



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 17.02.2026

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

CRP(MD). No.434 of 2026 and
CMP(MD).No.1962 of 2026

Indira

... Petitioner

Vs

Jhaya Huxer

... Respondent

PRAYER :- Civil revision petition filed under article 227 of the constitution of india to set aside the fair and decreetal order in I.A.No. 4/2022 in OS No. 221/2019 dated 17.10.2025 passed by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thirupuvanam and allow this Revision Petition and pass such further or other orders as this Honourable court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and thus render justice.

For Petitioner : M/s.M.Gurudas

For Respondent : Ms.S.Ananthi
for Mr.F.X. Eugene

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed against the fair and decreetal order passed in I.A. No.4 of 2022 in O.S. No.221 of 2019, dated 17.10.2025, by



the learned District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Thirupuvanam, whereby the application filed by the revision petitioner was dismissed.

2. Mr.M.Gurudas, the learned counsel appearing for the revision petitioner contended that the signatures found in the document of the year 1960 are disputed. The document contains the signatures of one Oorkavalan and Kaliasammal. According to the revision petitioner, there are several persons in the same village bearing identical names, and therefore, the signatures found in the document cannot be conclusively attributed to the persons concerned. On that basis, the petitioner sought comparison of the disputed signatures. He further submitted that the trial Court dismissed the application on the ground that the disputed document is only a Xerox copy. The trial Court further observed that in the absence of the original document and without any contemporaneous admitted signatures for comparison, the request for comparison of signatures cannot be entertained and prays for allowing this civil revision petition.

3. Ms. S. Ananthi, learned counsel appearing for the respondent, submitted that the said application was filed without proper basis. She further submitted that the document is only a Xerox copy and that the revision petitioner has not even established the identity of the persons whose signatures are alleged to have been forged. Therefore, the trial Court rightly dismissed the application.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the



materials available on record.

WEB COPY

5. The only point for consideration is whether, when a plea of forgery is raised, the Court below is bound to order comparison of signatures. In the present case, admittedly, the disputed document is of the year 1960 and is only a Xerox copy. The contention of the revision petitioner is merely that the names found in the document are common and that several persons in the village bear such names. In the absence of the original document and any admitted contemporaneous signatures for comparison, this Court is of the view that the order of dismissal passed by the trial Court does not warrant interference.

6. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

17.02.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet: Yes / No
trp

To

District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thirupuvanam

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.



WEB COPY



Trp

CRP(MD). No.434 of 2026 and
CMP(MD).No.1962 of 2026

17.02.2026