

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.

Thursday the 26<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026

IA.No.2/2025 in O.S. No. 83/2023

1. Kamatchi
2. Senthilkumar
3. Sandhiya
4. Kanchanadevi

...Petitioners/Proposed Defendants

Vs

1. Naganandhini
2. P.M. Manickam(died)
3. N. Sureshbabu
4. V. Sooriya Narayanan
5. G. Sukanya

.. 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent/ Plaintiff

.... 3,4,5 Respondents/2, 3,4 Defendants

This petition is coming on 25.02.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of M/s. V. Tamilarasu, V. Thulasi, J. Karpagam, V. Praveen. M.K. Archana, R. Kamesh, V. Srisaran, Counsels appearing for the Plaintiff and Respondents/Defendants and upon hearing the arguments on both sides and upon hearing arguments on both sides and upon perusal of records and having stood over the matter for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following

ORDER

Petition filed under Order I Rule 10 C.P.C. to implead the proposed parties as defendants in the main suit in O.S. No. 83 of 2023.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners/proposed parties would contend as follows. The main suit is filed for relief of declaration and injunction. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant died on 20.10.2016. Despite the same, the suit was filed by the petitioner/plaintiff as though her possession was interfered with by him. The petitioners/proposed parties are the legal heirs of the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. The property was purchased by the father of the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant under sale deed dated 11.10.2010 under document No. 8338/2010. The suit property is in the possession and enjoyment of the proposed parties. Hence, the petitioners are necessary parties to the present suit. Hence, that the petition be allowed.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff would contend that the petitioners/proposed party have no right over the suit property. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had earlier filed a suit which was dismissed for default. Hence, the petitioner/proposed parties who are the legal heirs of the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant cannot claim any rights over the property. Hence, that the petition be dismissed.

4. Upon hearing both sides and having perused the materials on record, this court finds as follows. The petitioners are the legal representatives of the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. The fact that the petitioners are the legal representatives of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is not disputed by the petitioners. It is apparent that the suit is filed against

the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant praying for a relief of declaration and injunction. Therefore, it is apparent that the petitioners are necessary and proper parties to the present suit. Hence, this petition is to be allowed.

5. In result, this petition is allowed without costs.

//This order has been partly dictated by me to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by her in the computer, and partly typed by me in my laptop corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the Thursday the 26<sup>th</sup> day of March 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.No.2/2025 in  
O.S.No. 83/2023  
D.D. 26.03.2026  
Principal District Court ,  
Kancheepuram.

