

IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE
AT CHENGALPATTU

Present: Thiru.A.Saravanakumar.,B.A.B.L.,
Additional District Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Tuesday, the 7th day of April 2026
I.A.No.5/2025 and IA.No.6/2025
in O.S.No.24/2016
CNR.No: TNCG01-000815-2016

I.A.No.5/2025

1.Susila Jayaraman

2.A.J.Dharmesh

3.A.J.Harini

4.A.J.Harshini

...Petitioners/Defendants 5 to 8

-Vs.-

1.A.Loganathan

...Respondent/ 2nd Plaintiff

2.A.Dhanalakshmi

3.A.Jayagopal

4.A.Maheswari

...Respondents 2 to 4/ Defendants 2 to 4

I.A.No.6/2025

1.Susila Jayaraman

2.A.J.Dharmesh

3.A.J.Harini

4.A.J.Harshini

...Petitioners/Defendants 5 to 8

-Vs.-

1.A.Loganathan

...Respondent/ 2nd Plaintiff

2.A.Dhanalakshmi

3.A.Jayagopal

4.A.Maheswari

...Respondents 2 to 4/ Defendants 2 to 4

These Petitions coming before this court on 23.1.2026 for final hearing in the presence of M/s.K.G.Vasudevan, S.Chandramohan, Praveen Sethia and O.M.Balakrishnan, counsel for the Petitioners/Defendants 5 to 8 and Mr.N.Ravi, counsels for the 1st Respondent/ 2nd Plaintiff and Counter of R2 to R4 not filed and upon hearing the arguments of both sides and perusing the material records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivered the following:-

COMMON ORDER

IA No.5/2025 is filed to under Order 18 Rule 17 and Section 151 CPC to recall PW1 and IA.No.6/2025 is filed under Section 151 CPC to reopen the evidence of PW1.

1. The petitions and counters perused.
2. Both sides heard.
3. The points for consideration:

Upon perusing the petitions and counters in IA.No.5/2025 and 6/2025 and this court has framed the following point for consideration in common:

“Whether the petitions are to be allowed as prayed for”?

4. Answer to the point:

The petitioners are the 5th to 8th defendants in the original suit. The 1st respondent is the 2nd plaintiff and 2nd to 4th respondents are the 2nd to 4th defendants therein. IA.No.6/2025 is allowed to reopen the case and IA.No.5/2025 is filed to recall PW1 for filing a power of attorney deed dated 13.6.1988 executed by late Achutha. As per the petitioners case, the above said document is necessary to prove their case and for that purpose PW1 may be recalled and the case may be reopened. The respondent seriously disputed the averments stated in the petitions and as per their contentions the petitions are filed belatedly and to drag on the proceedings. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is of the view that since the petitioners contented that the above document is necessary to prove their case an opportunity may be given to the petitioners to produce it. If this petition is allowed no serious prejudice would cause to the respondents since they have opportunity to cross examine and falsify the above document. However, since the case is one of more than 10 years old, this court is inclined to compensate the delay caused to the respondents.

IA.No.5/2025

In the result, the petition is allowed on payment of cost of Rs.750/- to be paid directly to the respondents on or before 4.6.2026. Otherwise, the petition shall be dismissed. call on 5.6.2026.

IA.No.6/2025

In the result, the petition is allowed on payment of cost of Rs.750/- to be paid directly to the respondents on or before 4.6.2026. Otherwise, the petition shall be dismissed. call on 5.6.2026

Dictated to the Shorthand writer and typed by her and corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, this the 7th day of April 2026.

Additional District & Sessions Judge
Chengalpattu.

Both sides Exhibits and Witnesses: Nil

Additional District & Sessions Judge
Chengalpattu.

Draft/Fair Order
Common Order
I.A.No.5/2025 and I.A.No.6/2025,
in
O.S.No.24/2016
Dated:07.04.2026
ADJ/CPT
