

**IN THE COURT OF THE I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE
RANIPET, RANIPET DISTRICT.**

**Present: Thiru.A.BALAKRISHNAN, B.B.A., L.L.B.,
I Additional District Judge,
Ranipet.**

Monday, this the 15th day of September 2025

**I.A.No.11/2025
in
O.S.No.9/2021**

R.Muthukrishnan

..... Petitioner/Plaintiff.

-Vs-

1. P. Krishnamoorthy @ P.Kutty

2. C. Sathya

.....Respondents/Defendants.

This petition is coming before me for final hearing on 10.09.2025 in the presence of Thiru.N.P.Nethaji, Advocate for Petitioner/Plaintiff and Thiru.S.P.Sampath kumar, Advocate for the 1st respondent and Thiru.J.Radhakrishnan, Advocate for the 2nd respondent and upon hearing the arguments of both side and on perusal of all connected material records and having stood over for consideration till this date, this court passed the following:-

ORDER

The petitioner/plaintiff has filed the application U/o 16 Rule 1 of CPC, seeking permission to send the witness summon to the Sub-Registrar, Walajah Nagar to come with the document mentioned in the petition and to give evidence on the side of the plaintiff.

1) The petitioner/Plaintiff has filed an affidavit stating that he has filed the above suit for the relief of declaration, declaring the sale deed dated 06.07.2020 as null and void and also for permanent injunction on the plea

of forgery and hence it is necessary for him to examine the Sub-Registrar of Walaja Nagar to prove the foul play in the registration of documents.

2) The respondents contended in the counter that the allegation of forgery is false and there is need to examine the Sub-Registrar as witness.

Point of determination is :-

Whether the application seeking permission to examine the Sub-Registrar, Walaja Nagar is deserved to be allowed?

Point :- a) On perusal of records, it is seen that the petitioner/Plaintiff has filed the above suit praying to grant the relief of cancellation of sale deed dated 06.07.2020 registered before the Sub-Registrar, Walajapet and also for other reliefs. The plaintiff has pleaded that the sale deed dated 06.07.2020 is fraudulent and sham and nominal document executed by the 1st defendant to the 2nd defendant without paying any amount. The plaintiff has further pleaded that he had executed General Power of Attorney for the loan amount borrowed by him from the 1st defendant. The defendants have also filed written statement and when the case was posted for plaintiff's side further evidence, the present application was filed on the side of the plaintiff. There is no serious objection raised on the side of the respondents and this court is of the view that it is necessary to give full opportunity to the plaintiff to adduce his entire evidence. No prejudice will be caused in examining the Official witness in respect the registration of document in question in this suit. This point is answered accordingly.

In the result, the application is allowed. No cost.

Dictated by me to the steno-typist, translated and typed by her in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, on this the 15th day of September 2025.

I Additional District Judge,
Ranipet.