

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE,  
TIRUVANNAMALAI.

**PRESENT : Mr.P. Mathusuthanan, B.A., B.L.,**  
Principal District Judge,  
Tiruvannamalai.

Tuesday, the 03rd of March - 2026

**I.A.No.10/2026 in O.S.No.96/2019**

1. Sarasu, 2. Devaraj 3. Dhanusu 4. Chinnathambi 5. Ettiyammal		.. Petitioners/Plaintiffs
	Vs	
1. The Superintendent Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tiruvannamalai. 2. The Junior Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tiruvannamalai. 3. Suresh 4. Shanmugam 5. The District Collector, Villupuram District.		..Respondents/defenadnts

This Interlocutory Application has come up before me for final hearing 27.02.2026 in the presence of **Tr.D.Subramanian**, Learned Advocate appearing for the Petitioners and **Tr.G.Pughazhenth**i Learned Advocate appearing for the Respondents and upon hearing the argument

on the both sides and upon perusing the available records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court passed the following...

**ORDER**

The petitioners filed this petition under Order 7 Rule 14(2) of CPC to receive the petition mentioned documents on the side of the petitioners / plaintiffs.

**2) Brief facts of the petition :**

The petitioners are plaintiffs in the main suit. The documents filed alongwith this petition sought to be marked are traced out only very recently and these documents are very vital one to prove the petitioners' case. If the petition is not allowed, the petitioners will be put to irreparable loss and serious hardship. Hence this petition.

**3) Brief averments of the counter filed by the 2nd respondent and adopted the same by 1 and 5th respondents are as follows:**

The application filed by the petitioner to receive the documents filed under order VII Rule 14 (2) [C.P.C.is](#) false, vexatious, wholly misconceived, unsustainable one either in law or on facts of the case and the petition deserves to be dismissed with costs.

This respondent denies the allegations made in the petitioner's affidavit save and except those that are specifically admitted herein and puts the petitioner to strict proof of each and every one of them.

The petition filed by the petitioner to receive the documents is a deliberate falsehood made with cant regard for truth and this respondent submits that the documents ought to be received in evidence is not at all connected with the facts of the present case and in order to confuse things, the petitioner has come forward with this vexatious allegations. Already evidence was adduced by the plaintiffs/petitioners and the defendants and the matter is now posted for cross examination of D.W 3 and 4 and hence the present application is filed by the petitioners only to drag the proceedings and there is no need to entertain the same. The entire allegations found in the petition to receive the documents is not at all maintainable and there is no need or necessity to mark them before this Honourable court, since the above documents are in no way connected with the facts of the present case and the same is liable to be dismissed and the present petition filed by the petitioners only to protract the proceedings.

There are no merits or bonafide in the present application filed by the petitioner to receive the documents and the same is devoid of merits, lacks in bonafide and deserves to be dismissed with the costs of

respondents. Hence, requested to dismiss the petition with the cost of this respondent.

4) 3rd and 4th respondent made an endorsement that they have no counter.

5) **Point that arises for consideration in this Petition is that**

Whether this petition is to be allowed as sought for?

6) **Point** : The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners have filed the main suit seeking the relief of compensation as against the respondents herein. He would further submit that the documents filed alongwith this petition sought to be marked are traced out only very recently and these documents are very vital one to prove the petitioners' case. And he would further submit no prejudice would be caused to the respondents. On the other hand, it would bring clear picture to arrive at fair conclusion over the main case, hence he argued for allowing this petition.

7) **Per contra**, the learned counsel appearing for the 1,2 and 5th respondents would contend that the petitioners has come forwarded with this petition only with an intent to drag on the proceedings and documents

sought to be marked are no way connected to the facts and circumstance to this case, hence he argued for dismiss the petition.

**8) Heard. Perused the records.**

9) The documents sought to be marked are all Driving license and transport permit for the vehicle which was involved in the above said accident, hence these documents sought to be marked cannot be said as extraneous to the issue under challenge as alleged by the counsel appearing for the respondent. Hence, this court donot find any inordinate delay on the part of the petitioners in marking these documents. Even otherwise, the respondent herein has every right to test the veracity of the documents while the same are marked through the witness concern by way of cross examination. Hence this court is inclined to allow this petition and thus the point is answered accordingly.

**In fine**, the petition is allowed. No cost.

This Order is dictated by me to the Steno-Typist Grade-I of this Court, transcribed by her in Computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 03rd day of March - 2026.

**Principal District Judge,  
Tiruvannamalai.**

Draft / Fair Order in  
I.A.No.10/2026 in  
O.S.No.96/2019  
Date : 03.03.2026.