

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 Friday of 14th Day of November 2025

I.A.No.6/2025 in OS.No.41/2018

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000045-2016)

...

1. A.J. Durai (died)

2. D. Vanitha

3. D. Raja

4. D. Prasanth

5. D. Prabu

...Petitioners /Defendants

/Versus/

G. Chinnarajan

...Respondent/Plaintiff

This petition came up before me for final hearing on 05.11.2025 in the presence of M/s. E. Shamu, Counsel for Petitioners/ Defendants, M/s. C.A. Natarajan, Counsel 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 the filing of the documents.

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

During the filing of suit, the petition mentioned document were not obtained. The said documents were obtained recently from the Registration department. The said documents in order to strengthen of the petitioners case. 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 mentioned documents are no way related to the suit property. The suit property contains New G.N.S.No.413/15 and not the S.No.293/12. So it is no relevant to this suit. Therefore they cannot be marked. There is no banofide merits in this petition. Hence the petition is liable to be dismissed.

3. **Point for determination:**

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

4. Heard both sides. According to petitioners, the petition mentioned documents were obtained recently from the Registration department and the same are necessary in order to strengthen the petitioners case. Hence the petitioners prays to allow this petition. The Respondent resisted the petition by contending that the suit property contains New G.N.S.No.413/15 and not the S.No.293/12. So it is no relevant to this suit. Therefore they cannot be marked. There is no bonafide merits in this petition. Hence the respondent prays to dismiss this petition.

5. On perusal of records, at the stage of Dw1 chief continuation this petition was filed. No valuable reason stated in this petition. Further mere receiving of the document 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 has ample opportunity to raise his objection at the time of marking of document regarding maintainability. Hence, this court is of view that in the interest of justice, to prevent multiplicity of proceedings, to provide the petitioner an opportunity to prove their 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 14th day of November 2025.

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.

Petitioners and Respondent side Exhibits and witness: NIL

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.