



WEB COPY

A No. 541 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30-04-2026

CORAM

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

A Nos. 541 of 2025 and 3627 of 2024
in C.S.No.860 of 2007

Kamachi Naveen (Deceased)

1. Gaurav
2. Mr.Karan
3. Priyadarshini
4. Naveen Chandar

..Applicant(s)

Vs


1. K.V.Jaisingh
2. K.V.Balajisingh
3. Lakshmi Bai
4. Saraswathi Bai
5. B.Shakila
6. P.Dheeraj Kumar
7. Indira
8. I.Dharmender
9. I.Jeetender
- 10.I.Shylander

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: To pass directing the Respondents 1 to 3 to deposit 1/7 share of income of residential rental income and rental income of Mahalakshmi Theater from the date of suit to till date in to court, to the credit of suit in C.S.No.860 of 2007.

For Applicant(s): Mr.B. Nedunchezhiyan

For Respondent(s): Mr.V.Raghavachari
Senior Counsel
for M/s.V.Srimathi




ORDER

In the morning session, it was represented by Mr. B. Nedunchezhiyan, learned counsel for the plaintiffs/applicants, that he was not sure whether one of his clients, namely Plaintiff No.5, had signed the compromise said to have been entered into between the parties before the Mediation Centre. He therefore sought time to verify the same with his client. The alleged joint compromise memo was not immediately available on record. Hence, the Registry was directed to verify the same with the Mediation Centre, and the matter was passed over.

2. When the matter is taken up in the afternoon session, Mr. V. Raghavachari, learned Senior Counsel, is present, and Plaintiff No.5 is also present through video conference. The learned Senior Counsel submits that the matter has already been compromised between the parties, that the plaintiffs have received compensation and that they do not wish to pursue the matter further. It is also submitted that the O.S.A. was withdrawn before the Division Bench.

3. However, it is brought to the notice of this Court by the officials of the Mediation Centre that, as per their records, no such compromise was drafted. Certain notes of the Mediation/Mediator have been produced before this Court. Mr. B. Nedunchezhiyan, learned counsel for the plaintiffs, is not present before



this Court here and now, though a memo appears to have been filed before the Registry and the same has also been placed before this Court, it can be considered only upon the appearance of the learned counsel and the parties.

4. Plaintiff No.5, who is present before this Court through video conference, is directed to appear along with his counsel. Since Mr. B. Nedunchezhiyan, learned counsel, continues to hold vakalat for Plaintiff No.5, the submissions of Plaintiff No.5 need not be entertained in the absence of his counsel.

5. List the matter on **02.06.2026** for the physical appearance of all parties and their respective learned counsel.

30-04-2026

SRM



WEB COPY

A No. 541 of 2



DR.A.D.MARIA CLETE, J.

SRM

A Nos. 541 of 2025 and 3627 of 2024
in C.S.No.860 of 2007

30-04-2026