on such casual approach of the Defendant and there is no gainsaying that if in every case, a party is permitted to file additional documents once the trial has begun, without due cause, the whole purpose of the Commercial Courts Act would be defeated. Defendant has clearly not been able to show any cause why the trial should be interdicted at this stage, as the only argument is that the documents came into existence post filing of the written statement and are crucial to establish the growing goodwill and reputation. If the contention of the Defendant is accepted, this would be setting the clock back inasmuch as if the documents are taken on record, Plaintiff will have to be given an opportunity to admit/deny the documents and lead its evidence in counter to the said documents, defeating the purpose of the Act, i.e., expeditious disposal. On the same analogy, document (b), which are printouts of the Social Media pages, cannot be taken on record.

29. Reliance by the Defendant on the judgment in Nitin Gupta (supra) is misplaced. Indisputably, in the said judgment, the Court has held that a Defendant under Order XI CPC, as applicable to commercial suits, is entitled to file a document if it establishes 'reasonable cause' for nondisclosure as this explicitly flows from the provisions of Order XI Rule 1(10) itself. Defendant has, however, relied on the

judgment in support of the contention that the brand report dated 22.12.2015, although not disclosed with the written statement, may be allowed to be brought on record. This argument overlooks the observations of the Court in the said judgment that late filing of documents can be permitted only if the applicant passes the muster of showing 'reasonable cause' and in the present case, Defendant has failed to disclose any cause, which can be termed as 'reasonable cause' for permitting a report of the year 2015 to be brought on record, through an application filed in the year 2020, when in the five years period there were several opportunities available to the Defendant to place the same on record. It bears repetition to state that mere inadvertence or unfavourable observations in a judgment granting injunction against the Defendant, cannot be a reasonable cause permitting filing of the brand report after five years of its existence. Defendant, it seems, is oblivious of a very significant observation of the Court in this very judgment that if the Commercial Divisions do not enforce provisions of the Commercial Courts Act strictly and show leniency in the name of 'interest of justice', the commercial suits will suffer from the same malady which the ordinary suits suffered.

30. With the greatest of respect, this Court cannot adopt this reasoning in the present suit in light of the judgments of the Supreme Court and this Court, as aforementioned as well as keeping in backdrop the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015, which is to provide for speedy disposal of the suits. If each time an additional document is sought to be placed on record by any party to the suit, without due cause, at a stage when the trial has commenced and the same has to be allowed on the ground that the opposite party can be given an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses and recall its own witnesses, the purpose of the suit proceedings under the Commercial Courts Act will be defeated.”

11. This court is conscious of the object and purpose of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 which aims for speedy disposal of the suits and act in stipulated timelines, levying cost on parties if the same is not adhered to.

12. It is also the case of the petitioner / plaintiff that the petition mentioned documents are in the name of the respondent and the same is adduced to prove the petitioner's claim, as the respondent has disputed the very transaction with the petitioner.

13. It is also an ordinary practice that the court allows filing of additional document petition during trial or in the belated stages upon cost subject to proof, relevancy and admissibility. This court is of the view that the petitioner / plaintiff has averred in his plaint regarding the invoices and statement of accounts.

14. This court refers to the recent decision of the **Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sudhir Kumar @ S. Baliyan vs Vinay Kumar G.B. AIR 2021 SC 4303** wherein it was held that:

“7.2 At the outset, it is required to be noted that as such the said application for leave to produce on record additional documents was preferred by the appellant herein – original plaintiff under Order VII Rule 14 (3) of the CPC. However, considering the Order XI Rule 1 as applicable to the commercial suits by which Civil Procedure Code has been amended with respect to the suits before the commercial court and in view of the Section 16 of the Commercial Courts Act, Order VII Rule 14 (3) of the CPC shall have no application at all. After the Order XI Rule 1 has been amended with respect to the suits before the commercial courts and a specific provision/procedure has been prescribed with respect to the suits before the commercial division and before the commercial court, the provision of the Code of Civil Procedure as has been amended by the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 shall have to be followed and any provision of any rule of the jurisdiction of the High Court or any amendment to the Code of Civil Procedure by the State Government which is in conflict of the Code of the Civil Procedure as amended by Commercial Courts Act, the provision of the Code of the Civil Procedure as amended by the Commercial Courts Act shall prevail. Therefore, Order XI Rule 1 as amended by the amendment in the Commercial Courts Act, with respect to the suits before the commercial division and the commercial

court, the provisions of Order VII Rule 14 (3) shall not be applicable at all. Therefore as such the plaintiff applied the wrong provision seeking leave of the court to place on record the additional documents. However, considering the fact that thereafter, both the learned Commercial Court as well as the High Court treated and considered and even applied Order XI Rule 1 of the CPC as amended by the Commercial Courts Act and as applicable to the suits filed before the commercial division, commercial court, we proceed to consider the application submitted by the appellant herein – original plaintiff, as if the same was submitted under Order XI Rule 1 (4) of the CPC.

7.3 It is true that Order XI Rule 1 of the CPC as applicable to the commercial suits brought about a radical change and it mandates the plaintiff to file a list of all documents, photocopies of all documents, in its power, possession, control or custody, pertaining to the suit, along with the plaint and a procedure provided under Order XI Rule 1 is required to be followed by the plaintiff and the defendant, when the suit is the commercial suit.

9. In view of the above and for the reasons stated above, the plaintiff can be permitted to rely on the documents in the form of invoices as mentioned in the application as additional documents. However, such production shall not affect the outcome of interim injunction application submitted under Order XXXIX Rule 1 of the CPC, which as such is reported to be kept for orders.”

15. It is seen from the record that the parties to the *lis* had filed the statement of truth before this court and a declaration to that effect. In considering the fact that the suit was filed for recovery of money by the respondent / plaintiff, the suit being in the stage of evidence and in order to effectuate the speedy trial and for effective adjudication, this court is inclined to allow the petition to receive the additional documents as there exist reasonable cause in relying on the documents sought to be adduced to base his claim and is subject to proof, relevancy and admissibility. The

question pertaining to forgery of the document and its relevancy could very well be decided during the trial.

16. This court is also very remindful of the recent decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Levaku Pedda Reddamma and other Vs Gottumukkala Venkata Subbamma* and Another wherein it was observed “ that denying a party in a civil matter permission to produce additional documents, even if there is considerable delay result in denial of justice.”

17. It was also stated that “the relevancy of the documents could be examined by the trial court on the bars of the evidence to be led, but to deprive a party to the suit not to file documents if there is a delay will lead to denial of justice.”

18. This court also relies on the decision of Hon'ble High Court Madras in *Gelateria Montecatini Terme Ice cream Art India Private Limited an others Vs Aswath Raj* wherein it was observed that the learned counsel for the other side could raise the issue of admissibility, relevancy and proof and that the trial court is bound to address the objections.

19. Since the scope of this petition is only limited to receiving of additional document, the respondent/defendant could cross examine the petitioner/plaintiff and could elicit the issues pertaining to admissibility, relevancy and proof of the documents sought to be relied by the petitioner/plaintiff.

20. For the reasons stated *supra*, this court feels that no prejudice would be caused to Respondent/ Plaintiff by marking these documents, subject to admissibility, relevancy and proof.

21. But this court has not lost sight of the trajectory of the case, counter averments and the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the respondents/defendants. This court finds force in the argument advanced by the respondent counsel that the petitioner / plaintiff could have filed the same documents at the time of filing the suit. But having mentioned about the invoices and statement of documents in the plaint,

this court finds that permitting the petitioner / plaintiff to adduce the petition mentioned documents would not cause any prejudice or hardship to the respondent / defendant.

22. In considering the delay, with the aim to not defeat the purpose of the Act, this court is inclined to impose cost of Rs.2000/- to be paid to by the Petitioner / Plaintiff to the Respondent/ Defendant on or before 17.11.2025.

In the result, the petition would be allowed upon payment of cost of Rs.2000/- to be paid by the Petitioner / Plaintiff to the Respondent / Defendant on or before 17.11.2025.

The Order is directly typed in computer by Typist, corrected and pronounced by me in this Open Court on this 10th Day of November, 2025.

Judge,
Commercial Court,
(Senior Civil Judge Cadre),
Coimbatore.

List of Documents:-

List of Documents the side of the Petitioners: Nil

List of Documents the side of the Respondents: Nil

Judge,
Commercial Court,
(Senior Civil Judge Cadre),
Coimbatore.

Fair Order.
IA.No. 02 of 2025.
Cos No. 363 of 2024.
Date: 10.11.2025.