

**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 Tuesday of 18<sup>th</sup> Day of March 2025

I.A.No.4/2025 in IA.No.3/2024 in OS.No.54/2023

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000058-2023)

...

1. C.N. Arumugam

2. A. Annapoorani

3. A. Lokesh

...Petitioners /Defendants

/Versus/

D. Dhanammal

... Respondent/Plaintiff

This petition came up before me for final hearing on 04.03.2025 in the presence of M/s. V.Venkatesan, N. Balaji. P.Pichaimani, Counsels for Petitioners/Defendants, M/s. C.A. Natarajan, Advocate for Respondents/ Plaintiffs. 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:-**

This above case was posted for petitioners side enquiry in the above IA. As such the documents to be filed in the above IA, there is a delay of filing the documents on behalf of the defendants. By oversight the petitioners could not file the documents at the time of filing of the written statement. 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 allegations in para 3 ad 4 of the affidavit are not fully correct as the documents filed on behalf of them which are subsequent to the respondents document and no way connected with the suit property and are created for the purpose of grab the suit property. There is no bonafide merits in this petition. Hence the 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 petitioners, by oversight the petitioners failed to file the documents in time. Hence, the petitioners pray to allow this petition. The Respondent resisted the petition by contending that the petitioners has filed documents which are no way connected with the suit property and are created for the purpose of grab the suit property. There is no bonafide merits in this petition. Hence the respondent prays to dismiss this petition.

5. Heard both sides. This petition filed by the petitioner seeking permission for receiving additional documents. This case is pending for petitioner's side enquiry. Considering the fact and circumstances, no prejudice would be caused to the respondents, as the respondents will have opportunities to argue as to the documents sought to be filed by the petitioners. Hence, 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 18<sup>th</sup> day of March 2025.

District Munsif,  
Tiruttani.

Petitioners and Respondent side Exhibits and witness: NIL

District Munsif,  
Tiruttani.