

In the Court of the District Munsif, Sathankulam.

Present. Thiru.M.Siva Rajesh, B.B.A.,L.L.B.,

District Munsif Sathankulam.

Dated:- This the 04th day of November 2025, Thusday.

IA.No.01/2025

in

O.S.No.38/2023

1. D.Harbansingh Premkumar (Age 56),

S/o.Deva Ashirvatham,

Door No.85, Manikkavasapuram

Sathankulam,

Sathankulam Taluka, Thoothukudi District.

2. T.Navaneethan(Age 67),

S/o.Thangavel @ Thangadurai,

Door No.16/13 Arasoor Part -I,

Kottaiyadithattu, Edachivilai,

Sathankulam Taluka, Thoothukudi District.

...Petitioners/Plaintiffs

/VS/

C.Arulraj (Age 52),

S/o.Late.Chelladurai,

Door.No.13/132, Kumaranvilai,

Edachivilai, Arasoor Part -I Village,

Sathankulam Taluka, Thoothukudi District.

... Respondent/Defendant

Advocate for the Petitioners :Thiru.K.Willin Felix

Advocate for the Respondents: Thiru.Periya Raja

Relief :-

This petition has been filed under Order 8 Rule 1A(3) of the Code of Civil Procedure, praying that the document mentioned herein may be accepted as part of the defendant's side evidence in the main suit.

2) Case of the petitioner :-

2.1 The petitioner state that he is the defendant in the main suit and case has been posted today for the defendant's side evidence. It was stated that, the document mentioned in the present petition, which is necessary to substantiate their evidence and to establish their case, has only now come into their possession.

2.2 It was further stated that a crucial document, recently obtained, could not be filed earlier with their written statement, and requested the court to accept and mark it as their evidence in the interest of justice. In case of failure it would cause them irreparable hardship.

3) Case of the respondent :-

3.1 The respondent denied the contention of the petition. It was stated that the additional document sought to be produced by the petitioners/defendants as part of their evidence has no relevance whatsoever to the subject matter of the original suit. It is entirely unconnected to the issues framed for trial.

3.2 The respondent further stated that the proposed document, namely the order dated 12.03.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court in W.P.(MD) No.4403 of 2025 and W.M.P.(MD) Nos.3157 & 3158 of 2025 by Hon'ble Justice B. Puthu Devanand, does not involve any of the parties to the present suit. It was stated that neither the plaintiff nor the defendants were parties to the said writ proceedings. Furthermore, while the original suit O.S.No.38 of 2023 was filed on 06.03.2023, the said High Court order pertains to disciplinary proceedings dated 12.02.2025, issued by the Joint Director of School Education, Chennai, in Na.Ka.No.030246/A3/E3/2024, concerning one Mr. Neelanarayanan, working in the Sathankulam Educational Office. This order bears no connection or relevance to the issues in the present suit.

3.3 The respondent further stated that there is no legal obligation or justification for the petitioner to file such an irrelevant document as additional evidence.

Hence, it is prayed that the interlocutory petition be dismissed with costs.

4. Analysis of this court :-

4.1 Heard. Record Perused. The petitioner sought to introduce as additional evidence an order passed by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court dated 12.03.2025. However, the said document pertains to a disciplinary proceeding involving one Mr. Neelananarayanan, who is not a party to the present suit. The Court observes that the document has no nexus or relevance to the issues framed in the present case O.S.No.38 of 2023.

4.2 The Court further notes that admitting such a document, which is wholly unrelated to the dispute between the parties, would not advance the cause of justice but rather result in unnecessary diversion of the Court's attention from the issues, which was framed to be adjudicated.

4.4 The Court conclude that irrelevant document cannot be permitted to form part of the record, as doing so would amount to an abuse of the process of law and a waste of judicial time.

Accordingly, the Court holds the petition lacks merit and deserve to be dismissed.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, typed by her, corrected, and pronounced by me in open court on this the 04th day of November, 2025.

District Munsif,
Sathankulam

Petitioners side witness and documents -Nil

Respondent side witness and documents -Nil

District Munsif,
Sathankulam

District Munsif Court, Sathankulam,
IA.No.1/2025in
OS.No.38/2023
Fair/Draft Order
Dated : 04.11.2025