

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF AT MADURANTAKAM

PRESENT: Tmt. V. Devapriya, B.Sc.,M.L.,
District Munsif, Madurantakam

Wednesday, the 6th day of July, 2022

I.A.No. 7/2022

in

O.S. No. 274/2012

K.N.Baskaran

...Petitioner/Plaintiff

-vs-

M.Sathiyaraj

...Respondent/Defendant

This petition coming up before me on 21.06.2022 for final hearing in the presence of, Thiruvallarkal V.Sridharan, S.Senthilkumaran and Priya Ilavarasi, counsel for the Petitioner/Plaintiff and Thiru. G.S.Suresh Babu, counsel for Respondent/ Defendant and after hearing the arguments of both sides and upon perusing the materials placed on record, and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivers the following,

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the Petitioner/Plaintiff under order VII Rule 14 (3) to receive the petition mentioned documents and to mark the same on the side of the Petitioner/Plaintiff.

2.The averments stated in the petition in brief:

The petition mentioned documents are vital to prove the Petitioner/Plaintiff's

case and now only he had got those documents. Hence this petition.

3. The averments stated in the Counter filed by the Respondent/Defendant in brief:

The petition mentioned document are online copies and they are fabricated documents. The suit property belongs to the Respondent/Defendant and those documents will not decide the case. This petition is filed to drag on the proceedings. Hence this petition is liable to be dismissed with costs.

4. The point for determination is whether this petition is to be allowed or not?

5. No Exhibits marked and no witnesses were examined on both sides

6. Heard both sides and perused the records.

7. The Petitioner/Plaintiff had filed this petition to receive the petition mentioned documents as evidence on his side. The Respondent/defendant had opposed the petition on the ground that those documents are fabricated documents. The Petitioner/Plaintiff had obtained those documents through online. The Respondent/Defendant has not specifically stated how those documents are fabricated. Hence in the interest of justice, this court is inclined to allow this petition and afford an opportunity to the petitioner to let in documentary evidence.

8. In the result, this petition is allowed. No costs.

Dictated to the Stenographer and transcribed by her and corrected and pronounced by me in open court on this the 6th day of July, 2022

District Munsif
Madurantakam

Petitioner side witnesses and documents:

Nil

Respondent side witnesses and documents:

Nil

District Munsif
Madurantakam