

**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 15<sup>th</sup> Day of October 2025

I.A.No.6/2025 in OS.No.39/2024

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000054-2024)

...

1. Muniyammal
2. N. Ponnusamy
3. N. Sankar
4. H. 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 08.10.2025 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 additional documents.

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

The petitioner filed this petition along with the original sale deed bearing Doc.No.10475/2007, R.T.I. reply dated 09.09.2025, the certified copy of C.S.R. and the complaint, and Appeal complaint preferred before the Superintendent of Police, Tiruvallur has been received through R.T.I. dated 09.09.2024. These documents are very necessary to prove the petitioners case. Therefore the petitioners filed this petition.

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

This petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts. These documents are not connected to the suit property and created documents to knock away the suit property. 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 petitioners, the petition mentioned documents are very necessary to prove their case. Therefore the petitioners pray to allow this petition. Respondents resisted the petition by contending that these documents are not connected to the suit property. 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 on terms.

In the result, this petition is allowed on condition that the petitioners have to pay a cost of Rs.500/- to the respondents on or before 22.10.2025 failing which this petition stands dismissed. Call on 22.10.2025.

Dictated to my Steno – Typist, typed by her directly in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 15<sup>th</sup> day of October 2025.

District Munsif,  
Tiruttani.

Petitioners & Respondents side Exhibits and Witnesses :- Nil

District Munsif,  
Tiruttani.