



C.R.P.No.98 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 18.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.98 of 2026
and C.M.P.No.354 of 2026

1.Dhanam

2.N.Kumar

3.N.Palanisamy

4.N.Balu

... Petitioners

vs.

1.Santhi

2.S.Indirani

3.The District Revenue Officer/
Land Acquisition Officer,
Salem, Salem District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the Document Order dated 25.09.2025 in I.A.No.4 of 2025 in L.A.O.P.No.165 of 2019 on the file of Principal District Judge, Salem.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Kalaikovan

For R3 : Mr.N.Muthuvel
Government Advocate (CS)



C.R.P.No.98 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Principal District Judge, Salem in I.A.No.4 of 2025 in L.A.O.P.No.165 of 2019, dated 25.09.2025 allowing the application filed by the respondents 1 and 2 seeking to produce certain revenue documents in support of their claim.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the impugned order has been passed without issuing notice to the petitioners, who are also claimants and therefore, the same is liable to be set aside.

3. A perusal of the certified copy of the petition and order in I.A.No.4 of 2025 would indicate the copy of the petition was served on the counsel for the petitioners and after taking notice, they marked their objection. Therefore, the submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the impugned order has been passed without issuing notice to the petitioners is not acceptable. Further, by impugned order, the revenue documents filed by the respondents 1 and 2 were ordered to be received subject to proof and relevancy.



C.R.P.No.98 of 2026

4. When the document is received subject to the proof and relevancy, the petitioners are entitled to raise their objection regarding proof and relevancy at the time of marking. Even then, the document can be admitted in evidence subject to proof, relevancy, unless it is *per se* inadmissible. The question of proof and relevancy can be considered at the time of final disposal. Therefore, the I do not think the impugned order will cause any prejudice to the petitioners.

5. Therefore, the Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected civil miscellaneous petition is closed.

18.02.2026

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

To

1.The Principal District Judge,
Salem.

.The District Revenue Officer/
Land Acquisition Officer,
Salem, Salem District.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.98 of 2026

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

dm

C.R.P.No.98 of 2026

18.02.2026