



A.No.3200 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE A.D.MARIA CLETE

A.No.3200 of 2024

in

O.P.No.657 of 2023

Arvind Chandrasekaran
S/o.N.Chandrasekaran, D6 Block 1, Leo
Taurus Apartments, No.33/42, Panchayat
Main Road, Perungudi, Chennai - 600
096.

Applicant(s)

Vs

Gayathri Ramasubramanian
D/o.Mr.K.Ramasurbramanian, B 304, S
and P Living Spaces, Kamarajar Salai,
Ayanambakkam, Chennai - 600 095.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER : This application is filed to permit the applicant to give evidence via
Video Conferencing in G.W.O.P.No.657 of 2023.

For Petitioner(s):	Mr.C.Prasanna Venkatesh
For Respondent:	Mr.V.Manoharan

ORDER

This application has been filed to permit the applicant to give evidence via
Video Conferencing in G.W.O.P.No.657 of 2023.

1/5



A.No.3200 of 2024

2. The affidavit filed in support of the application states that though he is in India and visiting his son for two hours every day , it will be difficult to take more days off as it might even lead to lose his job and thus sought for permission to attend trial proceedings through video conference as he has to travel to USA for work.

3. However, Rule 4(2) of the Madras High Court Video Conferencing in Courts Rules, 2020 requires that an application for video conferencing shall be supported by an affidavit evidencing the justifiable circumstances and all relevant particulars of the proposed Remote Site. Further, Practice Direction 6.3 provides that in civil cases, the parties requesting recording of statements by video conferencing shall confirm to the Court the location of the person, the willingness of such person to be examined through video conferencing, and the availability of technical facilities for video conferencing at the agreed time and place.

4. In the present case, while the affidavit refer to the applicant's inability to attend the trial, they do not set out the relevant particulars of the proposed remote site in the manner required by the Rules. The affidavit do not clearly specify the precise remote venue from which the applicant proposes to depose, the agreed time and place for such examination, the technical facilities available there, or the manner in which the proposed remote site satisfies the requirements of the Rules



A.No.3200 of 2024

and the Practice Directions. The affidavit is therefore not in compliance with Rule 4(2) of the Rules read with Practice Direction 6.3.

WEB COPY

5. The statutory requirement is that the application itself be supported by a compliant affidavit containing the relevant particulars of the proposed remote site. Such foundational particulars cannot be left to be supplied later by way of a memo or by oral submission across the Bar. In matters of this nature, the Court is required to assess the request on the basis of the affidavit and the governing Rules, irrespective of whether the opposite party chooses to file a counter affidavit or merely states an objection orally. The question is one of compliance with the Court's procedural framework and of the Court's own satisfaction in regulating the mode of recording evidence.

6. Further, practice Direction 3.3.1 contemplates that where the remote site is overseas, the remote-site coordinator shall preferably be an official of the relevant Indian Consulate, Embassy or High Commission.

7. In the circumstances, this Court finds that this application is liable to be dismissed on account of non-compliance with the Madras High Court Video Conferencing Rules, 2020. However, the petitioner is at liberty to file a fresh



A.No.3200 of 2024

application, if so advised, upon strict compliance with the requirements of the said

Rules.

WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

29.04.2026
(2/2)

dna/ay



WEB COPY



A.No.3200 of 2024

DR.A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

dna

A.No.3200 of 2024
in
O.P.No.657 of 2023

29.04.2026