

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF, TIRUTTANI

Present : Tmt. R.D. Gurulakshmi, M.A., M.L., P.G.D.I & C.L.,

District Munsif, Tiruttani.

Dated the Wednesday of 22nd Day of October 2025

I.A.No.8/2025 in OS.No.16/2019

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000029-2019)

...

1. Dinakaran

2. Lakshmi

...Petitioners/ Defendants

/Versus/

Venkatesan

... Respondent /Plaintiff

This petition came up before me for final hearing on 13.10.2025 in the presence of M/s.S. Karthikeyan, E. Thanigairaj, Counsels for Petitioners/ Defendants, M/s. G. Kamalakannan, Advocate for Respondent/Plaintiff. Upon hearing both sides and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following:

ORDER

This petition is filed under Order 8 Rule 1A(3) of CPC to receiving additional documents.

1. The averments of the petition in brief are as follows:-

This case was posted for Dw2 chief continuation. The petitioner has to prove his case through the documents filed herewith. The documents are utmost required to prove that the suit property is originally belongs to her husband's grandmother's self-acquired property. Now the petitioners are in possession and enjoyment over the suit property. The petition mentioned documents are old and they are very important to prove the petitioners possession, enjoyment and title of the suit property. Hence, this petition is filed.

2. The counter filed on behalf of the Respondent in brief:-

The petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts of the case. The petition averments are denied by this respondents. The documents are not related to the suit property and the same will not prove the petitioners case. The documents marked in O.S.No.12/2019. The documents submitted herein are very contra to the Pw1 evidence and documents marked and they are not related to this case. There is no valid reasons mentioned in the petition. The witness is not competent to mark the

documents through her because the documents are not at all stands in her name. The petition is highly belated and the petitioner aim is to protracting the proceedings. Hence this petition is liable to be dismissed with costs.

3. Point for determination:

Whether the petitioners are entitled to the relief as sought for? or not?

4. According to petitioner, the petition mentioned documents are very important to prove the petitioners possession, enjoyment and title of the suit property. Hence, the petitioners pray to allow this petition. The Respondent resisted the petition by contending that the documents are not related to the suit property and the same will not prove the petitioners case. There is no valid reasons mentioned in the petition for the delay. Further the witness is not competent to mark the documents through her. The petition is highly belated and to protracting the proceedings. Hence the respondent prays to dismiss this petition.

5. Heard both sides. This petition filed by the petitioners seeking permission for receiving additional documents. This suit is filed in the year 2019 itself and this case is pending for Dw2 chief continuation. There is no valid reasons in this petition for the delay in producing the documents. Further, mere receiving of the documents will not give any advantage to the petitioners as the petitioners have to prove the validity of the documents. No prejudice would be caused to the respondent as the respondent will have ample opportunity to cross examine the witness as to the documents. Hence, this court is of view that in the interest of justice, to prevent multiplicity of proceedings, to provide the petitioners an opportunity to prove their case and for proper adjudication of the case, this petition has to be allowed.

In the result, this petition is allowed. No cost.

Dictated to my Steno – Typist, typed by her directly in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 22nd day of October 2025.

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.

Petitioners and Respondent side Exhibits and witness: NIL

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.