



CRP(MD). No.3181 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 07.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

C.R.P(MD). No.3181 of 2025

Vincent Jeyakumar

... Petitioner

Vs

1.V.O.C. Matriculation School,
Educational Institute, (Reg. No.24/2004)
Represented by its Secretary/Correspondent
Namely M.S.Sundaresan.

2.Guru Subramanian

3.V.M.Muthuramalingam

4.M.S.Radhakrishnan

5.M.Govindaraja

6.A.Irulappan

7.T.V.Muniyandi


8.R.Boominathan

9.S.Ramadoss

10.S.M.Savarimuthupillai

11.K.C.Selvakumar

1/8



CRP(MD). No.3181 of 2025

WEB COPY

12.M.Saravanan

13.K.Loganathamurugan

14.M.Balasundaram

15.B.Thayalan

16.The District Registrar (Administration),
District Registrar Office,
Thirupathur Town,
Sivagangai Town,
Sivagangai District..

... Respondents

PRAYER:- Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to allow the Civil Revision Petition by setting aside the fair and Decretal order passed in IA No.1 of 2023 in OS No.51 of 2019, on the file of the Sub Court, Paramakudi dated 28.03.2025.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Niranjana S.Kumar
for Mr.S.Kishore Kumar

For R1 : Mr.C.Jeganathan

For R2,R3,R4,R8,
R10,R11,R12 : No appearance

For R16 : Mr.F.Deepak
Special Government Pleader



CRP(MD). No.3181 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY The present Civil Revision Petition has been filed to set aside the fair and decreetal order passed in I.A.No.1 of 2023 in O.S.No.51 of 2019 on the file of the Sub Court, Paramakudi, dated 28.03.2025.

2. The sum and substance of the arguments advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner is that the trial Court, by order dated 28.03.2025 passed in I.A.No.1 of 2023 in O.S.No. 51 of 2019, allowed the impleading of certain proposed respondents and recorded a finding that no prejudice would be caused to the respondents by such impleadment.

3. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the first respondent, who is the contesting respondent, contended that this Court, by order dated 20.06.2023 passed in W.P.(MD) No.24061 of 2019, had formulated the issues and directed the trial Court to allow the interlocutory applications filed by the plaintiff.

4. The relevant findings of the learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.(MD) No.24061 of 2019, dated 20.06.2023, read as follows:




WEB COPY

11. I do not enter into the merits of the matter for two reasons. (a) Allegations of fraud have been made and they can be gone into only in a full-fledged trial. (b) Any decision will have a bearing on the status of the persons said to have been inducted on 09.01.2019. Therefore, the plaintiff in the said suit is permitted to file an application for impleading the newly added members in a representative capacity. He is also permitted to seek the relief of declaration that induction of new members is null and void. If such interlocutory applications are filed, they shall be allowed by the Trial Court.

12. The trial Court is also directed to frame additional issues after the interlocutory applications are filed and allowed. The questions that have been thrown up for consideration are as follows:-

“(a) Whether induction of new members in the meeting held on 09.01.2019 is void when the notice published on 17.12.2018 does not contain an agenda for the same? (b) Whether Form VI and Form VII submitted on 20.01.2019 and approved on 08.02.2019 on the strength of the general body which included the newly added members is null and void? (c) Whether the minutes dated 16.12.2018 relied on by Guru Subramanian is forged? (d) The District Registrar passed an order on 07.12.2018 for conducting fresh election. Probably



CRP(MD). No.3181 of 2025

WEB COPY

pursuant thereto, Guru Subramanian caused publication on 17.12.2018 for electing new set of office bearers. When the order dated 07.12.2018 itself had been set aside by this Court in W.P.(MD)No.24706 of 2018, whether the election process itself is valid? (e) When the executive committee was elected on 24.04.2016 and its period would end only on 23.04.2019, whether such an election held before the expiry of the period is valid?"

5. The above judgment was challenged by the revision petitioner in W.A.(MD) No.1876 of 2023, and the Division Bench of this Court, by order dated 30.10.2023, held as follows:

since it is only in the form of suggestion and it is for the civil Court to independently frame the issues with reference to the disputed facts between the parties and conduct trial in the civil suit instituted in O.S.No.51 of 2019. Thus, the civil Court has to proceed with the suit uninfluenced by the observations made by the learned Single Judge in the order impugned dated 20.06.2023. It is for the parties to adjudicate the issues independently based on the documents and evidences as well as on merits.



CRP(MD). No.3181 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. The learned counsel for the respondent submits that the trial Court has independently framed the issues. However, the learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner refutes the said contention and submits that the issues framed by this Court in W.P.(MD) No.24061 of 2019 have been mechanically replicated by the trial Court.

7. Both the learned counsels have not placed before this Court the issues framed by the trial Court. Hence, both the counsels are directed to file the issues framed by the trial Court.

8. It is stated by the learned counsel for the first respondent that the present revision is confined only to the order of impleadment and not to the framing of issues.

9. Post the matter on 29.01.2026.

07.01.2026

Indu



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.3181 of 2025



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.3181 of 2025

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

Indu

CRP(MD). No.3181 of 2025

07.01.2026