

**In the Court of the Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at Srivilliputtur**

**Present:- Thiru.K.Jeyakumar, B.L.,L.L.M.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,**

Tuesday, this the 08th day of July 2025

I.A.No.06/2025

in

O.S.No.21/2018

1.A.Seenivasan

2.Vijayakumar

...Petitioners/Defendants

/Vs./

M/s.Sri Lalithambigai Cotton Agency,

a partnership firm represented

by its partner P.V.Subramaniyaraja

...Respondent/Plaintiff

This petition coming before me for final hearing on 27.06.2025 in the presence of Thiru.S.Sankaranarayanan, Advocate for the petitioner and Thiru.A.Suwatheeswaran, Advocate for the respondent and upon hearing the arguments of both side and perusing the case records, this Court delivered the following,

ORDER

This petition has been filed by the petitioners under Order 8 Rule 1 (3) of CPC seeking to accept the additional document marked as Ex.C-1.

2) Petition averments in brief:-

The 1st petitioner is the 1st Defendant in the Original suit. The 1st petitioner also filed this petition on behalf of the 2nd petitioner. When the 1st

petitioner/Defendant's side documents ought to have marked in the case, the said petition mentioned document had not marked as Ex.C-1 because this court directed that this original petition already in case records which cannot be marked as Exhibit but certified copy only can be marked as Exhibit. As per Court direction, the petitioner obtained certified copy of petition, order and decreetal order in I.A.No.4/2023. Now the petitioner wants to mark the above said petition mentioned documents. Therefore, it is just and necessary to excuse the delay in marking the petition, decree and order in I.A.No. 4/2023 as Ex.C1 and order it to be accepted as additional document. Hence, this petition.

3) Counter averments in brief:-

The petition is not valid in law. In the Original suit, I.A.No.4/2023 order was passed on 16/02/2024 in the court in I.A.No.4/2023. The documents was mentioned by the petitioner in the petition i.e, (petition, order and decreetal order in I.A.No.4/2023) are already in this case so, the certified copies of the documents are not valid. Further, this petition is filed only to drag on the suit proceedings. Therefore, the petition may be dismissed.

4) Now, the point for consideration is that whether the petition deserves to be allowed or not?

5) Heard. Record perused. The main case is filed for recovery of money by the respondent/plaintiff against the petitioners/defendants. This application is filed to seek the petition mentioned documents to mark an exhibit as Ex.C-1 (ie., petition, order and decreetal order in I.A.No.4/2023). Otherside has no serious objection was raised. If the petition is allowed, no prejudice would be caused to the respondent. Therefore, considering the above facts and circumstance of the case, the petitioner is permitted to mark the additional document as exhibit.

In the result, Petition is allowed. No costs.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, directly typed by her, then corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this **the 8th day of July 2025.**

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.**

List of witnesses and documents on both side:- NIL.

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.**

**Principal District Court
Srivilliputtur
I.A.No.6/2025 in
O.S.No.21/2018
Fair/Draft Order
Dt: 08/07/2025**