



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 29-04-2026**

CORAM

WEB COPY

**THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI**

**CRP No. 2616 of 2026  
and CMP No.11023 of 2026**

1. Dhanasekaran N  
S/o.Natarajan, 133, Perumal Koil Street,  
Medur, Ponneri 601204

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Abitha V S M  
Proprietor M/S.A.K.Paints and Electricals,  
New No.142, (Old No.250) Linghi Chetty  
Street, Muthialpet, Chennai 600 001 Rep.by  
Power of Attorney, SS Mohamed Zakariya,  
Jain Housing pebble Brook, Fob 4th Floor,  
Okkiyam. Thoraipakkam, Chennai 97.

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s): H.Shabeer Ali

### **ORDER**

The revision petitioner/landlord has filed the revision challenging the docket order passed in MP No.3 of 2025.

2. Before the trial court, the revision petitioner/landlord filed petition in RLTOP No.384 of 2025. Now the trial has commenced. At this stage, the respondent/tenant has filed a petition in MP No.3 of 2025 seeking to permit her to cross



T.V.THAMILSELVU

WEB COPY

sr

examine P.W.1 and also contends that the superstructure belongs to the revision petitioner. Considering the said submission, the trial court permitted the respondent/tenant to cross examine P.W.1. Aggrieved by the same, the landlord has filed the above revision.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that cross examination of witness under new Act is not a mandatory one and if the court is found that it is just and necessary, it can be, but the Court has not assigned any valid reasons to cross examine P.W.1 and simply ordered to cross examining without assigning any valid reason. It is also stated that without any document the superstructure belongs to him and the same has also been appreciated by the Rent Controller, which is erroneous.

4. Admit. Notice to the respondent. There shall be an order of interim stay of all further proceedings in M.P.No.3 of 2025 in RLTOP No.384 of 2025.

Post the revision on 06.07.2026.

29.04.2026

sr

**CRP No. 2616 of 2026**