CHENNAI MEENAKSHI MULTISPECIALITY HOSPITAL
Care that inspires

CMMH/BSE/2026-27/63 November 13, 2026

To,
The Department of Corporate Services
BSE Limited,
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers,
Dalal Street,
Mumbai - 400 001.

Scrip Code: 523489

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Disclosure under Regulation 30 of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 - Update on Legal Proceedings / Litigation.

Pursuant to Regulation 30 read with Schedule III of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, we wish to inform you that an order dated November 10, 2026, has been passed by the Hon'ble XII Judge, Court of Small Causes, Chennai, in M.P. No. 1 of 2026 in RLTOP No. 130 of 2026, filed against the Company by one of the co-owners of the leased premises.

The details required under Regulation 30 of the SEBI Listing Regulations read along with the SEBI Master Circular are enclosed herewith as Annexure I.

A copy of the order dated November 10, 2026, passed by the Hon'ble XII Court of Small Causes, Chennai, is enclosed herewith as Annexure II.

Kindly take the above information on record.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,
For Chennai Meenakshi Multispecialty Hospital Limited

M.S. Ananthalakshmi
Digitally signed by M.S. Ananthalakshmi
Date: 2026.11.13 22:15:24 +05'30'

M.S. Anantha Lakshmi
Company Secretary & Compliance Officer
Membership No.: A46694

Annexure I

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details / Information
1.	Name of the authority	Hon'ble XII Court of Small Causes, Chennai
2.	Nature and details of the action(s) taken, initiated, or order(s) passed	The Hon'ble Court passed an order on November 10, 2026, allowing M.P. No. 1 of 2026 (Impleading Petition) filed under Order 1 Rule 10(2) read with Section 151 of CPC in RLTOP No. 130 of 2026, which was filed seeking Dispossession against the Company from a Portion of Hospital Premises being run by the said Company, under the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Rights and Responsibilities of Landlords and Tenants Act, 2017, on the ground of Lack of Written Agreement. The main Petition seeking Dispossession is at a very preliminary stage (Pre-Trial stage). One of the Co-owners (Dr. G. Ra. Gokul) alone had originally instituted the Main Petition seeking Dispossession, against the Company. Subsequently the said Co-owner had filed an Interim Application bearing I.A. No.1 of 2026 in RLTOP No.130 of 2026, seeking to Implead the other Co-owners as Respondents in the said Main Petition. Consequently, the Hon'ble Court had passed an Order Impleading the remaining Co-owners/Legal Heirs of the Late Lessor (Mr. A.N. Radhakrishnan), namely, (i) Mrs. R. Gomathi, (ii) Mrs. Jayanthi Radhakrishnan, (iii) Mr. R. Rakesh, (iv) Dr. Gautam Srinivas, and (v) Dr. Aravind Srinivas as Respondent Nos. 2 to 6 in the above main Petition.
3.	Date of receipt of direction or order, including any ad-interim or interim orders, or any other communication from the authority	November 12, 2026 (Order uploaded on the Court records)
4.	Details of the violation(s) / contravention(s) committed or alleged to be committed	Not Applicable (This is a procedural order on an interlocutory application for implement in a landlord-tenant dispute).
5.	Impact on financial, operation, or other activities of the listed entity, quantifiable in monetary terms to the extent possible	The proceedings involve an interlocutory application to bring all co-owners on record in a pending eviction petition concerning the lease premises. There is no immediate quantifiable adverse financial impact on the operations of the company at this stage.

IN THE XII COURT OF SMALL CAUSES, CHENNAI
PRESENT: Mrs.P. Nithya, B.A., L.L.M.,
XII JUDGE,
COURT OF SMALL CAUSES,
CHENNAI -104.

Tuesday the 10th day of November 2026

M.P. No.1 of 2026
in
RLTOP.No.130 of 2026

Dr. Gokul G. Ra.
S/o. Late Mr. A.N. Radhakrishnan,
No. 70, Shanmugam Salai,
K.K. Nagar, Chennai 600 078. ..Petitioner/Applicant

.Vs.

1. M/s. Chennai Meenakshi Multispecialty Hospital Ltd.
Represented by its Managing Director,
Old No. 149, New No. 70,
Luz Church Road, Mylapore. ..Respondent/Respondent

2. R. Gomathi,
No. 931, 69th Street,
11th Sector, K.K. Nagar,
Chennai 600 078.

3. Jayanthi Radhakrishnan,
No. 931, 69th Street,
11th Sector, K.K. Nagar,
Chennai-600 078.

4. R.Rakesh,
957, Lakshmanasamy Salai,
Kalaingnar Karunanithi Nagar,
Chennai-600 078.

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:10:52 -0500

5. Gautam Srinivas,
C1, 8/7, 54th Street,
Ashok Nagar, Chennai-600 083.

6. Aravind Srinivas,
C1, 8/7, 54th Street, Ashok Nagar,
Chennai 600 083. ..Proposed Respondents

This petition came up for final hearing before me, in the presence of M/s.Adithya Varadarajan, R.Deepak, C.S.Jeeva Kuralamudhu and P.Devi Sai Monica, Counsels for the Petitioner/Applicant and M/s.Tatva Legal Chennai, Santosh Ukkur, R.Venkat Raman, D.Senthil Kumar, S.K.Harinarayanan, Sachin Menon, R.Kameshwaran, V.G.Kaarthik Balaji and Sasha Alfred Murray, Counsels for the Respondent/Respondent upon hearing the arguments of both sides and on perusing of the records and having stood over for consideration till this date, this court doth delivers the following:

ORDER

This petition is filed under Order 1 Rule 10(2) r/w Section 151 of CPC to implead the proposed respondents 2 to 6 in RLTOP No.130 of 2026.

1. The case of the Petitioner in brief:

1.1. It is submitted that the above R.L.T.O.P. has been filed under Section 21(2)(a) of the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Rights and Responsibilities of Landlords and Tenants Act, 2017, seeking eviction of the Respondent/Tenant on the ground of expiry of lease by efflux of time and unauthorized occupation thereafter.

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:11:04 -0500

1.2. It is submitted that the petition schedule premises originally belonged to the Petitioner's father, Late Mr. A.N. Radhakrishnan, who passed away on 03.12.2022, leaving behind the Applicant and the proposed Respondents as his legal heirs and co-owners/landlords. It is further submitted that the Applicant is entitled to an undivided 1/5th share in the petition schedule premises and the proposed Respondents hold the remaining shares.

1.3. It is further submitted that all the legal heirs jointly created the tenancy in favour of the Respondent vide Lease Deed dated 24.03.2025, commencing from 01.12.2024 for a fixed term of 11 months, expiring on 30.10.2025, at a monthly rent of Rs.5,50,000/- (excluding taxes), payable on or before the 7th day of every succeeding month to all the co-owners in their respective shares.

1.4. It is further submitted that the Lease Deed contained no provision for automatic renewal and required mutual consent for every further renewal of 11 months. Accordingly, the lease expired on 30.10.2025 without renewal, and the Respondent's continued occupation thereafter is unauthorized. It is further submitted that the proposed Respondents, being the other legal heirs and co-lessors, are necessary and proper parties for the effective and complete adjudication of the present proceedings.

1.5. It is submitted that the impleadment of the other co-owners/legal heirs is essential to avoid multiplicity of proceedings and to ensure that the order passed by this Hon'ble Court binds all parties interested in the petition schedule property.

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:11:11 -0500

1.6. It is therefore submitted that the proposed Respondents, namely (i) R. Gomathi, (ii) Jayanthi Radhakrishnan, (iii) R. Rakesh, (iv) Gautam Srinivas and (v) Aravind Srinivas, being the other legal heirs and co-owners of the petition schedule premises, may be impleaded as party Respondents in the above R.L.T.O.P.

1.7. It is submitted that no prejudice would be caused to the Respondent by the proposed impleadment, whereas serious prejudice would be caused to the Applicant if the necessary parties are not impleaded. It is further submitted that this application is filed bona fide and in the interest of justice. Hence this petition.

2. The case of the counter of 1st respondent in brief:

2.1. The 1st respondent Company is represented by its Authorized Signatory, who is acquainted with the facts of the case. The present counter affidavit is filed in response to the application under Order 1 Rule 10(2) CPC, 1908, seeking to implead (i) Mrs. R. Gomathi, (ii) Mrs. Jayanthi Radha Krishnan, (iii) Mr. R. Rakesh, (iv) Mr. Gautam Srinivas and (v) Mr. Aravind Srinivas as Respondents 2 to 6 in R.L.T.O.P. No.130 of 2026, filed under Section 21(2)(a) of the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Rights and Responsibilities of Landlords and Tenants Act, 2017, pending before this court.

2.2. At the outset, it is submitted that all allegations in the present application are denied, except those specifically admitted herein. It is further submitted that the present application discloses no valid grounds or compelling reasons for impleading

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:11:18 -0500

the proposed Respondents, but merely reiterates the averments of the main petition. Hence, the application is liable to be dismissed.

2.3. Without prejudice to the foregoing, it is submitted that the 1st Respondent Company reserves its right to respond to and rebut the allegations in Paragraph Nos. 3 to 5 of the present application in its Counter Statement to be filed in the main petition, as the same are mere repetitions of the averments already made therein. It is submitted that the petitioner has failed to explain why the proposed Respondents were not impleaded at the time of filing the main petition. Had there been any intention on their part to dispossess the 1st respondent, they would have been impleaded at the outset itself.

2.4. It is further submitted that the petitioner's contention that the proposed Respondents are necessary to avoid multiplicity of proceedings is untenable. Further, the present petition is not maintainable, as none of the respondents intends to initiate proceedings of the present nature. The proposed respondents' failure to join the Petitioner in initiating the present proceedings indicates their unwillingness to pursue the same and cannot be a ground for their impleadment. Without prejudice to the above, the present application is incomplete for want of impleading all the co-owners.

3. The case of the proposed respondents 2 & 3 counter in brief:

3.1. It is submitted that the proposed 2nd and 3rd respondents have filed a counter stating that the 2nd proposed respondent is well acquainted with the facts of the case.

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:11:39 -0500

The 2nd proposed respondent is well acquainted with the facts of the case and has filed the counter on behalf of himself and the 3rd proposed respondent. It is submitted that Late Mr. A.N. Radhakrishnan was the owner of the petition schedule property and that, after his demise, his legal heirs succeeded to the property as co-owners. The lease deed dated 24.03.2025 was jointly executed by all the legal heirs in favour of the 1st respondent. There is no unanimity among the co-owners regarding the eviction proceedings and that the petitioner has instituted the R.L.T.O.P. based on his individual decision without obtaining the consent or authority of these respondents.

3.2. It is submitted that 2nd and 3rd respondents have neither authorised the petitioner to initiate eviction proceedings on their behalf nor consented to the relief sought in the R.L.T.O.P. The petitioner cannot represent his individual stand as that of all the co-owners and that the correspondence relied upon by him reflects only his personal intention and is not binding on 2nd and 3rd respondents. The petitioner impleaded 2nd and 3rd only after instituting the eviction proceedings to overcome the objection regarding maintainability and to create an impression that all co- landlords support the eviction, which is incorrect. It is further submitted that 2nd and 3rd respondents do not support the eviction of the tenant and reserve their independent rights as co-owners and landlords to place their stand before this Court.

3.3. It is submitted that 2nd and 3rd respondents must be heard independently before any decision affecting their proprietary rights is made. The impleading application

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:11:52 -0500

does not signify the respondents' support for the petitioner's claim and that their impleadment, if allowed, is only to enable them to present their independent case before this court. It is submitted that 2nd and 3rd respondents reserve their right to file a detailed counter in the main R.L.T.O.P., opposing the relief sought by the petitioner and raising all available legal and factual objections. It is submitted that no order in the proceedings shall prejudice the independent proprietary rights of 2nd and 3rd respondents or their impleadment be construed as consent to or ratification of the petitioner's actions.

4. **Point for consideration:**

(i) Whether this present petition can be allowed?

5. Discussion and Decision:

5.1. Heard. Submissions considered.

5.2. The petitioner who is one of the co-owner of the petition premises has sought permission of this court to implead the other co-owners, i.e., R2 to R6 as proposed respondents in RLTOP No.130/2026 to avoid multiplicity of proceedings and to effectively adjudicate RLTOP No.130/2026.

5.3. The proposed respondents R4 to R6 has filed a memo stating that they do not have objection in allowing MP 1/2026. However R1 to R3 have filed their counter expressing their objections.

NITHYA P

Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:12:32 -0500

5.4. The 1st respondent who is a respondent/tenant in the RLTOP 130/2026 has contended that no proper reasons were stated by the petitioner as to why the 2nd to 6th respondents must be impleaded in the RLTOP. The 1st respondent also concluded that the 2nd to 6th respondents ought to have impleaded as parties at the time of institution itself. It was further contended that non joining of the co-owners as parties in RLTOP at the time of initiation of the RLTOP signals their protest for filing of RLTOP and prayed for dismissal of this miscellaneous petition.

5.5. The respondents No.2 and 3 have stated that the RLTOP has been filed without their consent and the knowledge. It was further contended that the petitioner portrayed as if all the co-owners consented to the filing of RLTOP only to withstand the test of maintainability at the stage of filing. It was further contended that R2 and R3 do not consent to the eviction of the 1st respondent from the petition premises and prayed for dismissal of the petition.

5.6. Now, admittedly, the petition premises jointly belong to the petitioner and the 2nd to 6th respondents herein and that they are co-owners of the same. The petitioner, one of the co-owners filed RLTOP 130/2016 seeking eviction of the 1st respondent without impleading the co-owners R2 to R6 and now seeks permission of this court to implead them. The question to be answered is whether the co-owner can files a

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:12:40 -0500

RLTOP without impleading the other co-owners, if so whether the it is necessary to implead R2 to R6.

5.7. It is settled principle of law that every co-owner owns every piece and every bit of the joint property along with other co-owners. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Mohinder Prasad Jain Vs. Manohar Lal Jain, reported in 2006 (2) SCC 724*** has held as follows;

> *"A suit filed by a co-owner, thus, is maintainable in law. It is not necessary for the co- owner to show before initiating the eviction proceeding before the Rent Controller that he had taken option or consent of the other co-owners. However, in the event, a co-owner objects thereto, the same may be a relevant fact. In the instant case, nothing has been brought on record to show that the co-owners of the respondent had objected to eviction proceedings initiated by the respondent herein. The submission of the learned counsel for the appellant to the effect that before initiating the proceedings, the appellant was required to show that he had experience in running the business in Ayurvedic medicine, has to be stated to be rejected. There is no law which provides for such a pre-condition. It may be so where a licence is required for running a business, a statute may prescribe certain qualifications or pre-conditions without fulfilment whereof the landlord may not be able to start a business, but for running a wholesale business in Ayurvedic medicine, no qualification is prescribed. Experience in the business is not a pre-condition under any statute. Even no experience therefor may be necessary. If the respondent has proved his bona fide requirement to evict the appellant herein for his own purpose, this Court may not, unless an appropriate case is made out, disturb the finding of fact arrived at by the Appellate Authority and affirmed by the High Court ".*

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:12:48 -0500

5.8. By applying the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India as extracted above to the facts of the present case, this court finds that there is no fault on the fact of the petitioner in filing the RLTOP without impleading the other co-owners. The petitioner being one of the co-owner is empowered to file the RLTOP seeking eviction of the 1st respondent without impleading R2 to R6. However from the perusal of the counter of R2 and R3, this court finds that they have expressed that they have no intention to evict the 1st respondent from the petition premises whereas the respondents 4 to 6 have not objected to their impleadment in the RLTOP.

5.9. Although a co-owner need not implead all the other co-owners, if the other co-owners object to the initiation of eviction proceedings, it is just to implead them for effective disposal and to avoid multiplicity of proceedings. Therefore, considering the objection expressed by the 2nd and 3rd respondents and the no objection of R4 to R6 to be impleaded in the RLTOP, this court considers it fit and necessary for all the co-owners to be impleaded in the RLTOP as respondents.

Decision:

In the result, this petition is allowed. No costs.

Dictated by me to the Steno-typist, directly typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day of the 10th day of November 2026.

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:12:58 -0500

XII JUDGE
Court of Small Causes
Chennai

IN THE XII COURT OF SMALL CAUSES, CHENNAI
PRESENT: Mrs.P. Nithya, B.A., L.L.M.,
XII JUDGE,
COURT OF SMALL CAUSES,
CHENNAI -104.

Tuesday the 10th day of November 2026

M.P. No.1 of 2026
in
RLTOP.No.130 of 2026

Dr. Gokul G. Ra.
S/o. Late Mr. A.N. Radhakrishnan,
No. 70, Shanmugam Salai,
K.K. Nagar, Chennai 600 078. ..Petitioner/Applicant

.Vs.

1. M/s. Chennai Meenakshi Multispecialty Hospital Ltd.
Represented by its Managing Director,
Old No. 149, New No. 70,
Luz Church Road, Mylapore. ..Respondent/Respondent

2. R. Gomathi,
No. 931, 69th Street,
11th Sector, K.K. Nagar,
Chennai 600 078.

3. Jayanthi Radhakrishnan,
No. 931, 69th Street,
11th Sector, K.K. Nagar,
Chennai-600 078.

4. R.Rakesh,
957, Lakshmanasamy Salai,
Kalaingnar Karunanithi Nagar,
Chennai-600 078.

5. Gautam Srinivas,
C1, 8/7, 54th Street,
Ashok Nagar, Chennai-600 083.

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:13:15 -0500

6. Aravind Srinivas,
C1, 8/7, 54th Street, Ashok Nagar,
Chennai 600 083. ..Proposed Respondents

This petition is filed under Order 1 Rule 10(2) r/w Section 151 of CPC to implead the proposed respondents 2 to 6 in RLTOP No.130 of 2026.

This petition came up for final hearing before me, in the presence of M/s.Adithya Varadarajan, R.Deepak, C.S.Jeeva Kuralamudhu and P.Devi Sai Monica, Counsels for the Petitioner/Applicant and M/s.Tatva Legal Chennai, Santosh Ukkur, R.Venkat Raman, D.Senthil Kumar, S.K.Harinarayanan, Sachin Menon, R.Kameshwaran, V.G.Kaarthik Balaji and Sasha Alfred Murray, Counsels for the Respondent/Respondent upon hearing the arguments of both sides and on perusing of the records and having stood over for consideration till this date, this court doth delivers the following:

DECREE

That the petition is allowed. No costs.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this the 10th day of November 2026.

NITHYA P
Digitally signed by NITHYA P
Date: 2026.11.10 16:13:28 -0500

XII JUDGE,
Court of Small Causes,
Chennai.