

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

PRESENT: Thiru.Pa.U.Chemmal,M.A.,LL.M.,
Principal District Judge,
Principal District Court ,
Kancheepuram.

Tuesday the 16th day of September 2025

IA.No.11/2025 in O.S. No.219/2024

1.A. Rajasekar
2. P. Kesavan

-- Petitioners/ 1st and 2nd defendants.
//vs//

N. Kothai

-- Respondent/ Plaintiff

This petition is coming on 12.09.2025 for final hearing before me in the presence of M/s. R. Abdulhakim, Counsel appearing for the petitioners/Defendants and M/s. V. Janarthanan, R. Vijyakumar, V. Pandiyan, Counsels appearing for the Respondent/ Plaintiff and upon hearing the arguments of both side and upon perusal of records and having stood over for my consideration till this day, this court delivered the following

ORDER

This petition is filed by the petitioner under Order 7 Rule 11 and Section 151 of CPC to reject the plaint in O.S. No.219/2024 pending on the file of the District and Sessions Judge Kancheepuram.

2) The averments found in the affidavit filed by the petitioners/1st and 2nd defendants in brief are as follows:

The petitioner has purchased 20 cents of vacant land in S.No.13/1AC from one Lalitha Bai, who is the mother of the respondent/plaintiff herein by way of registered sale deed 3708/201 dated 23.09.2011. The petitioner have been in possession and enjoyment of the suit property until the petitioner sold it to 3rd and 4th defendants. Patta was issued in his favour under Patta No.983 and the New S.No.17,18 and Old S. No.13/1AC -20 cents. The petitioners had given a general power of attorney in favour of the 2nd petitioner by a registered general power of attorney deed dated 23.12.2015. The said 3rd and 4th defendants had purchased the property by a registered sale deed dated 14.06.2021 through the power agent. From the date of the said sale till date 3rd and 4th defendants are in continuous and peaceful possession and enjoyment of the said land. They have got the patta also in their name and they have been paying taxes regularly. The transfer of patta in the name of the 3rd and 4th defendants was questioned by the plaintiff and ultimately it was decided it is for the Civil court to decide the title. While so, the respondent/plaintiff had filed the suit for declaration of tile and permanent injunction in the respect of our property claiming rights through a third party

Muslims who is said to have purchased the property from legal heirs of Lakshminarayanan Mudaliyar, her mother's brother. So, it is necessary to narrate the history of the property as mentioned below:-

a) Through Partition deed Krishna Swamy Mudaliyar got 3.5 Acres of land in S.No.13 through document Number (1417/1918) dated 25.04.1918.

b) The said Krishnaswamy Mudaliar along with his minor children Lakshminarayan, Ramachadran and Narashiman sold 18.5 cents in S.No.13/1, to Lalitha Bai (Krishnaswamy Mudaliar's daughter) through document number 6459/1942 dated 17.11.1942.

c) The said Lalitha Bai (i.e.,) the mother of the Plaintiff sold 20 cents of land in S.No.13/1AC to the petitioner through document number 3748/2011 dated 23.09.2011.

d) The petitioner had executed a power of attorney in favour of 2nd petitioner through Document No.3556/IV/2015 dated 23.12.2015.

e) The 2nd respondent sold 20 cents of property in T.S. No.17, 18 Old S.No.13/1AC to Narend and Ganesh who are the 3rd and 4th defendants herein, through document number 1669/2021 dated 14.06.2021.

f) The 3rd and 4th defendants had borrowed money from bank by executing a mortgage deed to Indian Bank, Kancheepuram through document number

1739/2021 dated 17.06.2024.

Case of the plaintiff N. Kothai,

- a) According to Kothai, through a Partition Deed Krishnaswamy Mudaliar got 3.5 Acres of lands in S.No.13 through Doc.No.(1417/1918) dated 25.04.1918.
- b) The said Krishnaswamy Mudaliar along with his minor children Lakshminarayan, Ramachandran and Narashiman sold 20 cents in S.No.13 to C.K. Duraisamy Mudaliar through Doc.No.2279/1936 dated 17.03.1936.
- c) The said to C.K. Duraisamy Mudaliar through Official trustee of Madras sold the property in S.No.13/1 to H.M. Abdul Kadher through document Number 41/1946 dated 22.12.1945.
- d) The legal heirs of the said H.M. Adbul Kadher created Power document among their family members for 20 cents through document number 142/2004 dated 30.12.2004, 1411/2024 dated 22.11.2004, 1547/2004 dated 24.12.2004, 1548/2004 dated 24.12.2004 for T.S.No.13, Old S.No. 13, 13/1AC.
- e) The said registered power holders and with unregistered power document along with 5 members who are all legal heirs of H.M. Adbulkadher sold the 20 cents of land in T.S.No.17,18 Old S.No.13, 13/1AC to Kothai through document number 1367/2005 dated 30.08.2005.

A Suit for declaration in O.S.No.1031/1979 was filed on the file of the

learned District Munsif Court, Kancheepuram by Lakshminarayan against Ibharim Sahib. The suit was decreed in favour of the said Lakshminarayan.

The said Lakshminarayan had filed a execution petition for delivery in EP No.240/1981 and the said EP was contested against legal heirs of HM Abdul Kadher. The delivery order was passed in the baove EP against legal heirs of HM Abdul Kadher.

The said legal heirs of Lakshminarayan and other family members had filed a suit for injunction in OS.No.1081/1985 against legal heirs of H.M AbdulKadher on the file of the District Munsif Court Kancheepuram and got decree against the legal heirs of HM Abdul Kadher.

An appeal suit in AS.No.10/1991 was filed by Legal heirs of H.M. Abdul Kadher against the decree and judgment in OS.No.1081/1985 on the file of the Sub Court, Kancheepuram and the same was also dismissed.

An execution petition in E.P. No.75/1997 was filed by the legal heirs of Lakshminarayan and others and the same was allowed against the legal heirs of HM Abdul Kadher.

A suit in O.S.No.52/1996 was filed by the Legal heirs of H.M Abdul Kadher on the file of District Munsif Court at Kancheepuram and the same was dismissed as not pressed by the plaintiff therein.

After the disposal of all the above cases, the following cases are filed for more or less the same relief and they are as follows:-

1. O.S.No.135/2021 - suit for declaration was filed by 2nd and 3rd defendant and others against the respondent.
2. O.S.No.219/2024 - suit for declaration was filed by the plaintiff that the certain documents are null void.
3. O.S.No. 309/2024 - suit for injunction was filed by the respondent against the petitioner.
4. O.S.No. 371/2024 - suit for declaration was filed by the petitioner against the respondent.

All the suits are related to the same property in respect of which already written statements were filed and disposed of as stated in para 5 to 10 above. It is not known as to why and how the subsequent suits can be filed when there are categorical findings in the earlier suit in favour of the predecessors of the plaintiffs herein. The said Kothai has filed the above suit suppressing the disposal of the earlier suits and her subsequent suit should be dismissed in limine. But, unfortunately, the suits which are not maintainable under the Limitation Act and also under section 11 of CPC and they are now being taken upon for trial jointly. As she came out with a false claim and frequently has

been disturbing us, we have also filed a suit in OS.No.371/2024 and the 3rd and 4th defendants have also filed a suit in OS.No.135/2021. Once then suit is dismissed as not maintainable, we will withdraw our suit in the light of the same.

The suit filed by the plaintiff Kothai is not at all maintainable and the same is liable to be rejected in limine.

Apart from that the relief brought for by the plaintiff in the present suit is reproduced below which would clearly reveal that the present suit is not maintainable at all in view of earlier decision of this court on the same subject in the respect of the same property. The plaintiff has filed the above suit for the following relief of suit in page 13 of the plaint.

- a. Declaring that the plaintiff is the absolute owner of the suit schedule property from the defendant 1 to 4 , after removing whatever superstructure of the building in the suit schedule property;
- b. To declare that the power of attorney executed by 1st defendant in favour of 2nd defendant vide Document NO.3556 of 2015 dated 23.12.2015 on the file of 7th defendant as null and void;
- c. To declare that the sale deed executed by the 2nd defendant in favour of 3rd and 4th defendant vide document NO.1669 of 2021 dated 14.06.2021 on the file

of the 7th defendant as null and void;

d. To declare that the depositing of title executed by the 3rd and 4th defendants in favour of 6th defendant vide document No.3547 of 2021 dated 17.06.2021 on the file of the 7th defendant as null and void;

e. Permanent injunction restraining the 1 to 4 defendants herein, men, servants, attorneys, legal heirs, agents or any other persons from putting up further construction in the suit schedule property;

f. for cost of the suit;

g. Granting such other relief;

Apart from that the cause of action mentioned in the plaint filed by the plaintiff also would clearly reveal that the suit is hopelessly barred by limitation and hence the plaint is liable to be rejected. The plaintiff had filed the above suit for the following cause of action in page 11 of the plaint stating the "Cause of action for suit arose in the year of 1936 and the suit schedule property within the jurisdiction of the Hon'ble Court. The partition deed of Thiru. Krishnaswamy Mudaliar in Doc.No.1417 of 1918 for 3.5 acres; subsequently the sale deed executed by Krishnasamy Mudaliar in favour of Duraisamy Mudaliyar in Doc.No.2279 of 1936 for 20 cents out of 3.5 acres; after that the sale deed executed by Krishnasamy mudaliar in favour of his daughter Lalitha

bai (who is the mother of the plaintiff) registered as Doc No.649 of 1942 for 18.5 cents out of 3.5 acres; subsequently the sale deed executed by Official Trustee of Madras behalf of Duraisamy Mudaliar through public auction in favour of Mr. H.M. Abdul Kadar in Doc.No.41 of 1946; Moreover the learned District Munsif Court, Kancheepuram decreed in favour of Lakshminarayanan in O.S.No.1081 of 1985 for the suit schedule property; subsequently sale deed of the suit schedule property executed by legal heirs of Lakshminarayanan in favour of the plaintiff Doc.No.525 of 1993; After that the legal heir of Krishnaswamy mudaliar's Son Narasimman executed a sale deed for suit schedule property in favour of plaintiff in Doc.No.524 of 1993; Thereafter the property tax paid to Kancheepuram Municipality by M. Abdul Kadar in favour of Plaintiff in Doc.No.1367 of 2005 on 30.08.2005; Thereafter the plaintiff got town survey field register with FMBSketch from VAO on 07.09.2007; Thereafter the sale deed was executed by Lalitha Bai in favour of the 1st defendant without boundaries in Doc.No.3748 of 2011 dated 23.09.2011; subsequently the plaintiff made Land grabbing complaint against 1st defendant on 12.03.2012; Thereafter the 1st defendant filed OS.No.221 of 2012 against plaintiff and her tenant B. Chandrasekaran same was dismissed for non-prosecution on 06.01.2020; Subsequently Electricity bill paid by plaintiff for

suit schedule property on 22.01.2014; Thereafter plaintiff made a complaint against 1st defendant in CSR.No.210 of 2014 on 05.01.2014; Thereafter the original suit was filed by the plaintiff in O.S.No. 211 of 2014 against 1st defendant for permanent injunction still pending; Thereafter the General Power of Attorney was executed by 1st defendant in favour of 2nd defendant in doc.No.3556 of 2015 on 23.12.2015; Subsequently The District Revenue Officer confirmed order of the Revenue Divisional Officer on 16.02.2018; Subsequently the plaintiff submitted the objection letter given to the 7th defendant for not alienate any encumbrance in the suit schedule property on 01.12.2020; Thereafter the sale deed was executed by 2nd defendant in favour of 3rd and 4th defendant in Doc.No.1669 of 2021 on 14.06.2021; Subsequently the Memorandum of deposit of title deed was executed by 3rd and 4th defendant in favour of the 6th defendant on 17.06.2021; Subsequently the suit was filed by the 3rd and 4th defendant for declaration against plaintiff and others in O.S.No.135 of 2021 on 12.08.2021; Meantime enquiry report filed by 7th defendant to the District Registrar Kancheepuram on 23.08.2021; Subsequently the plaintiff sent objection letter to the bank official of the Indian Bank, Kancheepuram on 01.07.2021; Thereafter the District Registrar, Kancheepuram passed order to 7th defendant, to enter in the encumbrance of

Documents No.3748 of 2011,3556 of 1015 and 1661 of 2021 as fraudulent due to false statements/ presentation in the 28.01.2022; Thereafter WMP No.4451 of 2022 and WMP No.4452 of 2022 in W.P.No.4338 of 2022 Interim Injunction granted to restraining the defendants 1 to 4 altering the physical features of the suit scheduled property on 03.03.2022; Where the suit schedule property is situated within the jurisdiction of this court.

Above all, the plaintiff has no basis at all to support her claim on merits and on this ground also the suit is liable to be rejected in limini. The plaintiff has made a false averment in the plaint at para 4 as if one Narashiman and Lakshminarayan has sold the property in favour of the plaintiff's predecessors without any title after the sale in her favour by the other legal heirs of Krishnasami Mudaliar. The plaintiff has referred to a document Number 524 of 1993 dated 20.05.1993 and 525 of 1993 dated 20.05.1993 and the said document is taken from the Sub Register Office. If the said document is perused, it would throw light on the fraudulent statement made by the plaintiff in para 4 of the plaint as the said document is related to completely different property with different survey number altogether. On this ground alone the plaint is liable to struck down.

The petitioner have a prima facie case and the balance of convenience in

favour of rejection of plaint. It is attempt by the respondent to protract the proceedings by a colourable relief. Hence, petition may be allowed and the plaint may be rejected.

3) **The averments found in the counter of the 1st Respondent/Plaintiff in brief are as follows:**

This Respondent denies all the allegations in the affidavit and save those which are expressly admitted in this counter.

The present application filed by the petitioners/1st and 2nd defendants under Order VII Rule 11 of CPC is nothing but a device to protract the proceeding. The Hon'ble Madras High Court, by order in W.P.No.4338 of 2022, has directed to clubbing of all four suits, and trial has already commenced. The petitioners have not set forth any valid or sustainable ground for rejection of the plaint in their affidavit, which is a mandatory requirement under law. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Church of Christ Charitable Trust and Educational Charitable Society v. Ponniamman Educational Trust, (2012) 8 SCC 706, rejection of plaint cannot be sought without satisfying the necessary conditions under Order VII Rule 11.

The 1st petitioner/1st defendant has himself admitted in Paragraph 2 of the affidavit that his vendor is one Lalitha Bai, who purportedly acquired the

property through Document No.6459/1942 executed by Krishnaswamy Mudaliar on 17.11.1942. However, the four boundaries recited in that sale deed are entirely different from the suit schedule property. On this ground alone, the applications in I.A. No.11/2025 in O.S.No. 219/2024 and I.A.No.3/2025 in O.S.No.309/2024 are liable to be dismissed.

The original survey No.13 Comprises a vast area measuring over 3.5 acres. Out of this 20 cents of house site were sold to C.K. Duraisamy Mudaliar in Survey No.13 under Document NO.2279/1936.

Boundaries of this property:

East- My Vacant Land (Krishnasamy Mudaliar)

West- Second Medial Street

North- Vacant land of Venugopal Mudaliar

South- Arcot Road (now Vellore Road)

Another 18.5 cents of Punjai land was sold to Lalitha Bai in Survey No.13, under document No.6459/1942;

Boundaries of this property:

East- Kullappa Naidu Street

West- S.Nos. 15 and 16 of my land (Krishnasamy Mudaliar)

North- Vacant land of Venugopal Mudaliar

South- House of Deivanai ammal

Both these transactions merely mention Survey No.13, and the clear demarcation of boundaries establishes that they are distinct. The Doc.No.2279/1936 is the suit schedule property and Doc.No.6459/1942 is not the suit schedule property.

It was only in the sale deed executed by the Official Trustee of the Madras High Court in favour of H.M. AbdulKadar under document No.41/1946 that Survey No.13 was subdivided and mentioned as Survey No.13/1.

In paragraph 5 of the affidavit, the petitioners refer to O.S.No.1031/1979 filed by Lakshminarayan against one Ibrahim Sahib. However, the said suit was not filed by Lalitha Bai, the alleged vendor of the 1st petitioner. It was filed only by Lakshminarayan, who claimed the suit property as ancestral property. The said Ibrahim Sahib, who ran a temporary bunk shop, had no connection with the legal heirs of H.M.abdulKadar who was the registered owner as per Document No.41/1946. This clearly shows that the claim of title through Lalitha Bai is unfounded.

Furthermore, Lakshminarayan never challenged the sale deeds executed by his father, Krishnaswamy Mudaliar, in favour of C.K. Duraisamy Mudaliar (Doc.No.2279/1936) or that by the official trustee in favour of H.M. Abdul

Kadar (Doc No.41/1946). Hence, the long- standing title of H.M. Abdul Kadar and his heirs remains un assailed and valid in law.

The petitioner's reliance in Paragraph 7 on the decree in O.S.No.1081/1985 filed by legal heirs of Lakshminarayan against the heirs of H.M. Abdul Kadar is misplaced. That suit was merely for injunction and involved only by his vendors. Neither Lalitha Bai nor her successors were party to that suit, and hence it has no bearing on the present dispute.

In paragraph 10 of the petitioner's affidavit, it is stated that O.S.No.52/1996 was dismissed as not pressed. This again pertains to inter party disputes between his vendors and is not in any way connected to the title of the petitioners. Withdrawal of a suit does not extinguish or affect title, as observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Ramesh Chand Ardawatiya V. Anil Panjwani (2003) 7 SCC 350.

The sale deeds in Document Nos. 524 and 525 of 1993 dated 20.05.1993 were executed by the legal heirs of Lakshminarayan and Narasimman. Among the five properties conveyed therein, the suit schedule property was shown as Item No.2. The UDR A- Register of Netteri Village reflects Survey No.13/1AC in the names of Lakshminarayan, Narasimman and Ramachandran. There is no entry for Survey No.13/1AAC, which clearly establishes that 13/1AC is the

correct and valid survey subdivision.

Thereafter coming to know of the existence of these sale deeds and of the possession and revenue records standing in the names of the legal heirs of H.M. Abdul Kadar, he made enquiries at the Registration Office and verified the title. The original sale deed in Doc.No.41/1946 stood valid and subsisting. The petitioner then lawfully purchased the suit schedule property from the heirs of H.M. Abdul Kadar under Document No.1367/2005 dated 30.08.2005.

Post purchase, the respondent/plaintiff was in peaceful possession and revenue records were mutated in his name. Subsequently the 1st petitioner/1st defendant purchased the property in Doc.No.6459/1942 through Document No.3748/2011 dated 23.09.2011 which contained no boundaries and is completely different from the suit schedule property. Despite this, the 1st petitioner attempted to disturb his possession and fraudulently created encumbrances.

The 1st petitioner then executed a General power of Attorney in favour of the 2nd petitioner, registered as Document No.3556/2015 dated 23.12.2015, wherein the suit property was deliberately and falsely included. This fraudulent inclusion was confirmed by the District Registrar, Kancheepuram , in order dated 28.01.2022.

When I filed the suit for injunction in O.S.No.309/2024 the respondent / plaintiff was in actual possession of the suit property, following the illegal eviction of his tenant. The land was vacant, and he regularly visited it. Subsequently when the 3rd and 4th defendants purchased the property under Document No.1669/2021 dated 14.06.2021, they illegally constructed a compound wall and took forcible possession.

While O.S.No.309/2024 was pending, further alienation occurred and possession was lost. Given the increase in value of the property and unlawful dispossession, the respondent was compelled to file the present suit in O.S.No.219/2024 seeking declaration and recovery of possession.

Additional grounds for Dismissal of the Interlocutory Application:

The interlocutory applications filed by the petitioners under Order VII Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure are not maintainable at this stage, especially when trial has already commenced and pleadings are complete. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in *R.K. Roja v U.S. Rayudu*, (2016) 14 SCC 275, that an application under Order VII Rule 11 must be decided based on the averments in the plaint alone, and not on the defence or documents filed by the defendant. In the present case, the plaint discloses a clear cause of action and triable issues; hence, the application deserves outright rejection.

As per the dictum of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *M. Pushpalatha v. V. Padmavathi*, 2022 SCC Online SC 1229, the court reiterated that once trial has begun and evidence is being led, belated applications for rejection of plaint cannot be entertained, unless the plaint is demonstrably barred by law on its face. In the present suit, the title documents, possession and disputed encumbrance are all matters requiring adjudication after full trial.

The petitioners have raised mixed questions of fact and law, particularly relating to boundaries, title history, survey numbers and prior litigations, all of which require appreciation of evidence and cannot be resolved Summarily. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Popat and Kotecha property v. State Bank of India Staff Association*, (2005) 7 SCC 510, held that if a meaningful reading of the plaint discloses a cause of action, the court should not reject the plaint merely on technical grounds.

The entire attempt of the petitioners is a dilatory tactic aimed at delaying the proceedings. Such conduct has been deprecated in multiple judgments including *Sejal Glass Ltd. v. Navilan Merchants Pvt. Ltd.*, (2018) 11 SCC 780, where the Hon'ble Court held that Order VII Rule 11 cannot be invoked by a defendant merely because they dispute the facts stated in the plaint.

I also place reliance on the decision of the Madras High Court in *Gnanam*

v. Sivagami and others, 2021 SCC Online Mad 12912, where the court held that the rejection of plaint under Order VII Rule 11 can be invoked only in exceptional cases and not where the matter involves documentary evidence and factual disputes that must be tried.

The application filed by the petitioners/ defendants is premature, devoid of merit, and does not satisfy any of the ingredients under clauses (a) to (f) of Order VII Rule 11 CPC. The suit is neither barred by any law nor is it without cause of action. As such , the plaint is not liable to be rejected.

This court may also consider that multiple proceedings involving the suit property have been consolidated and clubbed by earlier orders, and such consolidated trials cannot be fragmented by entertaining belated technical applications.

The delay caused by such interlocutory applications seriously prejudices the rights of the plaintiff and causes unwarranted hardship. If the petitioners are aggrieved they are free to contest the matter at the time of final hearing by cross-examining witnesses and leading their own evidence. Hence, petition may be dismissed.

4. On perusal of affidavit, petition and the counter, the point for determination that arose for consideration is

Whether the application to reject the plaint is to be allowed and the plaint in O.S.No.219/2024 on the file of this court is to be rejected ? Or not?

5. Answer to the Point:

Heard both sides. This is an application filed by the 1st defendant in O.S.No.219/2024 to reject the plaint stating that the suit in O.S.No.135/2021, O.S.No.219/2024, O.S.No.309/2024, O.S.No.371/2024 are related to the same property and subsequent suits cannot be filed when there are categorical findings in the earlier suit in favour of the predecessors of the plaintiff herein. By suppressing the disposal of the earlier suits and subsequent suits the present suit has been filed. Therefore, the present suit is not maintainable and the suit is liable to be rejected. The counsel for the petitioner/1st defendant has submitted his arguments in regard to the said averments in detail.

This is a case of the respondent/plaintiff the four boundaries recited in the suit property is different from the present suit property. There is a dispute in regard to the boundaries and the boundaries mentioned in the previous suits are completely different from the present suit schedule property. Therefore, the title documents, possession and disputed encumbrances are all matters requiring

adjudication of the full trial. Therefore this petition is liable to be dismissed and the counsel for the respondent urged for dismissal of the present application.

On perusal of records this case an advocate commissioner has been appointed and he has filed a report in regard to the identification of the property. There is a dispute in regard to the identification of the property. Therefore, title documents, possession and the disputed encumbrances are all matters requiring adjudication.

The plaintiff has raised mixed question of fact and law particularly relating to boundaries, title history, survey numbers this cannot be decided in this application.

While deciding application for rejection of plaint, court is not competent to go into correctness or otherwise of allegations contained in the plaint – plaint can only be rejected if statement in plaint without any addition or subtraction appears to be barred by law.

Court has to read the entire plaint as a whole to find out whether it discloses cause of action and if it does, then plaint cannot be rejected.

A bare reading of plaint perhaps the plaint documents, should alone convince the court to come to conclusion whether the plaint should be rejected at threshold or not.

An application under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC to be decided only on averments in the plaint and not by considering defence taken. In the circumstances cause of action would not be limited only to actual infringement of right sued , but also includes all material facts on which it is founded.

Court cannot short circuit proceedings and non suit plaintiff based on material other than plaint averments while exercising jurisdiction under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC . Therefore, the case of the 1st defendant to be looked into only after full fledged trial. In the circumstances this court deems fit to dismiss the application filed by the petitioner /1st defendant without costs. The point is answered accordingly.

6. In the result this petition is dismissed without costs.

//This order has been dictated by me to the Stenographer, taken down, transcribed and typed by her in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the day the 16th day of September 2025//

Sd./- Pa.U.Chemmal
Principal District Judge,
Principal District Court,
Kancheepuram.

Exhibits and Witnesses on both side: NIL.

Sd./- Pa.U.Chemmal
Principal District Judge,
Principal District Court,
Kancheepuram.

Draft/Fair Order
I.A.No.11/2025 in
O.S.No. 219/2024
D.D. 16.09.2025
Principal District Court ,
Kancheepuram.

