



IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE, THENI

**Present: Thiru.Swarnam J. Natarajan, M.L.,  
Principal District Judge, Theni**

Friday, this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of April - 2026

**I.D.O.P.No. 07/2025**

*C.N.R.No.TNTH010044182024*

Selvam

...Petitioner

*/Versus/*

Sebastia @ Vetri Sudar

...Respondent

This petition is coming upon 26.03.2026, for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru. K. Dharmakodi, Advocate for the Petitioner and Tmt. A. Lalitha and Tmt. Pavithrkrishnan, Advocate for the Respondent and upon hearing the arguments of both sides and perusing the evidence, documents, the case having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivers the following:-

**ORDER**

This is the petition filed by the petitioner/husband against the respondent/wife under Section 10 (i) (iii) of Indian Divorce Act seeking to dissolve the marriage solemnized between the petitioner and respondent on 16.09.2004 at Govinthanpatty Village, Uthamapalayam Taluk, Theni District by a decree of divorce with cost.



**2. The facts stated in the petition in brief is as follows:-**

**2(i)** The Petitioner and the Respondent are spouses. Their matrimonial home is situated within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court at Govindanpatti Village, Uthamapalayam Taluk, Theni District.

**2(ii)** The marriage between the Petitioner and the Respondent was solemnized as per Christian religious rites and customs on 16.09.2004 at the Petitioner's residence at Govindanpatti Village, Uthamapalayam Taluk, Theni District, in the presence of relatives and friends in a grand and auspicious manner. At the time of marriage, the Respondent's parents presented 7 sovereigns of gold jewellery, along with household articles such as cot, bureau, and utensils, as dowry to the Respondent. Similarly, they also presented to the Petitioner 1 sovereign chain, 1 sovereign hand chain, and 1 sovereign ring as gifts.

**2(iii)** The entire marriage expenses were borne out by the Petitioner's family. After marriage, the Petitioner and Respondent lived together in the matrimonial home with the Petitioner's parents. Subsequently, as the Petitioner was employed in the Army, he took the Respondent to Nagaland, where they lived happily for about 1½ years. Thereafter, due to transfer, the Petitioner was posted to Rajasthan and, due to lack of accommodation initially, the Respondent



was left at Govindanpatti. Later, the Petitioner obtained official accommodation and brought the Respondent to Rajasthan, where they lived together. The Respondent stayed with the Petitioner in Rajasthan for about 2½ years.

**2(iv)** Thereafter, due to transfer, the Petitioner was posted to Delhi, and the Petitioner, Respondent, and their child shifted to Delhi. On 11.01.2011, a female child by name Sharon Francis was born at the Army Hospital, Delhi. The Petitioner bore all medical expenses of the Respondent during her pregnancy and delivery. The Respondent's mother stayed with them for about 1½ months during this period and assisted in care. After delivery, the Petitioner, Respondent, child, and Respondent's mother stayed at Uthamapalayam for about 1½ months, after which the Petitioner resumed duty. Subsequently, due to transfer, the Petitioner was posted to Kashmir and, after about 1½ years, the Respondent and child were brought there. They lived in Kashmir till January 2015. Thereafter, due to transfer to Uttar Pradesh, the Petitioner left the Respondent and child at Govindanpatti with his parents and later brought them to Uttar Pradesh after six months, where they continued to live.

**2(v)** During this period, the Respondent frequently contacted the Petitioner over phone expressing fear that she was being ridiculed by neighbours. The Petitioner, despite workload, addressed the issue and visited



home. However, upon enquiry, it was found that no such incident had occurred. The Respondent also exhibited abnormal behaviour on certain occasions, including self-harm tendencies. When taken to hospital, doctors opined that she was suffering from mental stress and required care and supervision. The Respondent's parents refused to take proper care and advised that she should be brought back to Uthamapalayam.

**2(vi)** The Petitioner continued to take the Respondent for treatment at mental health hospitals in Theni. The Respondent's parents, however, insisted that the Petitioner alone should take full responsibility for both the Respondent and the child. Due to continuous hardship and family pressure, the Petitioner took voluntary retirement from service on 19.06.2016.

**2(vii)** After the Petitioner returned to his native place, the Respondent's parents brought the Respondent and child and left them with the Petitioner, stating that they could no longer take care of them. Thereafter, the Petitioner took full responsibility for the child's education and welfare. However, the Respondent failed to cooperate in household duties and childcare, and her condition worsened. The Respondent was again treated at a mental health hospital in Theni, where doctors advised continuous supervision and care. Despite repeated efforts, the Respondent did not cooperate and behaved



aggressively, including verbal abuse and physical assault on occasions, causing the Petitioner severe mental and physical distress. The Respondent's parents were informed, but they failed to take proper action. Panchayat elders were also involved; however, the Respondent's parents refused reconciliation and threatened legal action against the Petitioner and took the Respondent away.

**2(viii)** The Respondent later allegedly took gold jewellery weighing 35 sovereigns belonging to the Petitioner and herself without consent and pledged the same in various finance and jewellery shops between 14.09.2024 and 30.09.2024, raising substantial amounts. Thereafter, on 30.09.2024, the Respondent allegedly administered a sedative in the Petitioner's milk, causing him to lose consciousness, and left the house. When the Petitioner regained consciousness, he searched for the Respondent in several places but could not trace her. A missing complaint was lodged on 02.10.2024 at Uthamapalayam Police Station, and a case in Crime No.301/2024 (Women Missing) was registered. Later, the Respondent was traced in Chennai with police assistance and brought back after expenditure of Rs.30,000/- by the Petitioner. The Respondent stated that she did not wish to live with the Petitioner and that she had already spent the pledged money. She was thereafter handed over to her parents and has since been residing with them.



**2(ix)** Due to the Respondent's conduct, the Petitioner has suffered severe mental agony, social humiliation, and loss of reputation among relatives and society. The Petitioner is presently taking care of the minor daughter, aged 14 years, ensuring her education and welfare. Continued cohabitation with the Respondent would endanger his life, dignity, and reputation and would adversely affect the child's future. Hence, the Petitioner seeks for dissolution of marriage solemnized on 16.09.2004 and prays for a decree of divorce.

**3. The Counter statement filed by the Respondent in brief is as follows:-**

**3(i)** Except those facts that are specifically and expressly admitted in the counter, all other allegations contained in the petition are vehemently denied by this Respondent. The Petitioner is put to strict proof of all such denied averments.

**3(ii)** It is admitted that the parties lived in the Petitioner's parental home initially and that thereafter the Respondent accompanied the Petitioner to various Army quarters in different States, and that a female child, namely Sharon Francis, was born on 11.01.2011. The Respondent admits only that the Petitioner had filed I.D.O.P. No.14/2019. All other allegations, including withdrawal of the case out of love and affection and continued harmonious living thereafter, are false and are denied.



**3(iii)** In fact, the Petitioner is a close maternal relative (uncle) of the Respondent. Their marriage was solemnized on 18.09.2004 under Christian rites at Govindanpatti. At the insistence of the Petitioner and his family, the Respondent's parents gave about 20 sovereigns of gold jewellery to the Respondent, 3 sovereigns to the Petitioner, household articles worth Rs.2,00,000/-, and Rs.1,00,000/- cash for marriage expenses.

**3(iv)** After marriage, while living in the Petitioner's house, the Petitioner and his family harassed the Respondent demanding an additional 25 sovereigns of gold as dowry, calling her uneducated and of no financial benefit. The Petitioner, often under the influence of alcohol, abused and assaulted the Respondent. During her pregnancy in March 2007, the Petitioner assaulted her, causing miscarriage and endangering her life.

**3(v)** After the birth of the child in 2011, despite the Respondent's parents providing adequate gifts, the Petitioner and his family continued harassment. They also refused to include the Respondent's name in the family ration card and subjected her to cruelty. The Petitioner, citing risks in his Army job and fear of losing service benefits, insisted that the Respondent obtain a certificate of mental illness to facilitate his voluntary retirement. Upon her refusal, she was forcibly driven out. Due to continuous harassment, the



Respondent was compelled to undergo treatment at Keerthana Mental Hospital, which the Petitioner misused to obtain voluntary retirement.

**3(vi)** On 15.11.2018, the Petitioner and his family again assaulted the Respondent demanding dowry and poured hot food on her. A complaint was lodged, and a criminal case in Crime No.9/2019 was registered, which is still under investigation. The earlier divorce petition I.D.O.P. No.14/2019 was withdrawn not out of love but because the Respondent's family gave 12 sovereigns of gold to the Petitioner. Thereafter, the Petitioner continued to demand money and articles on various occasions, extracting cash, jewellery, and household items from the Respondent's parents.

**3(vii)** The allegations regarding pledging of jewellery and absconding are false. In fact, the Petitioner himself pledged the Respondent's jewellery and sent her to Chennai, instructing her to keep her phone switched off, and later created a false missing complaint.

**3(viii)** The Respondent was later brought back through police, and upon enquiry, the truth came out, and the Petitioner was warned. The Respondent, fearing for her life, returned to her parents' house. The Petitioner subsequently took away the child and has not permitted the Respondent to meet or speak with the child. The Respondent is mentally sound and has been falsely portrayed



otherwise by the Petitioner. She is ready and willing to resume matrimonial life with the Petitioner in the interest of the child. The present petition has been filed with false allegations to escape criminal liability and to harass the Respondent. Hence, the petition is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

4. On the side of the petitioner, PW1 was examined, Ex.P1 to P7 were marked. On the side of the respondent, RW1 was examined and no documents were marked. Ex.P1 is the joint photo taken during the time of marriage. Ex.P2 and Ex.P3 are the ID proof and ration card of the petitioner. Ex.P4 is the birth certificate of the petitioner's daughter date of birth is 11.01.2011. Ex.P5 is the FIR in respect of Cr.No.09/2019 of AWPS, Uthamapalayam, against the petitioner, her mother Annamal, sisters Jothi, Vanitha, Anbu, Rayappan and Rosy and Ex.A6 is the marriage invitation. The earlier IDOP petition No. 14/2019, filed by the petitioner and the copy is marked as Ex.P7.

5. In the earlier application, the petitioner had alleged that due to the cruelty caused by the respondent to the petitioner while he was serving in the military. He was forced to obtain leave after getting permission from his superiors and it reveals that there were no harassment from the neighbors. The respondent never performed her marital obligations by taking care of the petitioner and his daughter. Due to the cruelty meted out from the hands of the respondent, the



petitioner was forced to get her child discontinued from the school in 2016-2017. The respondent never behaved as an ordinary person and used to frequently quarrel with the petitioner, finding fault with him by blaming him for unnecessary reasons.

**6. The point for determination is :-**

Whether the petitioner is entitled for divorce on the ground of cruelty by making out a case that the respondent caused cruelty to him and whether the respondent if divorce is granted is entitled to permanent alimony. If so, what is the extent of the same?

7. The case of the petitioner is that he is a retired Ex-serviceman. According to him, his marriage was an arranged one from his native and during his tenure working in the military in various places like Rajasthan, Delhi, Jammu and Kashmir and other places, including remote areas, throughout the places of his posting he had taken the respondent along with him. While he was stationed at New Delhi, a female child was born out during the said wedlock and now the said child is studying in 10<sup>th</sup> standard staying with him.



8. It is the case of the petitioner that the respondent exhibited abnormal behavioral patterns during matrimonial life. While she was residing in the military quarters along with the petitioner, she developed unfounded suspicion against neighbors, repeatedly alleging harassment by them and also shouted unnecessarily at the petitioner. However, upon verification, the petitioner found that no such complaint or disputes emanate from the neighbors. The respondent according to the petitioner, frequently contacted the superior of the petitioner and his spouse, making complaints against him which compelled him to obtain leave and attend to her needs by taking leave abruptly while he was in the midst of his service.

9. It is further alleged that she resorted to self-inflicted injuries such as hitting her head against walls. Thereby creating situations requiring his immediate presence at the house. Due to her psychological condition, she was brought to the native place and provided sufficient treatment in local hospitals at Theni. Thereafter, the petitioner had not taken her back to his place of posting and ultimately, due to the cruelty caused from the respondent he ultimately was constrained to seek voluntary retirement. Post-retirement, he has been managing the household work and taking care of his daughter, who is now studying in 10<sup>th</sup> standard.



**10.** It is further alleged that the respondent neglected her maternal duties and frequently after taking medication remained indifferent to the welfare of the child and used to sleep till midday without attending the household needs. Subsequently, she left the matrimonial home without intimation after pledging her 35 sovereigns of jewels in four different banking institutions in her name and taken the money with her without informing the petitioner. In this regard, a missing complaint was lodged by the petitioner before the local police and later she was traced at Chennai. The respondent has been living separately for more than 1-1/2 years prior to the filing of the petition and had failed to discharge her matrimonial obligations. Hence, the petitioner prays for divorce on the ground of cruelty.

**11.** The respondent is denying all the allegations, according to her, she was forcibly taken to a psychiatric hospital by the petitioner for his own benefit, particularly in order to facilitate for his voluntary retirement peacefully and in order to oblige him, the respondent also attended the psychiatric hospital. She denied suffering from any mental illness and alleged that the petitioner has contacted a second marriage and is living with another woman and children. However, no particulars or evidence had been furnished in support of such allegations.



12. The evidence of RW1 is crucial. During court question she had stated that

".. எனக்கு ஷாரோன் பிரான்ஸிஸ் என்ற பெண் குழந்தை உள்ளது. அவருக்கு 15 வயது ஆகிறது. எனது குழந்தையானது விகாசா வித்யாலாயா பள்ளியில் பயின்று வருகிறார். என்னுடன் பிறந்த அக்கா, தங்கை மற்றும் தம்பி ஆகியோர் உள்ளார்கள். நான் கடந்த 1-1/2 ஆண்டுகளாக எனது பெற்றோர் வீட்டில் குடியிருந்து வருகிறேன். நான் மனுதாரருடன் சேர்ந்து வாழ வழக்கு ஏதும் தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை. மனுதாரர் க.புதுப்பட்டியைச் சேர்ந்த ஒரு பெண்மணியை 2 குழந்தைகளுடன் அவரது வீட்டிற்கு அழைத்து வைத்து குடும்பம் நடத்தி வருகிறார். அந்த தெருவில் உள்ள நபர்கள் சொல்லித்தான் இந்த விபரத்தை தெரிந்துகொண்டேன். எனது மகள் 10-ம் வகுப்பு படித்து வருகிறார். அவர் மனுதாரரின் தாயாருடன் கோவிந்தன்பட்டியில் வசித்து வருகிறார். கடந்த 1 வருடங்களாக அவரது பாட்டி வீட்டில்தான் எனது மகள் வசித்து வருகிறார். அங்கிருந்தே பள்ளிக்கு சென்று வருகிறார்.

நான் அழைத்தும் அவர் அப்பா, அம்மா இருவரும் வேண்டும் என கூறி என்னை மனுதாரர் வீட்டிற்கு வரச்சொல்லி சொன்னார். நான் வர முடியாது என சொல்லிவிட்டேன். நான் 2017-ம் ஆண்டு குடும்ப வன்கொடுமை தடுப்புச் சட்டத்தின்கீழ் மனு தாக்கல் செய்து, உத்தமபாளையம் நீதித்துறை நடுவர் நீதிமன்றத்தில் அந்த வழக்கானது நடைபெற்று வந்தது. அந்த வழக்கை நான்



கடந்த 2018-2019-ம் ஆண்டு வாபஸ் வாங்கினேன். மனுதாரர் என்னுடன் சேர்ந்து வாழ்வதாக சொன்னதன் காரணமாக நான் அந்த வழக்கை வாபஸ் வாங்கினேன். நான் மனுதாரருடன் சேர்ந்து வாழ இதுநாள் வரை முயற்சி ஏதேனும் எடுத்தேனா என்றால் ஒருமுறை வீட்டிற்கு சென்றேன்".

13. She had further answered during court question in the subsequent cross-examination held on 06.03.2026 as follows:

"..... சுமார் 1-1/2 ஆண்டுகள் எனது மகள், எனது கணவரான மனுதாரருடன் தனியாக வசித்து வருகிறார் என்றால் சரிதான். மனுதாரரின் தாயார் எனதுமகளை பார்த்துக்கொள்வதாக சொன்னதன்பேரில் எனது மகளின் தேவைகளை அவர் கவனித்துக்கொள்கிறார். எனது மகளை என்னுடன் அனுப்பக்கோரி நான் இதுநாள் வரை நீதிமன்றத்தில் மனு எதுவும் தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை என்றால் சரிதான். எனது மகள் என்னுடன் வராததற்கு என்ன காரணம் என்றால் எனது மகள் படிக்கும் பள்ளியில் பீஸ் கட்ட வேண்டும் என்பதற்காக என்னுடன் வந்தால் அவரால் பீஸ் கட்ட முடியாது என்பதால் எனது மகள் மனுதாரருடன் தங்கிப் படித்து வருகிறார்".

14. She had further stated that ".....எனது கணவர் மருத்துவர் கொடுக்கக்கூடாது என சொல்லியும் எனக்கு மருந்து கடைகளில் மருந்து வாங்கி வற்புறுத்தி கொடுத்து வந்தார். என்னை கொடுமை செய்து அடித்தார் என்று நான் தற்போது சாட்சியத்தில் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளேன். இருந்தும் நான் அவருடன் சேர்ந்து



வாழ தயாராக இருக்கிறேனா என்றால் எனக்கு கணவர் வேண்டும். எனக்கு குழந்தை வேண்டும் என்பதால் நான் சேர்ந்து வாழ தயாராக இருக்கிறேன். அவ்வாறு இருக்கும் பட்சத்தில் நான் ஏன் மனுதாரர் வீட்டிற்கு செல்லவில்லை என்றால் வேறு ஒரு பெண்ணுடன் அவர் குடும்பம் நடத்துவதால் அவருடன் நான் சேர்ந்து வாழ தயாராக இல்லை. அந்த பெண்மணி யார் என்று நான் தெரிந்துகொண்டேனா என்றால் இதுநாள் வரை நான் அதுபற்றி தெரிந்துகொள்ள முயற்சி செய்யவில்லை ".

15. So, the respondent during questioning had given contrary answers stating that she intend to live with the petitioner. However, she had not taken any efforts to live with him and only due to the inability to pay the school fee, she allowed her daughter to stay with the petitioner and had not taken any steps to get her daughter back with her.

16. It is well-settled principles of law that cruelty in family disputes need not be physical alone. Mental cruelty which causes deep anguish and renders continuation of matrimonial life impossible, is also a sufficient ground for divorce. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in several cases had illustrated the instances of mental cruelty and keeping in mind the above-said illustrations and the cruelty said to be caused in matrimonial disputes. The conduct of the



respondent in the present case, if seen would amount to mental cruelty as far as the petitioner is concerned.

17. The respondent's persistent and unfounded complaints against the neighbors, which were not substantiated by her and coupled with her repeated interference in the petitioner's professional life by contacting his superior officers has caused serious prejudice to the petitioner. For a person in military service, such conduct directly affects discipline, reputation and service stability. Further, the allegation that the respondent resorted to self-inflicted injuries to compel the petitioner to obtain leave stands un rebutted. Such conduct is not mere matrimonial discord, but a form of coercive psychological behavior causing severe mental stress.

18. The petitioner's voluntary retirement from military service is a significant circumstance. A reasonable inference can be drawn that such a decision was necessitated by the untenable domestic situation. The petitioner's subsequent role in managing the household and raising the child further corroborates his version. The minor daughter, while she was examined through video conference from Uthamapalayam, supports the petitioner's case. She had stated that she has been residing with her father for the past 1-1/2 years and that the respondent had not taken care of her. She neglected, especially during a



crucial academic stage, constitutes a serious breach of parental responsibility. Additionally, the respondent's allegations that the petitioner has contacted a second marriage is entirely unsubstantiated. Making false and reckless allegations against spouse, alleging that he contacted a second marriage without producing any materials before the Court, would amount to mental cruelty. The respondent's failure to provide any particulars renders the allegations baseless and malicious. Thus, the cumulative conduct of the respondent establishes mental cruelty.

19. In the present case, the respondent had left the matrimonial home without intimation after pledging jewels and taking money with her. Forcing the petitioner to lodge a women missing complaint before the police and later she was traced at Chennai. The fact why the respondent had pledged her jewels and left the matrimonial home without informing the petitioner has not been satisfactorily explained by the respondent before this Court. From then on-wards, the respondent is living separately for more than 1-1/2 years and had not taken any valid steps to resume cohabitation with the petitioner. This clearly establishes that the respondent never intended to live with the petitioner in order to perform her duties as a lawful wife.



**20.** The above facts clearly indicates that the marriage have been irretrievably broken down. The parties are living separately and the relationship is beyond repair. In spite of sufficient efforts taken by this Court for reunion, there is no possibility of reunion as the marriage has been irretrievably broken.

**21.** Considering the above circumstances, this Court finds that the petitioner had established that the respondent had deserted the petitioner and had not performed her marital obligations, either in providing comfort to the petitioner or to maintain her daughter, who is now in crucial academic stage of 10<sup>th</sup> standard. A grown-up adolescent daughter is abandoned by the respondent at her father's hand and residing with her parents without any lawful excuse and mortgaged all her jewels and left the matrimonial home without informing the petitioner, forcing him to file a complaint for women missing and no allegations leveled in the counter filed by the respondent with respect to the allegations that the petitioner is living with a woman and child has not been substantiated. The above grounds would attract divorce on the ground of cruelty and the petitioner is entitled for divorce on that ground.

**22.** The question with regard to permanent alimony is to be considered. Wherein the petitioner is a retired Ex-serviceman who had taken voluntary retirement and presently maintaining the household and the minor daughter. The



respondent had not established any independent source of income. The marital relationship has endured for a considerable period and the respondent despite her conduct cannot be left without financial support. At the same time, the conduct of the respondent which had been held to constitute cruelty and desertion is also a relevant factor while determining the quantum. Balancing these considerations, this Court is of the view that a lumpsum amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- would meet the ends of justice. The said amount is reasonable, having regard to the petitioner's limited post-retirement financial capacity, the needs of the respondent and the overall circumstances of the case.

**23.** Thereby, this Court finds it appropriate to order Rs.5,00,000/- as permanent alimony payable by the petitioner to the respondent within a period of 3 months from the date of this order. On such payment being made by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to consider the prayer for divorce. Hence, this Court finds that the petitioner had proved cruelty on the ground that the respondent had caused cruelty on the petitioner and the marriage has been broken down irretrievably and the respondent is entitled for reasonable permanent alimony.

**In the result,** the IDOP petition is allowed. The marriage held between the petitioner and the respondent on 16.09.2004 at the Petitioner's residence at



Govindanpatti Village, Uthamapalayam Taluk, Theni District is dissolved by decree of divorce under the provisions of the Indian Divorce Act and the petitioner shall pay a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- to the respondent towards permanent alimony within a period of 3 months from the date of this order. In default of the said payment within the stipulated period, the alimony carries further interest at the rate of 12% per annum till the realization. After payment of the alimony only, the petitioner is entitled to claim benefits of the divorce order passed and ordered accordingly.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, taken by her in shorthand, transcribed and typed by her with the help of voice recorder, and Microsoft 365, corrected and pronounced by me, in the open court, this the 10<sup>th</sup> day of April - 2026.

**Principal District Judge,  
Theni.**

**List of Witness examined on the side of Petitioner :**

PW1            Thiru. Selvam (Petitioner)

**List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Petitioner:**

Ex.P1 / PW1	--	Joint photograph of the petitioner and the respondent.
Ex.P2 / PW1	--	Family card of the Petitioner – Photo copy (compared with original)
Ex.P3 / PW1	--	Aadhar card of the petitioner – Photo copy ( compared with original)



Ex.P4 / PW1	27.06.2011	Birth Certificate of the Sharon Francis - Photo copy (compared with original)
Ex.P5 / PW1	08.03.2019	First Information Report -Photo copy
Ex.P.6	16.09.2004	Marriage invitation
Ex.P.7	--	Divorce petition in IDOP No. 14/2019 filed by the petitioner

**List of Witness examined on the side of Respondent :**

**RW1**      **Tmt. Sebastia @ Vetri Sudar ( Respondent)**

**List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Respondent :**

-Nil-

**Principal District Judge,  
Theni.**



scan the code using 'e Courts Services'  
mobile application download from Play Store

22

*I.D.O.P.No.07/2025*

Principal District Court,  
Theni.  
Copy of Order in  
**I.D.O.P. No.07/2025**  
Dated : 10.04.2026

10.04.2026

*Principal District Judge, Theni*