



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 12.06.2025

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE P.B. BALAJI
CRP.Nos.4807 & 4812 of 2023
& CMP.No.28556 of 2023

Ganesh Electricals,
Rep by its Proprietor,
B.Kumareson,
No.1, II Floor, New Street,
Sakthi Nagar,
Porur – 600 016.

... Petitioner in both CRPs

Vs.

Venus Electrical Works,
Rep by its Proprietor A.Murugavel,
S-9, 2nd Floor, New Shopping Complex,
No.100, Jawaharlal Nehru Street,
Pondicherry – 605 001.

... Respondent in CRP.No.4807 of 2023

K.S.Mani Electricals,
Rep. by its Proprietor,
K.Subramaniyan
No.50, III Cross Street,
Velmurugan Nagar,
Kuyavarpalayam,
Pondicherry – 605 103.

... Respondent in CRP.No.4812 of 2023

COMMON PRAYER: Civil Revision Petitions filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to set aside the order dated 14.09.2023 in I.A.No.5 of 2023 in C.O.S.No.548 of 2021 and I.A.No.6 of 2023 in C.O.S.No.557 of 2021 respectively on the file of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Subramanian in both CRPs



WEB COPY



For Respondent :

Mr.Sharath Chandran in CRP.No.4807 of 2023


Mrs.R.Hemalatha in CRP.No.4812 of 2023

COMMON ORDER

These Civil Revision Petitions are at the instance of the plaintiff in commercial suits pending before the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur.

2.Both the defendants took out applications in the respective commercial suits filed against them, seeking the Court to frame a preliminary issue with regard to territorial jurisdiction of the Court. The said applications were resisted by the revision petitioner. However, the commercial Court has proceeded to allow the applications, on enquiry and aggrieved by the same, the plaintiff is before this Court by way of these revisions.

3.I have heard Mr.R.Subramaninan, learned counsel for the revision petitioner in both petitions, Mr.Sharath Chandran, learned counsel for the respondent in CRP.No.4807 of 2023 and Mrs.R.Hemalatha, learned counsel for the respondent in CRP.No.4812 of 2023.



WEB COPY

4.Mr.R.Subramanian, learned counsel for the revision petitioner in both the revision petitions would submit that the suits have been filed against the respective defendants, who are respondents in these revisions for recovery of monies due from them, arising out of a contract entered into between the plaintiff and the defendants. It is to be noted that the plaintiff has been awarded a contract by the Government of Pondicherry and a part of the contract work (labour contract) has been assigned/made over to the defendants. According to the plaintiff, the plaintiff's office is situate in Porur, within the jurisdiction of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur and it is the place where the contracts have been signed with the defendants and further, payments have been made by the defendants only from their bank account, which is also situate in the jurisdiction of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur.


5.The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the issues have not been framed in the suit and in fact, the defendants did not choose to file their written statement within the mandatory period of 120 days and the applications are also pending for attachment before the judgment as well as seeking directions to the garnishee. An application has



WEB COPY

also been taken out by the plaintiff to strike of the defense since the written statement has not been filed within a period of 120 days. Admittedly, these applications are pending and he would therefore submit that the application for taking up the issue of territorial jurisdiction as a preliminary issue itself was premature and the Court below ought not to have entertained the same. He would further submit that part of cause of action for the suit arose only within the jurisdiction of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur and hence, unless the issues are framed in the suit, there was no necessity to decide the question of territorial jurisdiction as a preliminary issue. He would therefore pray for the revision petitions being allowed.

6.Per contra, Mr.Sharath Chandran as well as Mrs.R.Hemalatha, learned counsel for the respondents would submit that the entire cause of action arose only within the jurisdiction of the Courts at Pondicherry and no part of cause of action arose within the territorial jurisdiction of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur. They would further submit that even if the written statement cannot be entertained, it is always open to the Court to entertain and decide the counter claim that has been made and the suit can be proceeded with. Therefore, they contend that the pendency of the



WEB COPY

applications for strike off may not be relevant for the purposes of the application regarding the decision on territorial jurisdiction. They would further submit that the plaintiff has also not made out a case for part of cause of action arising within the jurisdiction of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur. They would therefore seek for confirmation of the order of Principal District Court, Thiruvallur.

7.The question of cause of action or part of cause of action arising within the Court of jurisdiction of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur, is certainly a mixed question of fact as well as law and the parties necessarily have to lead evidence. The learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage fairly submits that the plaintiff would have no objection for the counter claim to be taken on file, even though the defendants had lost their right to file their written statement, provided proper Court fee is paid on the counter claim and the parties may be directed to proceed with the trial. However, at the same time, when the defendants have specifically raised the issue of territorial jurisdiction, the Court necessarily will have to go into the said question also as an issue. In this regard, an issue shall be framed along with the other issues and the defendants, subject to payment of Court fee on



WEB COPY

the counter claim made, shall be entitled to have their respective counter claims also heard along with the suit claim. The defendants are given 4 weeks time, to pay the applicable Court fees on the counter claim, from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The Trial Court shall take up the trial of the suit and complete the pleadings, within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and thereafter shall dispose of the suit as well as the counter claim, if any filed, within a period of three months thereafter. It is made clear that the Interlocutory Applications shall be taken up and decided along with the suit.

8. With these above observations and directions, these Civil Revision Petitions are allowed and the order dated 14.09.2023 in I.A.No.5 of 2023 in C.O.S.No.548 of 2021 and I.A.No.6 of 2023 in C.O.S.No.557 of 2021 respectively on the file of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur, is hereby set aside. There shall be no order as to costs. Connected Civil Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

12.06.2025

Speaking/Non-speaking : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
ata

To

6/12




The Principal District Court, Thiruvallur.



WEB COPY

P.B. BALAJI,J.



WEB COPY




ata

CRP.Nos.4807 & 4812 of 2023
& CMP.No.28556 of 2023

12.06.2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 12.08.2025
CORAM

8/12



THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE P.B. BALAJI
CRP.Nos.4807 & 4812 of 2023
& CMP.No.28556 of 2023

WEB COPY

Ganesh Electricals,
Rep by its Proprietor,
B.Kumareson,
No.1, II Floor, New Street,
Sakthi Nagar,
Porur – 600 016.

... Petitioner in both CRPs

Vs.

Venus Electrical Works,
Rep by its Proprietor A.Murugavel,
S-9, 2nd Floor, New Shopping Complex,
No.100, Jawaharlal Nehru Street,
Pondicherry – 605 001.

... Respondent in CRP.No.4807 of 2023

K.S.Mani Electricals,
Rep. by its Proprietor,
K.Subramaniyan
No.50, III Cross Street,
Velmurugan Nagar,
Kuyavarpalayam,
Pondicherry – 605 103.

... Respondent in CRP.No.4812 of 2023

COMMON PRAYER: Civil Revision Petitions filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to set aside the order dated 14.09.2023 in I.A.No.5 of 2023 in C.O.S.No.548 of 2021 and I.A.No.6 of 2023 in C.O.S.No.557 of 2021 respectively on the file of the Principal District Court, Thiruvallur.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Subramanian
in both CRPs

For Respondent : Mr.Sharath Chandran



WEB COPY



in CRP.No.4807 of 2023

Mrs.R.Hemalatha
in CRP.No.4812 of 2023

COMMON ORDER

Today, the matter is listed under the caption “for being mentioned” at the instance of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that now the respondents are attempting to introduce a new counter claim which was not permitted in and by the common order passed by this Court on 12.06.2025. It is made clear that what was directed was only to enable the defendants to pay the Court fee on the counter claim already made along with the written statement. It does not entitle them to file a fresh counter claim and therefore the counter claim in so far as the Court fee paid in one suit alone shall be taken on file and not in respect of the other suit.

3. Registry is directed to issue a fresh order copy to the parties.



12.08.2025

jas
WEB COPY

To
The Principal District Court, Thiruvallur.

Note : Issue order copy on 12.08.2025.

P.B. BALAJI,J.

jas

11/12



WEB COPY

CRP.Nos.4807 & 4812 of 2023
& CMP.No.28556 of 2023

12.08.2025