

Chinnaiyan Vs Srinivasan

Chinnaiyan Vs Srinivasan

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1664075

Court : Chennai Orders

Decided On : Jun-29-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice S. Sounthar

Appeal No. : CMP(MD)/11949/2024

Appellant : Chinnaiyan

Respondent : Srinivasan

Judgement :

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT DATED:
29-06-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR Chinnaiyan
Petitioner(s) Vs 1.Srinivasan 2.Rajendran 3.The Tahsildar, Lalgudi,
Trichy. Respondent(s) For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Karthik For Respondent(s):
Mr.S.Vinayak (for R1 & R2) Mr.R.S.Sivakumar Government Advocate
(civil) (for R3) Prayer:Civil Miscellaneous Petition is filed under Section 5
of the Limitation Act, to condone the delay of 1055 days in filing the
above Civil Revision Petition.

Prayer in C.R.P(MD).No.SR53922 of 2024: To partly set aside the order

passed in I.A.No.01 of 2019 in O.S.No.171 of 2006 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Lalgudi and modify the order by giving liberty to the petitioner to file fresh suit.

ORDER

The petition is filed seeking to condone the delay of 1055 days in filing the revision petition. 2.In the affidavit filed in support of the condone delay petition, it is stated by the petitioner that due to his old age and hearing problem, he could not present the revision in time. It is further stated that due to COVID- pandemic situation, the petitioner could not file the papers in time. 3.It is seen from the typed set of papers that the impugned order was passed on 05.07.2019 well prior to the outbreak of COVID-pandemic. The petitioner received the certified copy of the impugned order as early as 21.08.2019 as seen from the typed set of papers. In such circumstances, reasoning given by the petitioner regarding outbreak of COVID is not acceptable to this Court merely because the petitioner is an aged person and has got hearing problem, he cannot take his own time to prefer revision. In the case on hand, there is a delay of of 1055 days in filing the revision. Apart from the inordinate delay, the reason given by the petitioner is very vague and the same cannot be treated as a sufficient cause within the meaning of Section 5 of the limitation Act. Hence, this Civil Miscellaneous Petition is dismissed. Consequently, the Civil Revision Petition is rejected at the SR stage itself. No costs. 29-06-2026
NCC : Yes/No Index : Yes/No Rmk

To 1.The District Munsif, Lalgudi. 2.The Section Officer, VR Section, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai. S. SOUNTHAR.J. Rmk 29.06.2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com