

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF, VANIYAMBADI

Present: Thiru V.ESHWAR, B.E.,LL.B.,
DISTRICT MUNSIF, VANIYAMBADI

Dated this the 30th day of July, 2026

(2057 திருவள்ளூர் ஆண்டு, ஸ்ரீ பராபவ வருடம் , ஆடி திங்கள் 14 ம் நாள்)

I.A. No. 01 of 2026

in

O.S.No. 37 of 2023

P.Chandran

.....Petitioner/ Plaintiff

Vs

1. C.Neela
2. Chakkravarty
3. Krishnan
4. Devaki
5. Nanda Kumar
6. Kathick

.....Respondents/ Defendants

This petition coming on 30.07.2026 for final orders before me in the presence of learned counsel Mr.**T.S.Kannaiyan** for the petitioner and learned counsel Mr.**R.Tirupathi** for the Respondents upon perusing the petition ,Counter and other material records in this case, this Court doth pass the following:

ORDER

(Petition filed. U/o.7.R.14(3) of CPC.r/w. 151 of CPC

The petitioner/plaintiff has instituted the present application under Order VII Rule 14(3) read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, seeking to condone the delay in filing seven documents into Court and to receive the same on record in support of his case.

Gist of Petition

2. It is the specific case of the petitioner that at the time of filing the suit, he was in possession of only photocopies of five of the subject documents. Certified copies of those five documents could be secured by him only recently. As regards the remaining two documents, the petitioner asserts that they were not available in his custody at the time of presentation of the plaint and came into his possession only subsequent to the institution of the suit. The petitioner maintains that the delay in bringing these seven documents on record is neither willful nor wanton, and that grave hardship would be caused to his case if the relief sought is not granted.

Gist of Counter

3. The respondent/defendant has stoutly opposed the application by filing a detailed counter statement. It is contended by the respondent that the petition is false, vexatious, and unsustainable in law. The respondent highlights that the petitioner, having admitted to holding photocopies of five documents at the inception of the suit, failed to offer any valid explanation as to why the original or certified copies were not applied for and produced earlier. It is further pleaded that the petitioner has offered no justifiable reasons for the non-production of the remaining two documents at the relevant stage. The respondent asserts that the present application is brought with ulterior motives, suppressing material facts, and ought to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

POINT FOR DETERMINATION

4. The point that arises for consideration in this interlocutory application is whether this petition is to be allowed or not?

EVIDENCE ADDUCED

5. No oral evidence was adduced by either side for the purpose of disposing of this interlocutory application.

DISCUSSION AND REASONS FOR DECISION

6. Heard both sides. Perused record. The procedural framework under Order VII Rule 14 Sub-rule (3) provides a discretion to the Court to grant leave to receive documents at a later stage upon sufficient cause being shown. The core objective of this provision is to prevent manufactured documentary evidence at a late stage while simultaneously ensuring that genuine, relevant records necessary for deciding the real points in dispute are not shut out.

7. A careful reading of the petition reveals that out of the seven documents sought to be received, five are certified copies obtained from public or judicial records. In respect of these five records, the petitioner has stated that only photocopies were available when the plaint was lodged, and the certified copies were obtained subsequently.

8. Regarding the remaining two documents, though the petition lacks details as to where they were lying prior to production, shut-out of documentary evidence at a pre-trial stage ought to be avoided unless gross negligence, deliberate suppression, or irreparable prejudice to the adversary is demonstrated.

The respondent will have full opportunity to cross-examine the plaintiff on these documents, object to their admissibility or mode of proof, and rebut them with counter-evidence during the trial.

9. In the considered view of this Court, hyper-technical objections should not stand in the way of placing relevant documentary evidence on record. The delay and inconvenience caused to the respondent by the late production of these records can be adequately compensated by way of monetary costs.

RESULT

10. In the result, this petition is **allowed on the conditional** payment of costs of **Rs. 500/-** (Rupees Five Hundred only) by the petitioner to the respondent or his counsel **on or before 07.08.2026**. In default of payment of costs within the stipulated period, this application shall stand automatically dismissed without further reference to this Court.

For reporting compliance of payment of costs, Call on **07.08.2026**

Directly typed by me in my official laptop, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court, this the 30th day of July 2026.

**DISTRICT MUNSIF,
VANIYAMBADI.**

APPENDIX

- I. Witnesses Examined on behalf of petitioner : Nil
- II. Documents Marked On behalf of the Petitioner: Nil
- III. Witnesses Examined on behalf of respondents : Nil
- IV. Documents Marked On behalf of the respondents: Nil

**DISTRICT MUNSIF,
VANIYAMBADI.**