

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF, GUDIYATTAM,
VELLORE DISTRICT.

Present: **Tr.K.Karthick Asath, B.A.,B.L.,(Hons).,LLM.,**
District Munsif,
Gudiyattam.

Wednesday, this the 04th day of February 2026

I.A. 05/2025
in
O.S.No. 202/2021

Vinothkumar Petitioner/ Defendant

// Versus //

Ekambaram Respondent/ Plaintiff

This petition came up on 21.01.2026 before me for final hearing in the presence of Thiru.K.Karthikeyan, Advocate for the petitioner and Thiru.K.Loganathan, Advocate for the respondent and upon perusing the case records and having stood over for consideration till this day this court delivered the following.

Order

Petition filed under Order 8, Rule 1A and Section 151 of Code of Civil Procedure to receive the petition mentioned documents as mentioned in this petition in the above suit and pass such other orders.

1. The averments of the petitioner in the application:-

The petitioner stated that at the time of filing the written statement the petitioner unable to receive and file those documents along with it. Now only those documents are received by the petitioner hence prayed to receive the additional documents on the side of the petitioner/defendant.

District Munsif, Gudiyattam.

2. The averments of the counter filed by the respondent:-

The respondent submit that the reasons stated by the petitioner are totally false. Without mentioning the pleadings the petitioner seeking permission to file additional documents. Those documents are created after the suit pronote. If the petitioner denied the signature in the pronote he can sent for expert opinion and not for filing created documents to compare the signature. No where in the written statement the petitioner pleaded about the additional documents. Hence prayed to dismiss the suit.

3. Both side enquiry heard.

4. Point for consideration:-

Whether this application is liable to be allowed ?

5. Evidence:-

Neither of the parties to this application have adduced any oral or documentary evidence.

6. Discussion:-

On perusing the available records this court delineate and proceeds its findings based on the following discussion.

6.1. The petitioner is the defendant in the main suit. The respondent filed suit for recovery of money against the petitioner in OS.202/2021. While the suit was posted for defendant side evidence the petitioner filed this petition for receiving and marking those additional documents. In the petition the petitioner stated that now only he found

District Munsif, Gudiyattam.

those documents. For proving his case those documents are necessary. Hence prayed to allow this petition.

6.2. Per contra the respondent filed counter and stating that the petitioner without stating in the pleadings filed documents. Those documents are created one. If the petitioner not signed in the pronote he should sent for expert opinion but not to ask the court to compare the signatures of the created documents. Hence prayed to dismiss the petition.

6.3. On perusing the available records while the suit was posted finally for defendant side evidence on 21.11.2025 the present petition for receiving additional document is filed by the petitioner/defendant. In the present petition the petitioner filed Bank statement and Xerox copy of Tenancy agreement, Xerox copy of Pan card, Xerox copy of Release deed, Xerox copy of Acknowledgment card signed by the defendant are documents. But in the petition there is no averment stated by the petitioner that for what purpose those documents are necessary to prove his case. There is no reason for filing those documents is mentioned in the petition.

6.4. It is further submit that on perusing the written statement filed by the defendant there is no pleadings regarding those additional documents. Without pleadings and without mentioning the reason for accepting those additional documents is not considerable. Even for comparing the signature of the petitioner he has to file original documents but the suit the petitioners filed only xerox copy of documents. The petitioner failed to show sufficient cause for receiving those additional documents. The petitioner failed to state how those documents are relevant

District Munsif, Gudiyattam.

to his case and what is the necessary to receiving those documents. Even the petitioner failed to state reason for delay in filing those documents at earlier stage. On considering the above discussion this court not inclined to allow this petition.

7. Result:-

As a result, this petition is dismissed without cost.

Dictated to Steno typist directly, typed by him corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 04th day of February 2026.

**District Munsif,
Gudiyattam.**

Petitioner side Witnesses and Exhibits :- Nil

Respondent side Witnesses and Exhibits :- Nil

**District Munsif,
Gudiyattam.**

District Munsif, Gudiyattam.