WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE GK.MUTHUKUMAAR

OSA No. 195 of 2026
CNR:{HCMA012481902026}

Case QR

AND

OSA NO. 197 OF 2026,
CMP NO. 28954 OF 2026, CMP NO. 29124 OF 2026

1. Vellachi Murugappan

2. Tarun Natarajan
   Rep by his Power Agent
   Vellachi Murugappan

3. Samyukta Natarajan
   Rep by her Power Agent
   Vellachi Murugappan

..Appellant(s)

Vs

1. M.V. Murugappan Hindu Undivided Joint Family
   Rep by its erstwhile Karta
   Valli Arunachalam,
   New.No.8/1, Boat Club Road,
   R.A.Puram, Chennai-600028.

2. Valli Arunachalam

3. Arunachalam Shanmugam
   (also known as A. Shanmugam)

4. Minor. Sahana Valli Arunachalam
   Rep. by her father and natural
   guardian Arunachalam Shanmugam

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

5. Minor. Aakash Annaamalai Arunachalam
   Rep. by her father and natural
   guardian Arunachalam Shanmugam

..Respondent(s)

Case QR

OSA No. 197 of 2026

CNR:{HCMA012517682026}

1. Valli Arunachalam

2. Arunachalam Shanmugam
   (also known as A. Shanmugam)

3. Minor Sahana Valli Arunachalam
   represented by her father and natural guardian
   Arunachalam Shanmugam

4. Minor Aakash Annaamalai Arunachalam
   represented by his father and natural guardian
   Arunachalam Shanmugam

..Appellant(s)

Vs

1. Vellachi Murugappan

2. Tarun Natarajan
   Represented by his Power Agent
   Vellachi Murugappan

3. Samyukta Natarajan
   Represented by her Power Agent

4. M. V. Murugappan Hindu Undivided Joint
   Family
   Represented by its erstwhile Karta
   Valli Arunachalam

..Respondent(s)

OSA No. 195 of 2026

Original Side Appeal filed under Order XXXVI Rule 9 of the Original Side Rules r/w. Clause 15 of the Letters Patent to set aside the portion of the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

order dated 30.09.2026 passed in O.A.No.1191 of 2025 in C.S.No.307 of 2025 insofar as it permits payment of statutory liabilities, tax obligations, professional charges, salaries, maintenance expenses and other legitimate family or other estate related expenditure without prior safeguard and consequently allow the O.A.No.1195 of 2025 in C.S.No.307 of 2025 as prayed for.

OSA No. 197 of 2026

Original Side Appeal filed under Order XXXVI Rule 9 of the Original Side Rules r/w. Clause 15 of the Letters Patent to set aside and quash paragraph 13 of the fair and decretal order dated 30.09.2026 made in O.A.No.1191 of 2025 in C.S.No.307 of 2025 on the file of the Hon'ble Madras High Court, insofar as it directs the appellant No.1/respondent No.2, to furnish to the respondent Nos.1 to 3 a statement setting out the respondent No.4/ respondent no.1 HUF assets and liabilities as on date of the order, together with available bank statements, investment statements and particulars of the maternal transactions relating to the respondent No.4 HUF from the date on which the appellant No.1/respondent No.2 assumed the office of Karta, and thereby allow the original side appeal.

OSA No. 195 of 2026

For Appellant(s): Mr.T.Saikrishnan

For Respondent(s): Mr.V.Raghavachari
Senior Counsel
for Mr.Thriyambak J. Kannan
for R2

Mr.K.V.Babu
for Mr.Thriyambak J. Kannan
for R3 to R5

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

OSA No. 197 of 2026

For Appellant(s): Mr.V.Raghavachari
Senior Counsel and
Mr.K.V.Babu
for Mr.Thriyambak J. Kannan

For Respondent(s): Mr.T.Saikrishnan
for R1 to R3

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by N.Sathish Kumar J.)

Challenging the order of the learned Single Judge of this Court made in O.A.No.1191 of 2025 in C.S.No.307 of 2025, dated 30.09.2026, insofar as it permits payment of statutory liabilities, tax obligations, professional charges, salaries, maintenance expenses and other legitimate family or other estate related expenditure by the 2nd respondent therein/Valli Arunachalam, the Appeal in O.S.A.No.195 of 2026 has been filed by the applicants in O.A.No.1191 of 2025.

2.Challenging the directions in Para No.13 of the same order of the learned Single Judge of this Court, directing the 2nd respondent therein/Valli Arunachalam to furnish a statement setting out the HUF assets and liabilities along with bank statements, investment statements and particulars of material transactions relating to the HUF, to the applicants in O.A.No.1191 of 2025, the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Appeal in O.S.A.No.197 of 2026 has been filed by the 2nd respondent therein.

3.For the sake of convenience, the parties will be referred to as per their ranking in the application in O.A.No.1191 of 2025 before the learned Single Judge.

4.Originally, the suit in C.S.No.307 of 2025 has been filed by the applicants for partition of the suit schedule properties held by M.V.Murugappan Hindu Undivided Family (1st respondent) and to declare that each of the three plaintiffs are entitled to 1/6th share in the suit schedule properties and to allot their respective shares to each of the plaintiffs. The 1st plaintiff is the sister of the 2nd defendant. The plaintiffs 2 and 3 are the children of the 1st plaintiff. The defendants 3 to 5 belong to the branch of the 2nd defendant.

5.According to the plaintiffs, one M.V.Murugappan constituted a Hindu Undivided Family (1st defendant). The plaintiffs and the defendants formed part of the HUF constituted by M.V.Murugappan. The said M.V.Murugappan died on 21.02.2022 leaving behind a Will dated 17.12.2015 and a Codicil dated 10.04.2018. In terms of the Will, only a portion of self-acquired properties were partitioned between the beneficiaries, namely 1st plaintiff and 2nd defendant, and the remaining portion of properties remain unpartitioned. At the time of death of Murugappan, the HUF assets consisted of several securities in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the form of shares, mutual funds, bonds, etc. and Bank accounts. According to the plaintiffs, the 2nd defendant, being the karta of the 1st defendant HUF after the demise of M.V.Murugappan, has not shared the accounts to the plaintiffs. After various negotiations and amicable meetings, it appears that, finally a draft partition deed was given to the plaintiffs. Accordingly, the plaintiffs have filed the present suit for partition, which was valued at Rs.829,99,53,720/-.

6.In the said suit, the plaintiffs have taken out the present application in O.A.No.1191 of 2025 seeking an interim injunction restraining the 2nd defendant/2nd respondent therein or anyone claiming through her from in any manner dealing with the assets of the M.V.Murugappan HUF either by operating the accounts and funds as set out in the schedule thereunder and withdrawing, transferring and or in any other manner dealing with the moneys, shares, mutual funds, etc., lying in the accounts and investments as set out in the schedule thereunder, pending disposal of the suit.

7.It is the main contention of the applicants before the learned Single Judge that, after assuming the position of karta, the 2nd respondent has been exclusively administering the HUF assets and despite repeated requests, the complete statement of accounts have not been furnished to the applicants by the 2nd respondent.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

8.The respondents took a stand that they have no intention to deprive the applicants of their legitimate share in the HUF. They contended that the applicants have addressed various letters to the financial institutions for freezing of the HUF accounts, due to which, they are not able to conduct even the day-to-day administrative functions of the HUF. If a blanket injunction is granted as prayed for by the applicants, that would have serious consequences.

9.The learned Single Judge, considering the submissions made on both sides, by the impugned order dated 30.09.2026, while rejecting the prayer of the applicants for grant of blanket injunction, directed the 2nd respondent to continue the ordinary and *bona fide* administration of the M.V.Murugappan HUF, including payment of statutory dues, taxes, salaries, professional charges, maintenance expenses and other reasonable and necessary expenses incurred for preservation and administration of the HUF assets, directed that, pending disposal of the suit, the 2nd respondent shall not withdraw, transfer, appropriate, distribute or otherwise deal with the corpus of the HUF assets for the purpose of making any distribution amongst the members or branches of the HUF, including any payment pursuant to or in furtherance of the disputed partition proposal dated 03.06.2024 without obtaining appropriate orders of this Court or written consent of all persons whose rights in the HUF are directed affected; and also directed the 2nd respondent to furnish to the applicants a statement

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

setting out the HUF assets and liabilities as on the date of the order, together with available Bank statements, investment statements and particulars of the material transactions relating to the HUF from the date on which the 2nd respondent assumed the office of kartha.

10.Challenging the portion of the order of the learned Single Judge permitting the 2nd respondent to continue payment of statutory liabilities, the applicants have filed O.S.A.No.197 of 2026. Challenging the order directing the 2nd respondent to furnish the statement of accounts, the 2nd respondent has filed O.S.A.No.195 of 2026.

11.Mr.V.Raghavachari, learned Senior Counsel and Mr.K.V.Babu, learned counsel appearing for the appellants in O.S.A.No.197 of 2026/2nd respondent in the application, would submit that, as per the suit, the applicants/plaintiffs claimed their share of Rs.829 Crores and odd. The respondents are ready to deposit the entire amount in Court. According to them, as the Kartha of the HUF, they had incurred certain expenses, including legal expenses, professional fees to the auditor and other experts, etc., to the tune of Rs.100 Crores. The said amount is disputed by the applicants. Even excluding the said amount, they are ready to deposit the remaining equal share to the credit of the suit. Alternatively, they are ready to directly pay the amount to the plaintiffs also. Therefore, the learned Senior Counsel would submit that the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

direction to produce the accounts cannot be sustained.

12.Mr.T.Saikrishnan, learned counsel appearing for the appellants in O.S.A.No.195 of 2026/applicants therein, would submit that the applicants dispute the sum of Rs.100 Crores said to have been spent by the 2nd respondent towards professional fees, etc. Therefore, they are in disagreement with the proposed partition proposal mooted out by the 2nd respondent involving the disputed amount of Rs.100 Crores. Hence, if the 2nd respondent/karta is allowed to operate the HUF accounts further, it may lead to further complications.

13.When the matter came before this Court on 16.10.2026, we directed the respondents to file a statement of accounts on the next date of hearing and the matter was adjourned to 28.10.2026. Pursuant to the same, the respondents have now produced the statement of accounts before this Court. A copy of the statement of accounts was also furnished to the applicants.

14.The primary contention raised by the applicants, namely, the plaintiffs, is that the respondents are stated to have spent certain amounts towards professional fees, etc., and that such disputed amount comes to around Rs.100 Crores, and hence, the same cannot be deducted. Therefore, they raised an objection to the settlement. In this regard, when we also enquired the learned counsel for the applicants as to whether they were willing to receive their share

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

excluding the disputed amount, an adjournment was sought on 28.10.2026 and accordingly, the matter was adjourned to 12.11.2026. On 12.11.2026, again, an adjournment was sought and therefore, it was made clear that the matter would be adjourned for orders to 18.11.2026 (today).

15.Even today, Mr.V.Raghavachari, learned Senior Counsel, would submit that the respondents are ready to deposit the entire amount. They are prepared to deposit even the disputed amount of Rs.100 Crores in the Court and the said disputed amount of Rs.100 Crores will be decided on the basis of evidence.

16.In the light of the above submissions, the only point that arise for consideration in these appeals is whether the order of the learned Single Judge is proper ?

17.We have perused the entire materials available on record.

18.The suit is merely between two sisters who are the daughters of one M.V.Murugappan. The 1st plaintiff, along with her children, plaintiffs 2 and 3, filed the suit claiming half share in the HUF constituted by M.V.Murugappan. The said suit has been filed on the basis of the draft partition proposal mooted by the respondents. The suit itself has been valued at Rs.829 Crores.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

19.When we directed the accounts to be produced, it was the contention of the respondents that, as per the HUF accounts, a sum of Rs.1749.88 Crores is available. The accounts also disclose that certain expenses, amounting to around Rs.100 Crores, have been incurred by the HUF towards professional fees to various experts in different fields.

20.From the submissions of Mr.Sai Krishnan, learned counsel appearing for the applicants, it is seen that the primary dispute appears to be with regard to the aforesaid expenses of around Rs.100 Crores said to have been incurred by the 2nd respondent. The learned counsel for the respondents, Mr.V.Raghavachari, submitted that the respondents are ready to deposit the half share of the plaintiff which arrives at Rs.874.94 Crores and also the disputed sum of Rs.100 Crores in the Court.

21.Though the suit claim itself is Rs.829 Crores, we are of the view that if the half share amounting to Rs.874.94 Crores and also the disputed sum of Rs.100 Crores amount is deposited to the credit of the suit, the rights of the applicants/plaintiffs will be substantially secured. The only dispute appears to be with regard to the expenses incurred by the respondents towards professional fees to the tune of Rs.100 Crores. The respondents are also ready to deposit the disputed amount before this Court. The learned Senior Counsel submits that the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

actual expenses and the veracity of the documents relating to such expenses shall be decided on the basis of evidence in the suit. We are of the view that such submissions have some force.

22.Since the main grievance of the plaintiffs/applicants appears to be only with regard to the expenses of Rs.100 Crores said to have been incurred by the 2nd respondent towards professional fees or other expenses towards various experts, if the rights of the plaintiffs/applicants are secured by directing the 2nd respondent to deposit the half share of the plaintiff along with the disputed amount of Rs.100 Crores, the rights of the applicants/plaintiffs will be preserved and the remaining issues can be decided in the suit itself, as the entire amount is deposited before the Court.

23.In such view of the matter, we direct the respondents in the application/appellants in O.S.A. No.197 of 2026 to deposit a sum of Rs.874.94 Crores, i.e., 50% of the amount available in the HUF, to the credit of the suit, besides Rs.100 Crores towards the so-called expenses claimed by them towards professional fees and other expenses towards various experts, totally amounting to Rs.974.94 Crores to the credit of the suit in C.S.No.307 of 2025 within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. On such deposit being made, the amount shall be kept in a nationalised bank in an interest bearing deposit by the Registry of this Court. It is made clear that it is

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

open to the applicants/plaintiffs to seek withdrawal of the amount towards their share by filing appropriate application before the learned Single Judge.

24.Since the entire issue appears to be only an ego fight between the sisters, viz., the 1st plaintiff and the 2nd respondent, we are of the view that the matter can be given a quietus, if the parties are really interested in resolving the dispute by arriving at an amicable settlement.

25.Since the only dispute, as we understand from the submissions of the learned counsel for the applicants, is with regard to the expenses said to have been incurred by the respondents towards certain professional fees and other expenses and now that, the rights of the applicants/plaintiffs are almost secured, as we have directed the respondents to deposit the entire half share as well as the disputed amount before this Court and a copy of the accounts have also been furnished to the applicants before this Court, there is no necessity for any further direction to produce the accounts. Further, it is relevant to note that the learned Single Judge ought not to have directed the production of accounts. The application is only for a blanket injunction. In such an application, directing the production of accounts is beyond the scope of the application.

26.However, with regard to any amount which has not been appropriated and which is not within the knowledge of the plaintiffs, the plaintiffs can very

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

well seek further accounts in respect of their share by issuing an appropriate notice or seeking production of accounts in accordance with law.

27.Even in the grounds raised by the applicants in their Appeal, their main grievance is only with regard to the so-called professional expenses, as pleaded in Paragraph No.14 of the memorandum of grounds of Appeal. When the disputed amount as well as half share is now directed to be deposited before this Court, there cannot be any further injunction restraining the respondents in the application/appellants in O.S.A.No.197 of 2026 from dealing with the accounts of the HUF. Since half of the available amount in the HUF, representing their equal share, is already directed to be deposited, the appellants in O.S.A.No.197 of 2026 are certainly entitled to deal with their share in any manner they deem fit and therefore, there cannot be any injunction.

28.With the above directions, these Original Side Appeals are disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

(N.S.K.,J.) (G.K.M.,J.)
18-11-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MKN

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

N.SATHISH KUMAR J.
AND
GK.MUTHUKUMAAR J.

MKN

OSA No. 195 of 2026
AND
OSA NO. 197 OF 2026

18-11-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis