

IN THE COURT OF THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE, DHARMAPURI

Present: Tmt.U.Monica,M.L.,
Additional District Judge,
Dharmapuri.

Friday, this the 27th day of March 2026

I.A.No.18/2026

in

O.S.No.85/2017

1.R.Radha.
2.R.Dhileepan.
3.R.Ramesh.
4.R.Suvetha.

..... Petitioners / plaintiffs.

/versus/

1.K.Mangammal (died)
2.Poongudi.
3.Alagurani.
4.Soundharoja.
5.Senthilkumar.
6.Venkatesh.
7.Rizwan.
8.Aswar Ali.
9.Thavamani.
10.Chinnasamy.
11.Deputy Superintendent of Police.
Law and Order, Dharmapuri.
12.Deputy Superintendent of Police.
Land Acquisition Branch, Dharmapuri
13.Superintendent of Police,
Dharmapuri.
14. The Collector, Dharmapuri.
15.Saravanakumar.
16.Sathiyapriya.

..... Respondents/defendants.

This petition is coming on 26.3.2026 for final hearing before me in presence
of Thiru.A.Kannadasan, Advocate for petitioners and Thiru.K.Inbasakaran, Advocate

for third defendant and upon hearing both side arguments and on perusal of the entire case records and having stood over till this day, this court pronounced the following:

ORDER

This petition has been filed under section 151 r/w 148 of CPC.

2. The averments in the petition in brief is as follows:

According to petitioners, the case is posted for arguments. On the plaintiff's side the petitioner's son Dhileep and Town surveyor were examined. The petitioner's grandsons were not well and were taking treatment. She was taking care of them, due to her old age she was also under medical treatment, so she was unable to give evidence in the Court. Hence the plaintiff side evidence has to be reopened to adduce further evidence.

3. The averments in the counter filed by third respondent in brief is as follows:

All the allegations in the petition are not correct. The petitioners have not given proper reason as to why the petitioners should be examined, no valid reason has been given for examining Joint Sub Registrar No.2, Dharmapuri, District Revenue Officer. There is no merits in the petition and liable to be dismissed.

4. The point for consideration:

Whether the petition is to be allowed or not?

5. Heard both side. No oral or documentary evidence have been adduced on both side.

6. Point:

6.1) The petitioners allege that in order to prove the case the case has to be reopened to examine the petitioner, Sub Registrar, District Revenue Officer to prove her case.

6.2) The respondents resisted the petition by contending that there is no merits in the petition and petition has been filed only to drag on the proceedings.

6.3) The case is in the stage of arguments, taking into consideration the case is filed for relief of declaration, permanent injunction in the alternate for partition between the family members. In the interest of justice, to provide an opportunity to prove the case and prevent multiplicity of proceedings and for proper adjudication of the case, that this petition has to be allowed on cost,

In the result, petition is allowed on payment of cost of Rs.1000/- to respondent on or before 1.4.2026 failing which petition stands dismissed. Call on 2.4.2026.

Dictated by me, typed by the Steno-typist, corrected and pronounced by me in Open Court on this the 27th day of March 2026.

Additional District Judge,
Dharmapuri.

Petitioner side Evidence, Exhibits: Nil
Respondents Side Evidence, Exhibits: Nil.

Additional District Judge,
Dharmapuri.

Fair Order

I.A.No.18/2026 in

O.S.No.85/2017

Dated:27.3.2026.