

In the Court of the Principal District Judge,
Principal District Court, Kancheepuram.

PRESENT: **Tmt. Deepthi Arivunithi, M.L.,**
Principal District Judge,
Principal District Court ,
Kancheepuram.

Tuesday the 21st day of April 2026

I.A. No. 4 /2026 and IA.No.5/2026 in Ind.OP. No.31/2015

P. Ravichandran

...Petitioner/3rd Respondent in both I.A.s
Vs

1. K.G. Lakshmi

.. 1st Respondent/Petitioner/Plaintiff in both I.A.s

2. G. Ravikumar

3. N. Thanthoni

4. J. Govindarajulu

5. The Special Tahsildar,
Nagara Nilavari Thittam,
Municipal Office Campus,
Kancheepuram Municipality,
Kancheepuram.

6. The Tahsildar,
Kancheepuram Taluk,
Kancheepuram.

7. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. By District Collector,
Kancheepuram.

.. Respondents/Respondents/Defendants 2 to 7 in both I.A.s.

These petitions are coming on 16.04.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.L. Sowmiya Narayanan, Counsel appearing for the Petitioner and M/s. M. Madhanagopal and S. Bharathi, Counsels appearing for the 1st respondent and Thiru.T.C. Soundararajan, Counsel appearing for respondents 2 and 3 and Thiru.A. K. Ramesh, Government Pleader for respondents 5 to 7 and upon hearing the arguments on petitioner side and upon perusal of records and having stood over the matter for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following

ORDER

Petitions filed to reopen the petitioner's side evidence and to recall P.W.1 for the purpose of cross examination.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner/3rd respondent would state that the Indigent O.P. was filed by the 1st respondent/petitioner/plaintiff to institute the suit as Indigent person on the ground that she has no means to pay the court fee. The evidence of P.W.1 was closed without giving an opportunity to the petitioner to cross examine the witness. Therefore that the petition be allowed.

3. The learned counsel for the 1st respondent/petitioner would vehemently oppose the petition on the ground that the case was pending for several years and the parties did not turned up for cross examining the witness and for drag on the matter endlessly. Therefore that the petition be dismissed.

4. Upon perusal of records, it is seen that the Indigent.O.P. was dismissed for default by this court due to the absence of P.W.1 for several hearings and thereafter based on the petition the said O.P. was restored to file. Therefore, it cannot be stated that the present petitioners have drag on the matter as suggested. It is seen that the 3rd respondent has not cross examined the witness previously. Hence, considering the reasons given and in order to provide an effective opportunity to the petitioner, this court is inclined to allow this petition without costs. On condition that the witness shall be cross examined on the date of her appearance.

5. In result, this petition is allowed without costs. On condition that the witness shall be cross examined on the date of her appearance.

//This order has been directly dictated by me to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by her in the computer and corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the Tuesday the 21st day of April 2026//

Principal District Judge,
Principal District Court,
Kancheepuram.

Exhibits and Witnesses on
both side: NIL.

Principal District Judge,
Principal District Court,
Kancheepuram.

Draft/Fair Order
I.A. 4/2026 and
I.A.No.5/2026 in
Ind.OP.No. 31/2015
D.D. 21.04.2026
Principal District Court ,
Kancheepuram.

