



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI


**CRP No. 2445 of 2026
and CMP.No.10427 of 2026**

Jayalakshmi
W/o Jayaraman,
D.No.255, Dr.Pasupathi Pannai House,
Kumarasamy Pettai,
Pennagaram Main Road,
Dharmapuri Town, Taluk and Dist.
Now Res at Door No 6/98,
Balajangamanahalli Village,
Nallampalli Tk,
Dharmapuri Dist.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Arumugam
S/o Vengatasamy Naidu,
Balajangamanahalli Village,
Nallampalli Tk,
Dharmapuri Dist.
2. Mukesh
S/o Arumugam,
Balajangamanahalli Village,
Nallampalli Tk,
Dharmapuri Dist.
3. Dhinesh
S/o Arumugam,
Balajangamanahalli Village,
Nallampalli Tk,
Dharmapuri Dist.
4. Arunagiri
S/o Gopal,
Omahnatham Village,
Elagiri,
Nallampalli Tk,



Dharmapuri Dist.

5. Angamuthu

S/o Nanjappamaniyakar,
Balajangamanahalli Village,
Nallampalli Tk,
Dharmapuri Dist.

6. Ragu

S/o K.Narasingaraji,
Balajangamanahalli Village,
Nallampalli Tk,
Dharmapuri Dist.

7. Jaya alias Jayalakshmi

W/o K.Narasingaraji,
Balajangamanahalli Village,
Nallampalli Tk,
Dharmapuri Dist.

8. Manogaran


S/o. Pachiyappan,
Muniyan Kottai,
Echampatti Post,
Balajangamanahalli Village,
Nallampalli Tk,
Dharmapuri Dist.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, praying to set aside the order and decretal order made in I.A.No.08/2025 in O.S.No.52/2015 dated 11.02.2026 pending on the file of the District Munsif Court, Dharmapuri and allow this CRP and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s):

MR.N.Umapathi



ORDER

WEB COPY

Challenging the impugned order passed by the Trial Judge in I.A.No.08 of 2025 in O.S.No.52 of 2015 dated 11.02.2026, the present revision has been filed by the plaintiff.

2. Before the trial Court, the plaintiff filed an application to reopen the evidence of P.W.1 and to recall him for the purpose of marking certain documents. However, the trial Court dismissed the said application. Aggrieved by the same, the present revision has been filed.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was an earlier suit in O.S. No.99 of 2006, the records of which were traced only recently. The plaintiff intends to mark certain documents, including the written statement filed in the said suit, on his side. Therefore, the necessity arose to reopen and recall P.W.1. However, the trial Court failed to grant such an opportunity.

4. On a perusal of the records, the trial Court observed that the application was filed only to fill up the lacuna after the cross-examination of P.W.1. However, it is seen that the documents sought to be marked pertain to O.S. No.99 of 2006, which is much prior to the present suit. Marking of such documents would not cause any prejudice to the respondents. On the contrary, it



would assist the Court in effectively adjudicating the issues involved in the suit.

WEB COPY

5. It is also pertinent to note that the evidence on the side of the defendants has not yet commenced. At this stage, an opportunity ought to be given to the plaintiff.

6. In such circumstances, the reasons assigned by the trial Court are set aside, and the revision petition is allowed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

22-04-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MPA



CRP No. 2445 of 2



WEB COPY

To

1. The District Munsif Court, Dharmapuri.
2. The Section Officer, V.R.Section, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 2445 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

MPA

**CRP No. 2445 of 2026
and CMP.No.10427 of 2026**

22-04-2026