

**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 Monday of 25<sup>th</sup> Day of August 2025

I.A.No.5/2025 in OS.No.39/2024

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000054-2024)

...

1. Muniammal
2. N. Ponnusamy
3. N. Sanker
4. Jayalakshmi
5. N. Balasubramaniam

... Petitioners/ Plaintiffs

/Versus/

1. B. Krishnan
2. K. Srinivasan @ Raji
3. Purusothaman
4. R. Sridar

... Respondents/ Defendants

This petition came up before me for the final hearing on 13.08.2025 in the presence of M/s. A. Al Arfeen Ahamed, Advocate for Petitioners/Plaintiffs, M/s. C.A. Natarajan, Advocate for Respondents/defendants. Upon hearing both sides and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following:

**ORDER**

Petition is filed under order 7 Rule 14 (3) of CPC to receive the documents mentioned in the petition.

1. **Petition averments in brief:-**

At the time of filing of this suit, the petitioner filed the xerox copy of the F.M.B. Sketch. Subsequently the petitioner obtained the certified copy of F.M.B. Sketch from the authority. The F.M.B. Sketch is one of the crucial document. Hence it is necessary to prove the petitioners case, the document has to be marked. Therefore the petitioner filed this petition.

2. **Counter filed on behalf of the Respondents in brief:-**

This petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts. The petitioner has wantonly filed the documents with delay. There is no bonafide merits in this petition. Hence, the petition is liable to be dismissed with cost.

3. **Point for determination:-**

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

4. Heard both sides. According to the petitioner, the petitioner obtained the certified copy of F.M.B. Sketch from the authority. The F.M.B. Sketch is one of the crucial document and it is necessary to prove their case. Therefore the petitioners pray to allow this petition. Respondents resisted the petition by contending that the petitioner wantonly filed this petition with delay. There is no bonafide merits in this petition. Hence the respondents pray to dismiss this petition.

5. On perusal of record, this case was posted for Pw1 chief continuation. This petition filed seeking permission to receive the additional documents. No valuable reasons stated in the petition. 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 respondents as the respondents 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, 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 25<sup>th</sup> day of August 2025.

District Munsif,  
Tiruttani.

Petitioners & Respondents side Exhibits and Witnesses :- Nil

District Munsif,  
Tiruttani.