

C.R.P.No.5861 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 26.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.5861 of 2025
and
C.M.P.No.28997 of 2025

- 1.Thirumal
- 2.Santhi
- 3.Perumal
- 4.Krishnamurthi
- 5.Suresh
- 6.Dinakaran
- 7.Megaraj
- 8.Babu
- 9.Vadivel
- 10.Sivaraj
- 11.Hari
- 12.Sadasivam
- 13.Chinnapayyan
- 14.Munirathinam

1/6



C.R.P.No.5861 of 2025

15.Govindaraj @ Bigil

16.Sathiyaraj

17.Panneerselvam

18.Nagaraj

19.Ravi

20.Kanniyappan

21.Sathish

22.Venkatesan

23.Srinivasan

24.Vaiyapuri

25.Samu @ Paranthaman

... Petitioners

vs.

Mani

... Respondent

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to allow the above Civil Revision Petition by setting aside the Fair and Decretal Order dated 29.08.2025 passed in I.A.No.02 of 2023 in O.S.No.37 of 2023 on the file of District Munsif Court, Arakkonam, Ranipet District.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Sriram
for M/s.K.Govi Ganesan



C.R.P.No.5861 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the District Munsif Court, Arakkonam, Ranipet District in I.A.No.02 of 2023 in O.S.No.37 of 2023, dated 29.08.2025 dismissing the application filed by the petitioners/defendants seeking to implead the Revenue Officials in a suit for permanent injunction filed by the respondent/plaintiff.

2. It is not in dispute that the respondent/plaintiff filed a suit for permanent injunction against the petitioners/defendants. The relief of injunction is a personal in nature and in such suit, the plaintiff is *dominus litis*. The petitioners filed impleading application seeking to implead the Revenue Officials as party defendants in the suit and the same was dismissed by the Trial Court. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioners have come before this Court.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that in 1960 SLR, the suit property was classified as 'Grama Natham' and subsequently, it was classified as property of Panchayat Union and therefore, Revenue Officials shall be impleaded in the present suit.



C.R.P.No.5861 of 2025


4. The respondent filed a suit for permanent injunction, which is personal relief. It is settled law that the plaintiff is a *dominus litis* in a suit for injunction and defendants cannot dictate to the plaintiff with regard to the person with whom, he want to fight. In a suit for injunction, the plaintiff has to prove his lawful possession and succeed. The petitioners are entitled to lead evidence and argue that the plaintiff was not in possession of suit property.

5. In this circumstances, the presence of the Revenue Officials is not at all necessary. If the petitioners want, they can follow the procedure under Rule 76 of Civil Rules of Practice and get the copies of the relevant revenue records and mark it on their behalf before the Trial Court.

6. With this clarification, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected civil miscellaneous petition is closed.

26.11.2025

Index : Yes / No
Speaking order : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
dm



C.R.P.No.5861 of 2025

To

WEB COPY
The District Munsif Court,
Arakkonam, Ranipet District.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5861 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

dm

C.R.P.No.5861 of 2025

26.11.2025