

IN THE PRINCIPAL SUBORDINATE COURT AT KANCHEEPURAM.

PRESENT: TMT. J. MOHANA, M.L.,

Principal Subordinate Judge.

Friday the 19th day of June 2026

INTERLOCUTORY APPLICATION Nos. 2 of 2026, 3 of 2026 and 4 of 2026

IN

O.S.No.223 of 2012

1. Ranganathan

2. Radhakrishnan

.....Petitioners/5 & 6th Defendants

Versus

1. Parvathi

2. Vasantha

.....1st, 2nd Respondents/1st and 2nd Plaintiffs

Versus

3. Varadhan (died)

4. Thyagarajan

5. Kavitha

6. Thilagavathy

7. Rani

..... 3 to 7th Respondents/ 1 to 4 & 7th Defendants

These petitions have come up on 09.06.2026 before me for final hearing in the presence of Mr. P. Rajamanikkam, G. Bharani and C. Kaviyarasan learned counsels appearing for the Petitioners and M/s. T.C. Soundararajan learned counsels appearing for Respondent No. 1 & 2, and 3rd Respondent died, Mr. C. Yedhunandhan learned counsel for Respondents No. 4 to 6 and 7th Respondent was set exparte and upon hearing the submissions made by the learned counsels for the Petitioner and the Respondent, and also on perusal of the records, having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivers the following:

COMMON ORDER

1. This petition (I.A.No.2/2026) is filed under Section 151 of CPC to reopen the case in order to examine the PW1 on his side again.
2. This petition (I.A.No.3/2026) is filed under Order 18 Rule 17 of CPC to recall PW1 in the case in order to examine the plaintiff.
3. This petition (I.A.No.4/2026) is filed under Order XI Rule 14 CPC an order against the 1st plaintiff to produce the documents.
4. **POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION:**

The Petitioner filed petition seeking under Section 151 of CPC, Order 18 Rule 17 and Order XI Rule 14 of CPC. The petitioner submitted that in their petition Voter ID which cannot support his age and Date of marriage, hence it is just and necessary to produce birth certificate of Sheela and her Aadhaar card who is the daughter of 1st petitioner enable me to prove that she has got married earlier to the year os 1985. Further the petitioner /Defendant submitted that he has necessary to recall of PW1 for their side. On the other hand detail counter filed by the respondent for plaintiff. Respondent/Plaintiff submit that petition alone has to submit the documents to created stand of the respondent by producing necessary documents in his side. Instead of the petition is seeking other side to produce documents that 2 documents

related to 3rd party is not maintainable. The respondent is any support to spoon feed .
The petitioner to succeed his case.

5. Considering both side this court feels that one opportunities given tot he petitioner/defendant for cross examination of PW1. Further ordered that the respondent/plaintiff here by directed to produce the documents before this court if said documents valuable on the hands of respondent/Plaintiff. Hence the petitions are allowed with condition that the petitioner is directed to pay a cost of Rs.1500/- to the respondent directly and filed memo before this court on hearing without fail. In this regard these petitions are allowed.

6. In the result, for the foregoing reasons, these petitions are allowed with condition that the petitioner is directed to pay a cost of Rs.1500/- to the respondent directly and filed memo before this court on hearing without fail.

Dictated to the Steno-typist, typed by her directly in the desktop, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 19th day of June 2026.

Principal Subordinate Judge,
Kancheepuram

LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED AND DOCUMENTS EXHIBITED ON THE BOTH SIDE : Nil

Principal Subordinate Judge,
Kancheepuram.