

This suit is coming for final hearing before me on 11.03.2026 in the presence of Mr.S.Vasantha Kumar counsel appearing for Petitioners/Plaintiffs. Mr.Alwing Devakumar counsel appearing for R1,R2. Mr.P.Ramamoorthy counsel appearing for 5th Respondent/Defendant. On perusal of entire case records having stood over for consideration till this day, this court has delivered the following:-

ORDER

This petition is filed by under order 7 Rule 14(1&2) of CPC to to permit the petitioners to mark the additional documents in the above suit.

1. Brief Averments of petitioner:

1.1. The petitioner states that they are the petitioners in above suit and the 1st petitioner in the petition and the petitioner filing this affidavit on behalf of other petitioners as such they well acquainted with the fact and circumstances of the case. The above main case is posted for marking of documents and they filing additional documents in the above main suit filed by the petitioners. Further states that the additional documents are very much necessary to prove their case and the additional documents Ex.A11 to Ex.24 to marked and necessary to prove their case. Therefore, prayed to permit the petitioners to mark the additional documents in the above suit.

2. Brief Averments of the Counter and filed by 3rd Respondent/ Plaintiff:

2.1. The respondent states that the petitioners filed the above suit for declaring them as the legal heirs of deceased alleged Williams Jayaraj @ Jayaraman. The 1st respondent is competent authority to issue any legal heir certificate after due enquiry. But the petitioners are not legal heirs to the alleged William Jayaraj @ Jayaraman. The 1st respondent did not accept the petition to issue the legal heir certificate after due enquiry. So the petitioners are not legal heirs of the alleged deceased William Jayaraj @ Jayaraman.

2.2. Further states that the William Jayaran and Jayaraman are two different persons and they are not one the same. Jayaraman was working in the R.P.F. and is the 2nd husband of Jagathambal. So the suit is basically not maintainable. The said alleged William Jayaraj already filed the suit before this Hon'ble Court O.S.No.3/2013 as against this respondent and the same was dismissed. This respondent pleaded the same in her written statement, but the petitioners did not

plead the petition mentioned documents in his plaint. The petitioners ought to have pleaded each and every documents in respect of relevancy of the same in their case. The petitioners are not entitled to file the documents surprisingly without any pleading in their plaint. So the petition has no merits and liable to dismiss.

3. Points for consideration:

Whether this petition is to be allowed or not?

No oral evidence has been adduced by either side. No exhibits were marked on either side.

4. Discussion and findings:

4.1. Heard both sides. Perused the records. The case of the petitioner is that is necessary to prove their case and prays to permit to mark additional documents on their side. Whereas, the contention of the respondent/defendant is that the respondent did not plead the petition mentioned the documents and petitioner are not entitled to filed the documents surprisingly without any pleading in their plaint.

4.2. Upon perusal of rival of submission this court is of opinion that though the petitioner/plaintiff have not stated sufficient reasons for the delay in receiving the documents this court is of considered view that the petitioner should be given and opportunity to let in sufficient evidence to prove their case. The validity of the document will be considered after full fledged trial. However, the respondent always has the liberty to cross examine the petitioner upon the document being received. Hence, in interest of justice this court is inclined to allow this petition subject to the proof and admissibility of the document.

4.3. In result this petition is allowed with cost of Rs.1000/- to be paid to the respondent directly. In default this petition will be dismissed automatically.

DMC ARAKKONAM

4

IA.02 of 2025 IN OS.119/2022

Dictated to typist directly, typed in his computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 26th day of March 2026.

District Munsif,
Arakkonam.

Petitioner side witnesses and Exhibits:- NIL

Respondent side witnesses and Exhibits:- NIL

District Munsif,
Arakkonam.