



CRP Nos.5395 & 5396 of 2025
and CMP Nos.27174 & 27176 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 18.03.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRP Nos.5395 & 5396 of 2025
and CMP Nos.27174 & 27176 of 2025

1.E.M.Bhuvaneswari

2.Minor. E.M.Kethan Krishnan
(Minor Rep. By his natural guardian
and mother E.M.Bhuvaneswari)

... Petitioners in both CRPs

VS

1.N.Rajendran
2.E.M.Vamsi Krishnan

... Respondents in both CRPs

Common Prayer : Civil Revision Petitions filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India against the fair and decreetal order in allowing the IA Nos.4 & 3 of 2025 in OS No.3513 of 2021 dated 22.09.2025 by the III Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.

In both CRPs :

For Petitioners	: Mr.M.Venkatakrisnan
For R1	: Mr.B.S.Jothiraman
R2	: Not available



CRP Nos.5395 & 5396 of 2025
and CMP Nos.27174 & 27176 of 2025

WEB COPY

COMMON ORDER

Challenging the impugned order dated 22.09.2025 passed in IA Nos.4 & 3 of 2025 in OS No.3513 of 2021 on the file of the III Additional City Civil Court, Chennai, the revision has been preferred by the defendants.

2. The plaintiff / 1st respondent has filed an application in I.A.No.3 of 2025 under Order XVI Rule 6 CPC, to direct the Inspector of Police, V-5, Thirumangalam Police Station, Chennai – 600 101, to produce the complaint dated 23.11.2017 given by the 1st respondent in petition No.1383/2017 and the two letters both dated 14.12.2017 signed by E.S. Munirathnam, S/o. E.Subbiah and the petitioner before the trial court to give evidence. I.A.No.4 of 2025 was filed by the 1st respondent under Order XVI Rule 7-A CPC to direct the office to deliver the summons to the 1st respondent for service on the Inspector of Police, V-5, Thirumangalam Police Station, Chennai – 600 101. The reason assigned by the plaintiff that the documents Ex.A8 & Ex.A9 said to be executed by the deceased husband of the defendant and to prove the genuineness of

Page 2 of 6



CRP Nos.5395 & 5396 of 2025
and CMP Nos.27174 & 27176 of 2025

WEB COPY

those documents he want the original file kept in the said police station to be produced along with the file.

3. The said applications were objected by the first defendant / petitioner herein stating that already the said documents were marked during the lifetime of her husband E.S.Munirathnam and the person who is said to have executed himself has denied the same and he needs that acknowledgment and therefore he raised objection to that documents and also denied the execution letter during the cross examination. Further he raised objection that even any documents under the custody of police has no evidentiary value and therefore, he raised objection. Considering both submissions, the Trial judge has allowed the applications and passed an order for production of the documents from the police officer, against which the present revision is preferred.

4. Heard Mr.M.Venkatakkrishnan, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr.B.S.Jothiraman, learned counsel for the first respondent.



CRP Nos.5395 & 5396 of 2025
and CMP Nos.27174 & 27176 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. Pending proceedings, it was brought to the knowledge of this Court that the police officer appeared before the Court on 29.10.2025 wherein the learned Trial judge has held as follows :

“Inspector of police V5 Thirumangalam present and produced CSR copy the same recorded for further PWs Memo filed. CRP filed and pending call on 04.11.2025.”

6. Therefore, pending CRP proceedings, the Inspector of Police appeared and produced CSR copy and the same was recorded. Except that he has not produced any other document. Therefore, as on date even though the order is under challenge the police officer appeared, which was also objected by the revision petitioner. Furthermore, there is no evidence already attached to the documents under the custody of the police during investigation. To prove their own defence, already the police officer appeared and produced CSR copy and the same was recorded. Except that he has not produced any other documents. Since the police officer appeared and submitted documents before the Court, no further direction is required.



CRP Nos.5395 & 5396 of 2025
and CMP Nos.27174 & 27176 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Hence, these Civil Revision Petitions are disposed of. The plaintiff wants to summon the other Sub Inspector of Police, who conducted enquiry which should not be entertained. The police officer appeared before the trial Court and submitted that only CSR copy is available. The Sub Inspector of Police who conducted enquiry in the year 2017 is not relevant with regard to the particulars of the case. Therefore, such exercise need not be entertained before the Trial Court also. No costs. Consequently, connected Civil Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

18.03.2026

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-Speaking order
mtl

To

1. The III Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.
2. The Section Officer, VR Section, High Court, Madras.

Page 5 of 6



WEB COPY



CRP Nos.5395 & 5396 of 2025
and CMP Nos.27174 & 27176 of 2025

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

mtl

CRP Nos.5395 & 5396 of 2025
and CMP Nos.27174 & 27176 of 2025

18.03.2026