



CMP Nos.9550, 9553 & 15789 of 2024
in
AS No.294 of 2024

CMP Nos.9550, 9553 & 15789 of 2024

WEB COPY

in
AS No.294 of 2024

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
and
K.RAJASEKAR, J.

(Order of the Court was made by C.V.Karthikeyan, J.)

The learned counsel for the appellants had filed an affidavit regarding proof of service for 7-12 respondents who are proposed to be impleaded in the appeal. They were not parties to the suit. The suit had been dismissed since they were not impleaded as defendants. They were all residing in West Malaysia and private notice could not be served. So far as the Court notice sent by the counsel, acknowledgment card was not received and only the delivery track record has been filed.

2.The learned counsel for the appellants and the learned counsel for the 1-6 respondents who were earlier parties to the suit may file a genealogy table and also the shares by which the property should be divided. It is contended that the 7-12 respondents have an exclusive right over a particular property. That property then could be excluded from being subjected to partition and the ratio can be decided with respect to the properties in which the plaintiffs and the defendants have a share.

3.Registry may print the names and addresses of the 7-12 respondents in the cause list. For providing the genealogy table and arguing on these aspects, list these matters on 28.04.2026.

sli

(C.V.K.J.,) (K.R.S.J.,)
06.04.2026



WEB COPY



CMP Nos.9550, 9553 & 15789 of 2024
in
AS No.294 of 2024

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
and
K.RAJASEKAR, J.

sli

CMP Nos.9550, 9553 & 15789 of 2024 in
AS No.294 of 2024

06.04.2026