



C.R.P.No.5907 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No. 5907 of 2025

and

C.M.P.No. 29191 of 2025

1. G.Kesavan
2. K.Vijay Balaji
3. K.Prabhu

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. G.Gajapathy
2. Deputy Inspector General of Registration,
Santhome, Chennai – 600 004.
3. The District Registrar,
Central Chennai,
Bharathi Salai,
Chennai – 600 005.
4. The Sub Registrar,
Periamet Sub Registrar Office,
Periamet, Chennai – 600 003.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition filed Article 227 of Constitution of India, to allow the above CRP and set aside the Docket Order dated 25.09.2025 passed in O.S.No.2461 of 2022 which is made in 'A' diary



C.R.P.No.5907 of 2025

being maintained in the Court of learned XXIII Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.

WEB COPY


For Petitioners : Mr.P.K.Sabapathi

For Respondents : Mr.V.Nivetha Bernice for R1

ORDER

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the docket order dated 25.09.2025 passed in O.S.No.2461 of 2022 on the file of the learned XXIII Assistant Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.

2. A perusal of the impugned order would indicate that on 25.09.2025 when the matter was called in the morning, a representation was made by the counsel appearing for the defendants and the case was passed over. However, till 5.20 p.m. there was no representation on the side of the defendants. It is also recorded by the trial Court that the plaintiff/first respondent herein, who is aged about 79 to 80 years was present before the Court, however, cross examination of the plaintiff could not continue due to non appearance of the counsel appearing for the defendants till the evening. Hence, the matter was adjourned to 10.10.2025 for further cross examination. Taking into consideration the



C.R.P.No.5907 of 2025

WEB COPY

events that had taken place on 25.09.2025, the trial Court imposed costs of Rs.500/- on the defendants/petitioners herein. Aggrieved by the same, the present Civil Revision Petition.

3. Taking into consideration the turn of events that had happened on 25.09.2025, the trial Court exercised its discretion and imposed costs of Rs.500/- on the defendants. Hence, I do not find any error to interfere with the impugned order passed by the trial Court.

4. If the case of the petitioner is that the recording made by the trial Court is factually incorrect, it is for him to approach the very same Court, when the facts are still afresh in its memory.

5. With the above clarification, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

26.11.2025

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

3/5



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5907 of 2025

To

The XXIII Assistant Judge,
City Civil Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5907 of 2025
S.SOUNTHAR, J.
ms

C.R.P.No.5907 of 2025

26.11.2025