



**IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF OF UDHAGAMANDALAM,
THE NILGIRIS**

Present: **Thiru. L. PRAKASH, B.Sc., B.L.,**
DISTRICT MUNSIF, UDHAGAMANDALAM.

Friday, the 24th day of July 2026

I.A. No. 02 of 2026
in
O.S. No. 159 of 2022
(C.N.R. No. TNNS030 - 00188 - 2022)

Tarannum Shaikh

... Petitioner/Plaintiff

/Vs/

Nizamuddin Azimudin Shaikh

... Respondent/Defendant

This petition came on 16.07.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of Mr. Puneeth K.G., learned Counsel for the Petitioner/Plaintiff and of Mr. E. Sreedharan, learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent/Defendant, upon considering case records carefully, this court passes the following:

ORDER

1. This petition has been filed under Order VII Rule 14(3) read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, seeking to condone the delay in filing the petition-mentioned documents and to permit the petitioner/plaintiff to produce the certified and original documents.

**Gist of Petition and affidavit:**

2. The case of the petitioner/plaintiff is that she has filed the present suit for injunction against the respondent/defendant and has already produced certain documents in support of her claim. During the pendency of the suit, the learned Judicial First Class Magistrate Court, Andheri, Mumbai, passed an order in a Domestic Violence case against the petitioner's husband, and the petitioner seeks to produce a copy of the said order. It is further stated that the petitioner's husband, along with his second wife, allegedly trespassed into the suit property by breaking open the lock and removed her valuables and documents, in respect of which she lodged a police complaint and obtained a CSR receipt from the B-1 Police Station. Therefore, the petitioner seeks permission to produce two additional documents, namely, (i) the order passed in the Domestic Violence proceedings, and (ii) the CSR copy relating to the police complaint. According to the petitioner, these documents came into existence during the pendency of the suit, and therefore, the delay in producing them is neither wilful nor deliberate. It is contended that unless permission is granted, she would suffer hardship and irreparable loss. Hence, the petition.

Counter statement:

3. The respondent/defendant has endorsed "No Counter" and have not raised any objection to the petition.

Points for Consideration:

4. Heard the petitioner's side, the Petition and case records have been carefully perused. The point arose in this petition for consideration is that, ***Whether the petitioner/plaintiff has shown sufficient cause for the delay in producing the additional documents and whether the documents sought to be received are relevant and necessary for the effective adjudication of the suit?***

**Discussion:**

5. The suit was instituted on 05.12.2022 for the relief of injunction. Issues were framed on 09.06.2023. The petitioner was examined as P.W.1 on 22.01.2026, and on the very same day, the present petition was filed seeking permission to produce additional documents. A perusal of the petition records shows that the documents sought to be produced are (i) a CSR issued by Ooty Town Central Police Station, and (ii) a copy of the order passed by the learned Judicial First Class Magistrate Court, Andheri, Mumbai, in C.C. No. 04/DV/2024. These documents relate to events that are stated to have taken place during the pendency of the suit and appear to have a bearing on the dispute between the parties.

6. It is true that the copies filed along with the present petition are only photocopies. However, for the limited purpose of receiving documents under Order VII Rule 14(3) CPC, production of the original documents is not a condition precedent. The question regarding their admissibility, proof and evidentiary value can be considered at the appropriate stage during trial. At this stage, the Court is only concerned with whether sufficient cause has been shown for their belated production. Further, the respondent has not filed any counter and has expressed no serious objection to the petition except requesting that it may be allowed on costs. In the absence of any prejudice being caused to the respondent and considering that the documents are relevant for the effective adjudication of the issues involved in the suit, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has shown sufficient cause for permitting the documents to be received. Accordingly, this petition deserves to be allowed.

**Result:**

7. *In the result, this petition is allowed, no costs.*

This order is dictated by me to the steno typist, transcribed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 24th day of July 2026.

**District Munsif,
Udhagamandalam**

Draft/ Fair Order:

I.A. No. 01/2026
in
O.S. No. 159/2022

Dated: **24.07.2026**

**District Munsif,
Udhagamandalam.**