

KABR030018072007



**IN THE COURT OF THE II ADDITIONAL CIVIL JUDGE,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT, BENGALURU.**

PRESENT: **SRI.RAMESH K, B.B.M., LL.B.,**
 II Additional Civil Judge,
 Bengaluru Rural District,
 Bengaluru.

Dated this the 1st day of July , 2026

O.S.No.1802/2007 C/W O.S.No.1557/2008

CAUSE TITLE IN O.S.NO.1802/2007

PLAINTIFF: Chikkamallaiah Since
 Dead by His LR's

1(a) Sri. Venkatesh,
 S/o Chikkamallaiah,
 Aged about 40 years,

1(b) Sri. Marappa,
 S/o Chikkamallaiah,
 Aged about 40 years,

1(c) Sri. Murthy,
 S/o Chikkamallaiah,
 Aged about 38 years,

1(d) Sri. K.C. Nagaraja,
 S/o Chikkamallaiah,
 Aged about 35 years,

1(a) to 1(d) are R/at
Kamakshipura village,

Byatha Post, Hesaraghatta Hobli,
Bengaluru North Taluk.

(By Sri. R.K.M Advocate)

- Versus -

- DEFENDANTS:1.** Smt. Kaveramma,
W/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 50 years,
2. Sri. Ramesh,
S/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 25 years,
Both are R/at Ramadevanahalli Village,
Madure Hobli, Doddaballapura Taluk,
Bangalore Rural District.

(By Sri. V.R Advocate)

Date of institution of the suit : 06.10.2007

Nature of the suit : Injunction

Date of the commencement of
Recording of the evidence. : 28.08.2013

Date on which the judgment
Was pronounced : 01-07-2026

Total Duration. : Years Month days.

-18- -07- -26-

**II ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU.**

KABR030015982008

**CAUSE TITLE IN O.S.NO.1557/2008**

- PLAINTIFFS:**
1. Smt. Kaveramma,
W/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 60 years,
 2. Smt. Shivamma,
D/o late Hanumnthappa,
Aged about 32 years,
 3. Smt. Rajamma,
D/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 30 years,
 4. Smt. Lakshmamma,
D/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 30 years,
 5. Sri. H. Ramesha,
S/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 28 years,

The plaintiff No.1 to 5 are
R/at Kamakshipura Village,
Hesaraghattapura Hobli,
Bengaluru North (Addl.) Taluk,
Bangalore.

(By Sri. V.R Advocate)

- Versus -

- DEFENDANTS:** 1. Sri. Bolaiah,
Since dead by his LRs
- 1(a). Smt. Malamma,
W/o Late Bolaiah,
Aged about 62 years,
R/at Sunnaghatta Village,
Kundana Hobli,
Devanahalli Taluk,
- 1 (b) Smt. Aswathamma,
D/o late Balaiah,
W/o Seenappa,
Aged about 38 years,
R/at Shettarahalli Village,
Kundanahalli Hobli,
Devanahalli Taluk.
- 1(c) Smt. Manjula,
D/o late Balaiah,
W/o Seenappa,
Aged about 35 years,
R/at Yelahanka beedhi,
Devanahalli Town,
Bangalore Rural District.
- 1(d) Smt. Chikka Ramakka,
W/o Late Bolaiah,
Aged about 60 years,
R/at Sunnaghatta Village,
Kundana Hobli,
Devanahalli Taluk.
- 1(e) Smt. Annapoorna,
D/o Late Bolaiah,
Aged about 30 years,
R/at Chikkabommasandra,
Village, Yelahanka Hobli,
Bengaluru North Taluk.

1(f) Sri. Ananda,
S/o Late Bolaiah,
Aged about 28 years,
R/at Sunnaghatta Village,
Kundana Hobli,
Devanahalli Taluk.

1(g) Sri. Amaranarayana,
S/o late Bolaiah,
Aged about 26 years,
R/at Sunnaghatta Village,
Kundana Hobli,
Devanahalli Taluk.

2. Sri. Aswathappa,
S/o Late Narayanappa,
Aged about 62 years,

3. Sri. Mallanna,
S/o Late Narayanappa,
Aged about 58 years,

4. Sri. Narayanaswamy,
S/o Late Narayanappa,
Aged about 54 years,

5. Smt. Narayanamma,
D/o Late Naraynappa,
Aged about 56 years,

defendant No.2 to 5 are R/at
R/at Sunnaghatta Village,
Kundana Hobli,
Devanahalli Taluk.

6. Sri. Chikkamallaiiah,
Since dead by his LRs

6 (a) Sri. Venkatesh,
S/o Late Chikkamallaiiah,
Aged about 44 years,

6(b) Sri. Marappa,
S/o Late Chikkamallaiiah,
Aged about 40 years,

6(c) Sri. Murthy,
S/o Late Chikkamallaiiah,
Aged about 38 years,

6 (d) Sri. K.C. Nagaraja,
S/o Late Chikkamallaiiah,
Aged about 35 years,

Sl. No.6 (a) to(d) are R/at
Kamakshipura Village,
Hesaraghatta Hobli,
Bengaluru North Taluk.

7. Sri. Chikkayeliyappa,
S/o doddanjinappa,
Since dead by his LR's

7(a) Smt. Mallamma,
W/o Late Chikkayeliyappa,
Aged about 55 years,

7 (b) Sri. Siddagangappa,
S/o Late Chikkayeliyappa,
Aged about 38 years,
R/at Kamakshipura village
Hesaraghatta Hobli,
Bengaluru North Taluk.

(D-1 to 5 By Sri. J.C.K Advocate)

(D-6 By Sri. R.H. Advocate)

(D-7 are placed exparte)

Date of institution of the suit : 25.10.2008

Nature of the suit : Declaration by way of adverse possession & Injunction

Date of the commencement of
Recording of the evidence. : 10.08.2012

Date on which the judgment0 : 01-07-2026

Total Duration. : Years Month days.

-17- -07- -07-

**II ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU.**

**Common Judgment in O.S.No.1802/2007 and
O.S.No.1557/2008**

This O.S.No.1557/2008 is clubbed with
O.S.No.1802/2007 vide order dated 26.03.2022.

2. The O.S.No.1802/2007 is filed by plaintiff by name Chikkamallaiah Since dead by his LRs Venkatesh and others for the relief of Declaration and Permanent Injunction against the defendants.

3. The O.S.No.1557/2008 is filed by plaintiffs by name Kaveramma and others against the defendants, seeking for the relief of Declaration and permanent injunction.

4. Brief facts of the case of the Plaintiff in O.S.No.1802/2007 is as under:

Description of the suit schedule property;

Land bearing Sy.No.50/2 measuring 1 acre situated at Kamakshipura village, Hesaraghatta Hobli, Bengaluru North Taluk and bounded on the:

East by : Property of Chikkayellappa
West by : Property of Attibele Munihanumaiah
North by : Government Road
South by : Property of Siriyappa's Gangappa

5. To appreciate the issues involved in this suit, it is necessary to set out, in brief, the relevant facts of the plaint. It is the case of plaintiff that, plaintiff is in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. The RTC extract also show the possession of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property. The RTC extract and RR clearly discloses the name of Hanumanthappa having only 34 guntas in the above said survey number the plaintiff having 1 acre of land in Sy.No.50/2. In the year 1981 the name of Hanumanthappa was deleted and entered he name of Chikkaellappa and same was continued in the name of Chikkaellappa. The defendants have no manner of right or interest over the suit schedule property, are trying to interfere with the plaintiffs peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. In

this regard the plaintiff has approached the jurisdictional police, but police have advised the plaintiff to approach this court. Hence this suit.

6. Per contra the defendants have filed written statement.

7. Brief averments of the written statement of defendants in O.S.No.1802/2007 are as follows:-

That the land bearing Sy.No.50/2 measuring 1 acre 34 guntas of Kamakshipura village is a Jodi Inam Land belongs to the Jodi village Kamakshipura, Hesaraghatta Hobli was in possession of Jodidar one M. Anantharamaiah. The father-in-law of the defendant No.1 who is the grand father of the defendant No.2 herein Honnurappa was in cultivation of the land in question. The said Honnurappa had filed an application before the Special Deputy Commissioner for Inam in case No.49/1959-60 Bangalore to register him as khatedar of the said land. After the said order dated;19.03.1960, Honnurappa continued to possess and enjoy the said land as its owner. Thereafter the said Honnurappa had executed a nominal sale deed in favour of Narayanappa on 31.03.1964 and died immediately after the execution of the said sale deed. After death of said Honnurappa, his son by name Hanumanthappa, the husband of the defendant No.1 and father of the defendant No.2 was continued to possess and enjoy the said land. After his death the defendant No.1 and 2

are in possession of the land measuring 1 acres 34 guntas in Sy.No.50/2. Hence prays to dismiss the suit.

8. Brief contents of plaint in O.S.No.1557/2008 are as follows:-

Description of the suit schedule property;

All that piece and parcel of the agricultural land bearing Sy.No.50/2, measuring 1 acre 34 guntas of Kamakshipura Village, Hesaraghatta Hobli, Bengaluru North (Additional) Taluk and bounded on:

East by : Government Road (Oni)
West by : Land of Sri. Muniraju
 S/o Munihanumaiah
North by : Government road,
South by : Land of Sri. Gangappa
 S/o Siriyappa

9. To appreciate the issues involved in this suit, it is necessary to set out, in brief, the relevant facts of the plaint. It is the case of plaintiff that the suit schedule property is a Jodi Inam. One Anantharamaiah was the Jodidar of the said village. The father-in-law of the plaintiff No.1 and grand father of the plaintiff No.2 to 5 Honnurappa was in possession of the suit schedule property cultivating the said land as tenant under Jodidar giving Kandayam. The said Honnurappa had filed an application before the Special Deputy Commissioner for Inam in case No.49/1959-60 Bangalore to register him as khatedar

of the said land. After the said order dated;19.03.1960, Honnurappa continued to possess and enjoy the said land as its owner. In the year 1964 the said Honnurappa sold the suit schedule property in favour of father of the defendant No.1 to 5 herein by name Narayanappa by executing sale deed dated;30.03.1964. Further the said Narayanappa never took the possession of the land. After the death of Honnurappa, his son i.e., husband of the plaintiff No.1 Hanumanthappa continued to cultivate the suit schedule property. After death of Hanumanthappa, the plaintiffs herein being his legal heirs have continued to possess and enjoy the suit schedule property. The defendant No.6 and 7 have managed to obtain the RTC of the suit schedule property in their name, but possession of the suit schedule property continued to be with the plaintiffs only. Further the plaintiffs have filed application for change the khata of the suit schedule property in the name of original grantee Honnurappa and said application was allowed. Thereafter filed application for change of khata in the name of plaintiffs, the mother of the defendant No.1 to 5 herein Siddagangamma has objected for the same in case No.RRT (dispute) CR.01/2007-08 and passed an order for changing the khata of the suit schedule property jointly in the name of defendant No.1 and 3 herein by his order dated;04.01.2008. Aggrieved by the said order dated;04.01.2008, the plaintiffs herein have filed an appeal No.R.A.No.699/2008 and said appeal is pending for adjudication. The said possession and

enjoyment of the suit schedule property by the plaintiffs continued even after the execution of the sale deed in favour of father of the defendant No.1 to 3 and the defendant No.1 to 5 herein as the said sale deed dated;30.03.1964 was never acted upon. No action was taken either by the father of the defendant No.1 to 5 late Narayanappa or his wife and children to get their names mutated in the revenue records. Hence the plaintiffs have filed present suit.

10. per contra the defendants have filed Written statement.

11. Brief averments of the written statement of defendants in O.S.No.1557/2008 are as follows:-

The defendants have denied entire plaint averments grand father of the plaintiff No.2 to 5 and father-in-law of the plaintiff No.1, Late Honnarappa, during his lifetime sold the suit schedule property in favour of father of this defendant by name Late Narayanappa under registered sale deed dated;31.03.964. The defendants being illiterate, uneducated, they could not obtain the revenue entries in their names, it also the duty of the concerned revenue authorities, for transfer of khata by defendants or their father as per Section 128 (4) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act. Taking undue advantage of the khata transferred in the name of Honnarappa from Anantharamaiah, the plaintiffs have been claiming alleged title by way of adverse possession. Further contended that

plaintiffs or their predecessor in title never in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Hence prays to dismiss the suit.

12. Based on the above pleadings the following issues have been framed in **O.S.No.1802/2007** by predecessor in office:

ISSUES

1. *Whether the plaintiff proves that he is the absolute owner and lawful possession, enjoyment of the suit schedule property as on the date of filing of the suit ?*
2. *Whether the plaintiff proves that alleged interference by the defendants?*
3. *Whether the plaintiff is entitled for Permanent Injunction as sought for?*
4. *Whether the court fee paid is sufficient ?*
5. *To what relief parties are entitle?*
6. *What order or decree?*

13. Based on the above pleadings the following issues have been framed in **O.S.No.1557/2008** by predecessor in office:

- : ISSUES : -

1. *Whether the plaintiffs prove that they are the owners and possessors of the suit schedule property by way of adverse possession?*

2. Whether the plaintiffs prove that the alleged interference by the defendant ?

3. Whether the plaintiffs are entitle to reliefs as prayed in the plaint ?

4. What order or decree?

14. In order to prove the case of plaintiff in O.S.No.1802/2007, the General Power of Attorney holder of the plaintiff by name K.C. Nagaraju has been examined as PW1 and got marked 26 documents at Ex.P-1 to 26. On the other hand the plaintiff No.5 in O.S.No.1557/2008 by name H. Ramesh has been examined as PW1 and got marked 16 documents at Ex.P-1 to 16.

15. In spite of sufficient opportunity, the counsel for the both parties have not addressed their arguments. Hence arguments by both side taken as not canvased. However the both parties are permitted to file written arguments within 7 days, but not filed. Perused the materials available on record.

16. My findings on the above issues in O.S.No.1802/2007 as follows:

ISSUE NO.1: In the Negative

ISSUE NO.2: In the Negative

ISSUE NO.3: In the Negative

ISSUE NO.4: In the Negative

ISSUE NO.5: In the Negative

ISSUE NO.6: As per final order for the following.

17. My findings on the above issues in O.S.No.1557/2008 as follows:

ISSUE NO.1: In the Negative

ISSUE NO.2: In the Negative

ISSUE NO.3: In the Negative

ISSUE NO.4: As per final order for the following.

REASONS

18. Issue No.1 To 3 in O.S.No.1802/2007 and Issue No.1 to 3 in O.S.No.1557/2008:- These issues are interrelated to each other, hence they are taken together for common discussion to avoid repetition of facts.

19. The Plaintiff in O.S.No.1802/2007, in order to substantiate his contentions, his General Power of Attorney holder examined as PW-1, in his examination in chief, he deposed to the facts asserted in the plaint. In order to avoid repetition, this court will not discuss the evidence of PW-1, as the affidavit is nothing but replica of the plaint. Further, in support of oral evidence, the Plaintiff got marked 26 documents at Ex.P1 to Ex.P-26 and got marked Ex.D-1 & D-2.

20. On the other hand the plaintiff No.5 in O.S.No.1557/2008 by name H. Ramesh has been examined as PW1, in his examination in chief, he deposed to the facts

asserted in the plaint. In order to avoid repetition, this court will not discuss the evidence of PW-1, as the affidavit is nothing but replica of the plaint. Further, in support of oral evidence, the Plaintiff got marked 16 documents at Ex.P1 to Ex.P-16.

21. This court has carefully gone through the documents produced by the PW-1 in O.S.No. 1802/2007 i.e., Ex.P-1 is the General Power of Attorney executed by the plaintiff herein in favour of his son by name K.C. Nagaraju to prosecute the case on behalf of the plaintiff. Ex.P-2 is the copy of the Record of Rights in respect of property bearing Sy.No.50/2. Further it show that one Hanumanthaiah has been in possession over the property measuring 34 guntas. Ex.P-3 to 8 are are the Records of rights pertaining to property bearing Sy.No.50/2, on perusal of the column No.9 of the said RTC extracts, they show that one Anantharamaiah has been in possession over the property measuring 1 acre 34 guntas. Further on perusal of the column No.12 of the said RTC extract it shows that one Chikka Elleyappa and Chikkamallaiah i.e., plaintiff herein has been cultivating the said land. Ex.P-9 to 13 are the tax paid receipts, they show that tax has been paid in the name of Anantharamaiah and others in respect of suit schedule property. Ex.P-14 to 18 are the Record of right and RTC pertaining to property bearing Sy.No.50/2 measuring 1 acre 34 guntas. on perusal of the column No.9 of the said RTC

extracts, they show that one Anantharamaiah has been in possession over the property measuring 1 acre 34 guntas. Further on perusal of the column No.12 of the said RTC extract it shows that one Chikka Elleyappa and Chikkamallaiah i.e., plaintiff herein have been cultivating the said land. Ex.P-19 and 20 are the RTC extracts for the year 2006-07 and 2008-09 pertaining to property bearing Sy.No.50/2, on perusal of the column No.9 of the said RTC extract, it is forthcoming that onfe Honnarappa has been in possession over the property measuring 1 acre 34 guntas. Further on perusal of the column No.12 of the said RTC extract it shows that one Chikka Elleyappa and Chikkamallaiah i.e., plaintiff herein and Honnarappa have been cultivating the said land. Ex.P-21 to 24 are the RTC extracts pertaining to property bearing Sy.No.50/2, on perusal of the column No.9 it shows that one Bolaiah, Ashwathappa, Mallanna and Narayanaswamy have been in possession over the property measuring 1 acre 34 guntas. Ex.P-25 and 26 are the tax paid receipts, on perusal of the same it shows that tax has been paid in name of Mallappa, Narayanappa and others.

22. This court has carefully gone through the documents produced by the PW-1 in O.S.No.1557/2008 i.e., Ex.P-1 is the certified copy of the application submitted by grand- father of the plaintiff for grant of suit schedule property by way of possession and being paid tax continuously. Further, the

plaintiff has produced the certified copy of deposition in O.S.No.49/1959-60 before the Special Tahasildar prosecuted regarding Inam abolishan. The grand father of the plaintiff was deposed in this document the grand father of the plaintiff by name Hanumanthappa was examined and deposed that he had been possession over the suit schedule property from long back by way paid revenue tax. This document marked as Ex.P-2.Ex.P-3 is the reported submitted by the Tahsildar regarding Inam Abolishan procedure and also produced Ex.P-4. The Special Deputy Commissioner was passed order in Inam Abalishan on dated:21-03-1960.Ex.P-5 is the endorsement in this document disclose that the plaintiff one Kamalakshi was paid taxes to the suit schedule property. Further, Ex.P-9 is the registered sale deed dated:30-03-1964. One Narayanappa was purchased suit schedule property. Ex.P-7 toll its shows that the RTC in Sy.No.50/2 in the year 1966-67 /1981-82. On perusal of those documents the katha was its shows that in column No.9 & 10 in the name of the grand father of the plaintiff of the suit schedule property. Ex.P-12 is the cceretified copy of FormNo.7(a) application submitted by the 7th defendant of this case. As per the application the Special land acquisition officer had registered the case in LRF(7A)/47(DC/1999-2000). The said applications is rejectedondated:22-03-2007. Ex.P-14is the mutation register No.12/2006-07 it appears that the katha has been shows in jointly one Anantharaya and Honnarappa nonother then childrensof Hanumanthappa. As per the Ex.P-

13the katha has been changed in the name of childrens of the grandfather and also produced Ex.P-15& 16 are the RTC in the year 2007-08 the said documents show that in column 9 & 12 in the name of Honnarappa S/o Hanumanthappa.

23. Upon discussion both documents produced by the plaintiff in O.S.1802/2007 and 1557/2008. It appears that the plaintiff of the O.S.No1802/2007 is claiming title and injunctions of the suit schedule property. But despite sufficient opportunity the plaintiff has not produced any single documents regarding the title. In respect of failure of the title the injunction cannot be granted. Even though after examination of P.W-1 he was not appears before this court.

24. In concern in O.S.1557/2008 the plaintiff has produced the documents to show that he was possession of the property. The plaintiff claiming the declaration the way of adverse of possession of the suit schedule property. The settled of Principles in law held that when the party claiming adverse possession he must be proves peaceful possession of the property without any obstruction in 12 years and indirectly admit that the opposite party is absolute owner of the property. In this case the defendant claiming adverse possession he was produced several document regarding the possession and revenue orders. But those documents not relevant to this case. Because this is serious dispute of the between the both parties regarding possession. Though the

plaintiff of the O.S.No1802/2007not proved his title this court not come to conclusion that the defendant(plaintiff in O.S.No.1557/2008 is the owner of the property. The plaintiff in this case is lies burden to prove his case in his own way not depending opposite party. If the plaintiff in O.S.No1802/2007 fails to prove his title. The plaintiff of in O.S.No.1557/2008 is must prove his possession and title by way of adverse.

25. At this juncture, court lies on decision by the Hon'ble apex court in **AIR 1999 SC Page 1441 (Vidhyadhar V/s Manik Rao)** "(A) Evidence Act- Sec 114 Adverse inference – Party to suit not entering the witness box – give rise to interference adverse against him".

"Where a party to the suit does not appear into the witness box and state his own case on oath and does not offer himself to be cross examined by other side, a presumption would arise that the case set up by him is not correct".

In the present case both parties are examined as P.W-1 in his own cases in spite of sufficient opportunity both parties are not appear this court to enter the witness box.

26. The ratios laid down in the said decisions reveals that no duty is cast upon the court to analysis and to touch the factual allegation to know whether they are true or not

in the case where the defendants do not appear to counter the suit of the plaintiff. It is well settled principle of law that pleadings are not evidence. Without proof pleading is not helpful to establish anybodies case. The defendants' contentions in the written statement about GPA invalidity and partition suit are mere pleadings without evidence, when allegations are not specifically proved by evidence, they cannot dislodge plaintiff's positive proof. Moreover, the defendant who filed written statement did not step into the witness box, and hence adverse inference is drawn under **Section 114(g) of the Indian Evidence Act**. Accordingly, in issues of No.1 to 3 of 1802/2007 and O.S 1557-2008. this court answered in the **Negative**.

27. Issue No.5 in O.S.No.1802/2007 and Issue No.3 in O.S.No.1557/2008: In view of my findings on the above issues, I proceed to pass the following:-

ORDER

The suit of the plaintiff in
O.S.No.1802/2007 is hereby dismissed with
costs.

The suit of the plaintiff in
O.S.No.1557/2008 is hereby dismissed with
costs.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Original judgment is kept in
O.S.No1802/2007 and a copy of thereof is
kept in clubbed case O.S.No.1557/2008)

(Dictated to the Stenographer, typed by her, corrected and
then pronounced by me in the open court on this the 1st day
of July 2026).

(RAMESH.K)
II ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU.

A N N E X U R E in O.S.No.1802/2007

List of witness examined on behalf of Plaintiff:

P.W-1 : Sri. K.C. Nagaraju

List of documents marked on behalf of Plaintiff:

Ex.P-1 : GPA
Ex.P-2 : Copy of Village Form No.II
Ex.P-3 to 8 : RTC
Ex.P-9 to 13 : Tax paid receipts
Ex.P-14 & 24 : RTC extracts
Ex.P-25 & 26 : Copies of Tax paid receipts

List of witness examined on behalf of Defendant:

-Nil-

List of documents marked on behalf of Defendant.

-Nil-

**List of witness examined on behalf of Plaintiff in
O.S.No.1557/2008:**

P.W-1 : Sri. H. Ramesh

List of documents marked on behalf of Plaintiff:

Ex.P- 1	:	C/C of grant certificate
Ex.P-2	:	C/C of Special Tahasildar for enam-abolition
Ex.P-3	:	C/C of report of Special Tahasildar for enam abolition
Ex.P-4	:	C/C of report of Special Deputy Commissioner enam abolition
Ex.P-5	:	C/C of endorsement issued by Manger in the office special Commissioner
Ex.P-6	:	C/C of sale deed dated:30-03-1964
Ex.P-7 to 11	:	5 RTC extract in respects of suit schedule property
Ex.P-12	:	Form No.7(a) by the 7 th defendant's
Ex.P-13	:	C/C of the Order passed by the Special Acquisition office
Ex.P-14	:	CC of mutation order passed in MR.No.12/06-07
Ex.P-15 & 16	:	2 RTC extract for the year 2006-07 and 2007-08

List of witness examined on behalf of Defendant:

D.W-1 : Smt. Channamma

List of documents marked on behalf of Defendant.

-Nil-

**Sd/-
II ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU.**