

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 10th Day of October 2025

MP.No.2 OF 2024 in MP.No.1 OF 2021 in RCOP.No.2/2018

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000098-2018)

M.C. Santhi

...

... Petitioner/Petitioner/Landlord

/Versus/

1.P.S. Khajahmoigheen (died)

2. S.K. Iqbal

... 1,2 Respondents/1,2 Respondents/1,2 Tenants

3. S.K. Farook Basha

4. S.K. Badurunisa Begam

5. S.K. Mohamad Ali

... 3 to 5 Respondents/3 to 5 proposed Tenants

(Respondents 3 to 5 are impleaded as per order in M.P.No.6/2025, dated 08.09.2025.)

This petition came up before me for the final hearing on 24.09.2025 in the presence of M/s. M. Mohan Raju, G. Sivakumar, Advocate for Petitioner/Petitioner/Landlord, R1 died, M/s. G. Kamalakannan, Advocates for R2, R4, M/s. V. Senthilkumar, R. Ragupathi, Advocates for R3, R5. 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 7 Rule 14(3) of CPC to receive the additional documents.

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

The RCOP was filed by the petitioner as against the respondents for eviction on the ground of willful default. The documents were misplaced and could not be traced in time. The petition documents are very important to prove the petitioner's case. Hence this petition.

2. Respondents side endorsed as no counter.

3. Point for determination:

Whether the petitioner is entitled to the relief as sought for? or not?

4. Heard both sides. According to petitioner, the petition mentioned documents are important to prove his case. Therefore the petitioner prays to allow this petition. Counsel for Respondents endorsed as no counter.

5. On perusal of record, this case was posted for Respondent side enquiry in MP.No.1/2021. In this stage this petitioner filed this petition seeking permission for receiving additional documents. Further, mere receiving the documents will not give any advantage to the petitioner as the petitioner has to prove the validity of the documents. Further the respondents may raise their objection at the time of marking of documents 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 his 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 10th day of October 2025.

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.

Petitioner and Respondents side Exhibits and witness: NIL

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.