

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MUNSIF, CHIDAMBARAM

Present:Tmt.E.Swetha, B.B.A., L.L.B (Hons)
 Additional District Munsif
 Chidambaram

Saturday, the 18th day of April 2026

IA.NO.77/2025 IN OS.54/2025

Lalitha

..... Petitioner/Plaintiff

/Vs/

1. Sadhanandham
2. Vignesh
3. Loganathan

.... Respondents/Defendants

This petition come on 25.3.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.R.Gnanamani, Advocate for the petitioners and Respondents were called absent set exparte due to non-filing of counter and upon hearing the argument of petitioner side and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following:

ORDER

Petition filed under Order 39 Rule 1, 2 of CPC to pass an ad interim order of injunction exparte restraining the respondents her men, agents and persons claiming under her from in any manner interfering with petitioner's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property till the final disposal of the suit and for costs.

2. The case of petitioner :

The petitioner is plaintiff in the suit and the respondents are defendants. The petitioner has filed the suit for permanent injunction restraining the respondents from interfering with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The suit property originally belonged to her husband with patta no.116 and he was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The petitioner is the wife of Soundararajan. Soundararajan out of love and affection towards the petitioner executed a registered settlement deed dated 13.12.2012 in her favour in respect of the suit property

registered as document No.2533/2012 before Sub Registrar, Bhuvanagiri. The settlement deed dated 13.12.2012 is true, valid accepted and acted upon. The petitioner accepted the settlement and took possession of the suit property on the date of settlement and ever since then the petitioner in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. Herself and members of her family are cultivating the suit property. Thus, the petitioner is in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property as absolute owner thereof. Prior to the execution of settlement, her husband Soundararajan was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The respondents own their house to the south of the suit property. 1st respondent is the father of respondents 2 and 3. 1st respondent has an eye over the suit property and to extend his property, 1st respondent demanded the petitioner to sell 0.03 cents in the suit property to him. The petitioner refused to sell the property. Aggrieved over the same the respondents are not in cordial terms with the petitioner and attempted to take forcible possession of the suit property. In fact the respondents attempted to trespass the suit property on 12.4.2025. With very great difficulty, the petitioner resisted their attempts. The respondents are very powerful persons in the village with men and money power. Any further attempt by the respondents will result in breach of peace and bloodshed. If the respondents are not restrained by an order of injunction, the petitioner will suffer serious loss and damages which cannot be compensated on any account. Hence the petitioner has filed the suit for permanent injunction restraining the respondents from in any manner interfering with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The petitioner have a strong prima facie case and balance of convenience is in her favour. If the respondents are not restraining by an order of injunction, the petitioner will suffer serious loss and damages which cannot be compensated on any account. The petitioner prepared to abide by the terms of the court. Hence this petition.

3. The respondents were set exparte for Non-filing of Counter on 20.1.2026.

4. Now the point for consideration is whether the petitioner is entitled to get the reliefs as prayed for?

5. On the side of Petitioner, Ex.P1 to P3 was marked. No oral evidences were let in on the side of petitioner. On the side of respondents, no evidences were produced.

Points For Consideration:

6. Heard the Learned counsel for the Petitioner. Material records perused. This is the suit filed for the relief of permanent injunction and the instant petition is filed to pass an ad interim order of injunction exparte restraining the respondents her men, agents and persons claiming under her from in any manner interfering with petitioner's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property till the final disposal of the suit. According to the petitioner the suit property originally belonged to the petitioner's husband Soundararajan, who was in possession and enjoyment thereof. Out of love and affection, the said Soundararajan executed a registered Settlement Deed dated 13.12.2012 in favour of the petitioner in respect of the suit property, registered as Document No.2533 of 2012 on the file of the Sub Registrar, Bhuvanagiri. According to the petitioner, the settlement deed was accepted and acted upon, and possession of the suit property was delivered to her on the date of settlement. Since then, she has been in continuous possession and enjoyment of the suit property and has been cultivating the same through herself and her family members.

7. The petitioner further contends that the respondents own property to the south of the suit property. The first respondent allegedly demanded that the petitioner sell an extent of 0.03 cents from the suit property to him, which request was refused by the petitioner. Aggrieved by the same, the respondents are alleged to have attempted to trespass into the suit property and forcibly take possession thereof on 12.04.2025. The petitioner claims that she resisted the said attempt and apprehends further interference by the respondents. Hence this petition.

8. The respondents were called absent set exparte in this petition.

9. On perusal of records, it is seen that the suit property is located in R.S.No.210/4A to an extent of 0.67 cents in Keezh Bhuvangiri, Chidambaram. To substantiate the case of petitioner, the petitioner has marked Ex.P1 to P3. Ex.P1 dated

13.12.2012 is the Registered settlement deed in favour of plaintiff executed by Soundararajan, Ex.P2 dated 27.3.2025 is the e-patta in the name of Soundararajan, Ex.P3 dated 27.3.2025 is the Adangal for 1434 fasli issued by VAO Keezh Bhuvanagiri village. Though Ex.P3 is issued by VAO, from the rest of the documents, it is shown that the petitioner is in possession and enjoyment of the suit property.

10. Hence the petitioner has made out prima facie case. The balance of convenience is also in favor of the Petitioner. If interim injunction is not granted, they will cause irreparable loss. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, the Petitioner have produced the documents to show their possession and enjoyment the suit properties. Therefore, in the interest of justice, this court is of the considered view that the petitioner is entitled for the relief of temporary injunction.

In the result, this petition is allowed and the order of interim injunction is granted till the disposal of the suit. No costs.

Dictated to the steno-typist, transcribed by her and typed in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court this the 18th day of April 2026.

(Sd/-E.Swetha)
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MUNSIF,
CHIDAMBARAM

List of witnesses on the side of the petitioners: NIL

List of documents on the side of the petitioners:

Ex.P1	13.12.2012	Registered settlement deed in favour of plaintiff executed by Soundararajan- Certified copy
Ex.P2	27.3.2025	Patta- Online copy
Ex.P3	27.3.2025	Adangal for 1434 fasli issued by VAO Keezh Bhuvanagiri village- True copy

List of witnesses and documents on the side of the respondents: NIL

(Sd/-E.Swetha)
ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MUNSIF,
CHIDAMBARAM