



Presented on : 17-10-2023
Registered on : 17-10-2023
Decided on : 18-07-2026
Duration : 2Y, 9M, 1D

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL CIVIL JUDGE, WAGHODIA
DISTRICT: VADODARA**

R.C.S. No. 213 of 2023

Ratanben Pachiyabhai Vasava & Ors.

... Plaintiffs

Versus

Shantilal Chunilal Vasava & Ors.

... Defendants

ORDER BELOW EXHIBIT 16

(Application by Defendant No. 1 under Order VII Rule 11 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, for rejection of the plaint)

1. Nature of the Application

Defendant No. 1 has filed the present application, below Exhibit 16, under Order VII Rule 11(d) read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ("CPC"), praying that the plaint filed by the Plaintiffs in R.C.S. No. 213 of 2023 be rejected in limine on the ground that the suit, as framed and as it stands on the Plaintiffs' own pleadings and admissions, is barred by law, namely, the Hindu

Succession Act, 1956 ("HSA"), does not apply to the parties, who are members of a notified Scheduled Tribe.

2. Detailed Facts

2.1 The Plaintiffs and the Defendants are members of a single family, being descendants of one late Pachiya Chhaganbhai Bhayjibhai, the common ancestor of the parties. The suit concerns agricultural land, being ancestral and unpartitioned joint family property, situated at Mouje Goraj, Taluka Waghodia, District Vadodara, comprised in old Khata No. 112 (new Khata No. 1073), new Block/Survey Nos. 930 and 931, and old Khata No. 1108, new Block/Survey Nos. 1043, 1044 and 664 ("suit properties").

2.2 The Plaintiffs plead that, as legal heirs in the direct line of the common ancestor, they are entitled under the law of inheritance to a legitimate half share; nime bhag in the suit properties, which continue to stand in joint, undivided ownership and possession of the parties.

2.3 The Plaintiffs further plead that, without their signature or consent, the present Defendants unilaterally and arbitrarily got a mutation entry (Entry No. 4040) effected in the revenue record on 04.03.2016 before the Mamlatdar, Waghodia, purporting to partition the suit properties amongst themselves alone, which entry was certified on 30.05.2016. Aggrieved thereby, the Plaintiffs challenged the said entry before the Deputy Collector, Dabhoi, in R.T.S. Dispute No. 112/2021. The said dispute came to be partly allowed in the Plaintiffs' favour, Entry No. 4040 was set aside, and a direction was issued for a fresh partition of the record of rights; however, the Defendants did not comply with that direction and did not effect any partition in favour of the Plaintiffs.

2.4 The Plaintiffs, through their advocate, thereafter issued a legal notice dated 01.04.2023 calling upon the Defendants to effect partition of the suit properties.

No steps were taken by the Defendants pursuant thereto, which, according to the Plaintiffs, gives rise to the cause of action for the present suit.

2.5 In **paragraph 4 of the plaint**, the Plaintiffs have specifically pleaded that "the Plaintiffs and the Defendants are Hindus and the Hindu Succession Act applies to us", that the suit properties are ancestral, joint, and unpartitioned property of the parties, and that under the Hindu Succession Act the Plaintiffs are entitled to a nime bhag; halfshare, right, title and interest therein, which right has never been surrendered/given up by the Plaintiffs in favour of the Defendants by way of any deed or otherwise.

2.6 On this footing, the Plaintiffs have prayed in the suit under the Exhibit 1 plaint, inter alia, In Para 11 of the Exhibit 1 Plaint for (i) a decree for partition of the suit properties by metes and bounds and separate possession of the Plaintiffs' share; and (ii) a permanent injunction restraining the Defendants from selling, mortgaging, gifting, transferring, or creating any encumbrance or charge over the suit properties, or any part thereof, till such partition takes place.

2.7 Simultaneously with the suit, the Plaintiffs moved an application Vide Exhibit 5 under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC for a temporary injunction However My learned Predecessor Judge had By order dated 17/10/2023 below the said application, this Court, following *Jaisu & Co. v. M/s. Meera Agency and Anupam Rekadi Cabin Association v. Municipal Corporation, Jamnagar, 1995(1) GLH 586*, held that an ex-parte ad-interim injunction could be granted only in exceptional cases and that the present case did not fall in that category; Thus, notice was accordingly ordered to be issued to the Defendants, returnable on 30.11.2023 and no Interim Injunction was granted in favour of the Plaintiff.

2.8 Defendant No. 1 thereupon filed the present application Vide Exhibit 16 under Order VII Rule 11(d) read with Section 151 C.P.C, 1908, contending that

the suit, as filed, is barred by law inasmuch as the Hindu Succession Act does not govern the parties while giving out the Section 2(2) of the Hindu Succession act while contending that since the Both Plaintiff and Defendants belong to the "Vasava" caste and contended that their sub-caste is " (Bhil)" and thus they are "Scheduled Tribe" not only in Gujarat but whole of India, and they can't be governed by Hindu law nor it is applicable on them . Thus when they belong to the Scheduled Tribe and thus this suit is barred by the law inasmuch as the Hindu Succession Act does not govern the parties and thus suit doesn't have any footing before this court of law and thus suit should be dismissed in Toto as it is clearly barred by law and it would be utter wastage of time if continued and thus his application under Order VII Rule 11(d) read with Section 151 C.P.C, 1908 be allowed and thus Plaint be rejected.

2.9 In their written reply to this application Vide Exhibit No 17, the Plaintiffs have, while opposing the application, admitted that they belong to the "Vasava" caste, but contended that their sub-caste is "Hindu (Bhil)" and not "Scheduled Tribe", and that they continue to be governed by Hindu law. The Plaintiffs have further contended that the plaint discloses a valid cause of action within limitation, that the bar of law under Order VII Rule 11(d) CPC must appear from the averments of the plaint alone, and that Defendant No. 1's application is misconceived and liable to be dismissed with costs.

3. Parties Contentions & Arguments:-

3.1 On behalf of Defendant No. 1

It is contended that the Plaintiffs and the Defendants belong to the Vasava (Bhil) community, a community notified as a Scheduled Tribe in the State of Gujarat within the meaning of clause (25) of Article 366 of the Constitution of India. It is submitted that Section 2(2) of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 expressly excludes members of any Scheduled Tribe from the operation of the Act, unless the Central Government, by notification in the Official Gazette, otherwise directs; that no

such notification has ever been issued extending the Act to the Vasava community; and that the entire cause of action pleaded by the Plaintiffs for partition and injunction is founded solely and exclusively upon a claimed right of inheritance under the Hindu Succession Act. In order to support his contention he has given the copy of their ST certificate issued by the Government of the Gujarat vide Exhibit 19 Documentary list; Mark 19/2 & 19/2. It is submitted that once it is shown, on the Plaintiffs' own admitted caste, that the Act cannot apply to them, the suit is barred by law on the face of the record and is liable to outright rejection under Order VII Rule 11(d) CPC, without putting the parties to the expense and delay of a full trial. Further in order to Buttress his submission he has relied upon the Judgement of the Apex court delivered in the case of;

- *Labishwar Manjhi Versus Pran Manjhi 2000 (0) AIJEL- SC 15234*
- *Ram Charan Versus Sukhram 2025 (0) AIJEL – SC 75594*

3.2 On behalf of the Plaintiffs

It is contended that the application is misconceived in law and on facts. The Plaintiffs submit that (i) for the purposes of Order VII Rule 11(d) CPC, only the averments made in the plaint are germane, and the pleas raised by a defendant, whether in a written statement or in an application, cannot be looked into for rejecting the plaint; (ii) the plaint nowhere concedes that the Plaintiffs are members of a Scheduled Tribe to whom the Hindu Succession Act does not apply; (iii) the Plaintiffs, although belonging to the Vasava caste, belong to a sub-caste described as "Hindu (Bhil)" and are, and have always considered themselves to be, Hindus governed by Hindu law and custom; and (iv) the suit is within limitation and discloses a valid cause of action, so that the question raised by Defendant No. 1 is, at best, a mixed question of law and fact requiring evidence, and is not a pure question of law that can be decided at the threshold under Order VII Rule 11 CPC.

4. Points for Determination

(i) Whether, on a meaningful reading of the plaint together with the admitted and undisputed facts on record, the suit is barred by law within the meaning of Order VII Rule 11(d) CPC on the ground that the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 does not apply to the parties?

(ii) What order?

5. The Law on Order VII Rule 11 CPC

Order 7, Rule 11 of Civil Procedure Code, 1908 deals with rejection of plaint.

The provision of law is extracted below:

Rejection of Plaint:- The plaint shall be rejected in the following cases:

(a) Where it does not disclose a cause of action;

(b) Where the relief claimed is undervalued, and the plaintiff, on being required by the Court to correct the valuation within a time to be fixed by the Court, fails to do so;

(c) Where the relief claimed is properly valued but the plaint is written upon paper insufficiently stamped, and the plaintiff, n being required by the Court to supply the requisite stamp paper within a time to be fixed by the Court, fails to do so;

(d) Where the suit appears from the statement in the plant to be barred by any law;

(e) Where it is not filed in duplicate;

(f) Where the plaintiff fails to comply with the provisions of Rule 9. (Provided that the time fixed by the Court for the correction of the valuation or supplying of the requisite stamp papers shall not be extended unless the Court, for reasons to be recorded, is satisfied that the plaintiff was prevented by any cause of an exceptional nature from correcting the valuation or supplying the requisite stamp

papers, as the case maybe, within the time fixed by the Court and that refusal to extent such time would cause grave injustice to the plaintiff)

Thus Order VII, Rule 11 of C.P.C. can be summarized as follows:

(i) Where it does not disclose the cause of action

(ii) Where the relief claimed is under valued and plaintiff fails to correct the valuation within the time fixed.

(iii) If the relief is properly valued but insufficient court fee stamp is paid and the plaintiff fails to make good such amount.

(iv) Where the suit appears to be barred by the law, from the statements in the plaint.

(v) When the plaint does not disclose any cause of action. The whole plaint should be rejected and not a portion of it.

Order VII Rule 11 CPC casts a mandatory duty on the Court to reject a plaint in the circumstances enumerated therein, including, under clause (d), "where the suit appears from the statement in the plaint to be barred by any law". The power under this provision can be exercised at any stage of the suit -before registration of the plaint, after issue of summons, or at any time before conclusion of the trial and does not depend upon the filing of a written statement by the defendant.

In *Saleem Bhai v. State of Maharashtra, (2003) 1 SCC 557*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that for the purposes of deciding an application under clauses (a) and (d) of Order VII Rule 11, the relevant facts which need to be looked into are the averments in the plaint; the pleas taken by the defendant in the written statement are, at that stage, wholly irrelevant, and it is a settled principle that an

application under this Rule must be decided on a reading of the plaint as it stands, without the necessity of the defendant first entering the witness-box or filing a written statement.

In *T. Arivandandam v. T.V. Satyapal*, (1977) 4 SCC 467, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that if, on a meaningful-and not merely formal-reading of the plaint, it is manifestly vexatious and meritless in the sense of not disclosing a clear right to sue, the Court should exercise its power under Order VII Rule 11 CPC; and that if clever drafting has created an illusion of a cause of action, the Court should nip it in the bud at the earliest stage rather than subject the parties to a protracted and futile trial.

In *Dahiben v. Arvindbhai Kalyanji Bhanusali*, (2020) 7 SCC 366, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated that the entire purpose of conferring the power to reject a plaint under Order VII Rule 11 is to ensure that a litigation which is meaningless and bound to prove abortive is terminated at the threshold, without wasting the time of the Court and putting the defendant to the trouble of a trial; the Court further clarified that the clause bars an entire suit if the suit, as framed, is not maintainable, and that the test is whether the averments made in the plaint, if taken to be true in their entirety, would result in a decree being passed.

It is thus well settled that while the Court, in deciding an Order VII Rule 11(d) application, ordinarily confines itself to the plaint and the documents filed along with it, it is equally settled that the Court is entitled to consider the substance of the plaint on a meaningful reading, and is not bound to accept the plaintiff's characterisation of the applicable law where that characterisation is contradicted by the plaintiff's own admitted and undisputed facts appearing on the record of the very proceeding in which the application is made. A bare, formal assertion of an applicable law in the plaint cannot immunise a suit from rejection where the plaintiff's own admission demonstrates, without the need for any further evidence or trial, that the asserted law has no application to the parties.

6. Section 2(2) of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956

Section 2 of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 defines the persons to whom the Act applies. Sub-section (1) extends the Act broadly to persons who are Hindus in any of its forms, including Virashaivas, Lingayats, followers of the Brahmo, Prarthana or Arya Samaj, Buddhists, Jains and Sikhs, and to any other person domiciled in the territories to which the Act extends who is not a Muslim, Christian, Parsi or Jew by religion.

Sub-section (2) of Section 2, however, carves out an express and unqualified exclusion. It provides that, notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), nothing contained in the Act applies to the members of any Scheduled Tribe within the meaning of clause (25) of Article 366 of the Constitution, unless the Central Government, by notification in the Official Gazette, otherwise directs.

Sub-section (3) further clarifies that the expression "Hindu" in any portion of the Act shall be construed as if it included a person who, although not a Hindu by religion, is nevertheless a person to whom the Act applies by virtue of the provisions contained in the Section — a construction that does not assist a person who is excluded by sub-section (2), since that sub-section operates as an overriding, non-obstante exclusion notwithstanding sub-section (1).

The exclusion under Section 2(2) is thus absolute and self-operating: once a person is shown to be a member of a notified Scheduled Tribe, the Act does not apply to that person's succession or inheritance, regardless of that person's religious practices, self-identification as "Hindu", or degree of assimilation into Hindu customs, unless and until a specific Central Government notification under the Official Gazette extends the Act to that community.

7. Judicial Precedents on the Non-Applicability of the Act to Scheduled Tribes

7.1 Nawang & Anr. v. Bahadur & Ors., Civil Appeal No. 4980 of 2017 (Supreme Court, decided 8th October 2025) 2025 LiveLaw (SC) 1025

The Hon'ble Supreme Court set aside a direction issued by the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, in a judgment dated 23.06.2015, that daughters in the tribal areas of the State of Himachal Pradesh should inherit property in accordance with the Hindu Succession Act, 1956, and not by tribal custom. The Supreme Court held that Section 2(2) of the Act excludes members of Scheduled Tribes from its operation unless a Central Government notification so directs; that no such notification had been issued qua the community concerned; and that the High Court's direction, extending the Act to that community by judicial fiat, was legally unsustainable and beyond the scope of the appeal before it. The Court reaffirmed that questions of extending statutory personal-law protections to Scheduled Tribes fall within the exclusive domain of the Legislature and the Central Government, and cannot be achieved through judicial directions, however well-intentioned.

7.2 Kamla Neti (Dead) through L.Rs. v. Special Land Acquisition Officer, (2023) 3 SCC 528

The Hon'ble Supreme Court, while dealing with a claim to a share in compensation by the daughter of a deceased member of a Scheduled Tribe, proceeded on the settled premise that the Hindu Succession Act does not, of its own force, apply to Scheduled Tribes by virtue of Section 2(2), and addressed the question of inheritance rights of tribal women through the lens of justice, equity and good conscience rather than the codified provisions of the Act, while calling upon the Central Government to consider extending statutory protection to Scheduled Tribe women by notification.

7.3 Labishwar Manjhi v. Pran Manjhi & Ors. 2000 (0) AIJEL- SC 15234

This decision given by the Defendant in support of his application; where in he has argued that this Judgment has been consistently relied upon by the Various High Courts, as the Apex Court have clearly stated in this that “ for the proposition that Section 2(2) of the Hindu Succession Act constitutes a legislative bar on the application of the Act to Scheduled Tribes, and that mere proof of "Hinduised" customs or practices does not, by itself, lift that statutory bar; what is required is a specific notification issued by the Central Government. Thus this court agrees with the Judgment given by the Defendant in support of this application.

7.4 Madhu Kishwar & Ors. v. State of Bihar, (1996) 5 SCC 125

The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the context of examining the inheritance rights of tribal women in Bihar, likewise proceeded on the basis that the Hindu Succession Act does not extend to Scheduled Tribes under Section 2(2), and addressed the question of according inheritance rights to tribal women through constitutional principles of equality and the doctrine of justice, equity and good conscience, rather than treating the Act as directly applicable.

7.5 Ram Charan Versus Sukhram 2025 (0) AIJEL – SC 75594

The Hon'ble Supreme Court, while dealing with a claim to a Equal share where in women member of a Scheduled Tribe (Or her Legal Heir) from her Ancestral Property, proceeded on the settled premise that the Hindu Succession Act does not, of its own force, apply to Scheduled Tribes by virtue of Section 2(2), and addressed the question of inheritance rights of tribal women through the lens of justice, equity and good conscience rather than the codified provisions of the Act and thus the claim of the Tribal women member of a Scheduled Tribe (Or her Legal Heir) would be based on the customs governing under the Scheduled Tribes

The consistent thread running through this line of authority, and reaffirmed most recently and authoritatively in Nawang (supra)¹, is that (i) Section 2(2) operates

¹ 2025 LiveLaw (SC) 1025

as an absolute statutory bar excluding Scheduled Tribes from the Hindu Succession Act; (ii) the bar can only be lifted by a specific Central Government notification in the Official Gazette; (iii) no degree of religious or cultural assimilation into Hindu practices dispenses with the requirement of such notification; and (iv) courts cannot, by judicial interpretation or direction, extend the Act to a class of persons whom Parliament has expressly excluded. Thus The Community Practises governed under their Scheduled Tribes would be applicable on the Parties and not the Hindu law or Hindu Succession law wouldn't be applicable on them as barred by the Section 2(2) of the Hindu Succession Act.

8. Analysis and Reasoning

8.1 It is not in dispute, and is in fact affirmatively admitted by the Plaintiffs themselves in their written reply to the present application, that the Plaintiffs and the Defendants; all belong to the Vasava caste. Vasava is a community notified as a Scheduled Tribe in the State of Gujarat within the meaning of clause (25) of Article 366 of the Constitution of India.

8.2 Neither the plaint nor the Plaintiffs' reply to the present application pleads, discloses, or produces any notification issued by the Central Government under Section 2(2) of the Hindu Succession Act extending the provisions of the Act to the Vasava community. The Plaintiffs' contention that their "sub-caste" is "Hindu (Bhil)" is, even if taken at face value, a claim of religious or customary assimilation, which, in view of the law laid down in *Nawang* (supra)² and the consistent line of authority noted above, cannot by itself dispense with the requirement of a Central Government notification. This contention is also supported by the Exhibit 19 Documents given by the Defendant no 1 in order to support his application and have out the Certificate issued by the Government of the Gujarat which specially gives out that "Vasava" caste belongs to the

² 2025 LiveLaw (SC) 1025

"Scheduled Tribe" as the List of the Scheduled Tribe approved as per the Law by the government of Gujarat and was also published in the Gazette by the Government of Gujarat and is also on the Website³ of the Ministry of the Tribal Affairs, government of India And thereof at the Serial no 4 is also given out (**Sr.No 4-** , *Dholi Bhil, Dungri Bhil, Dungri Garasia, Mewasi Bhil, Rawal Bhil Tadvil Bhil, Bhagalia, Bhilala, Pawra, Vasava, Vasave.*) and also by the Government of Gujarat in their website⁴ of **Department of Social Justice & Empowerment**, Government of Gujarat, while publishing the list of community under the Schedule Tribe with the **“ The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes order (Amendment) Act, 195, Act No 63 of 1956; Schedule I- Part 3.** Thus, The statutory bar under Section 2(2) operates independently of the degree of a community's Hinduisation which is applicable on the Parties to the suit and thus specifically on the Plaintiff when he contends that Partition be done according to the Hindu Succession act, 1956 which instead would be governed under the Customs of the Vasava, Bheel Community as they are in the Schedule Tribe list as Indian Evidence Act, 1872, Section 81 gives out about the Presumption about the publication of the Gazette.

Section 81. Presumption as to Gazettes, newspapers, private Acts of Parliament and other documents.

The Court shall presume the genuineness of every document purporting to be the London Gazette or [any official Gazette, or the Government Gazette] [Substituted by A.O. 1937, for "the Gazette of India, or the Government Gazette of any L.G., or".] of any colony, dependency or possession of the British Crown, or to be a newspaper or journal, or to be a copy of a private Act of Parliament [of the United Kingdom] [Inserted by A.O. 1950.] printed by the

³ <https://tribal.nic.in/WriteReadData/CMS/Documents/201212010312287275390File1051.pdf>

⁴ https://sje.gujarat.gov.in/downloads/cast_cert_act_04.pdf

Queen's Printer and of every document purporting to be a document directed by any law to be kept by any person, if such document is kept substantially in the form required by law and is produced from proper custody.

Thus here in this suit Proceedings when the Section 81 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1876 is read and thereby drawing the Presumption of the List of the Schedule Tribe which was published by the Government of Gujarat in the Gazette while adding the Vasava Community in the Schedule Tribe List. Thus making all the People of the Vasava Community under the Schedule Tribe Community.

8.3 The entire cause of action pleaded in the plaint, and every relief claimed therein- partition of the suit properties, separate possession of the Plaintiffs' share, and a permanent injunction restraining alienation pending partition- rests exclusively upon the Plaintiffs' claimed status as heirs **entitled to a share under the Hindu Succession Act, as expressly pleaded in paragraph 4 of the plaint.** No alternative basis for the claim, whether founded on tribal custom, family arrangement, contract, adverse possession, or any other head of law, has been pleaded anywhere in the plaint.

8.4 Applying the test Rendered in the case of the *Saleem Bhai* (supra)⁵ and *Dahiben* (supra)⁶ rendered by the H'nble Apex Court namely, whether the plaint, read meaningfully and in its entirety along with the admitted facts on the record of the proceeding, discloses a sustainable cause of action- this Court finds that it does not. Once it is held, as it must be on the admitted facts, that the Hindu Succession Act does not apply to the parties, the foundational premise of the plaint collapses, and the reliefs claimed cannot, in law, be granted on the basis pleaded. This is precisely the class of case which H'nble Apex Court in the case

⁵ (2003) 1 SCC 557,

⁶ (2020) 7 SCC 366

of *T. Arivandandam* (supra)⁷ requires the Court to "nip in the bud" rather than relegate to a full trial that is bound to prove an exercise in futility and perfectly fits under the Rule of the Order 7 Rule 11 (D) barred by the law Category..

8.5 This Court is not at all persuaded by the Plaintiffs' submission that the bar under Order VII Rule 11(d) CPC cannot be examined because the plaint itself does not expressly refer to the parties' caste or tribal status. The plaint's own averment in paragraph 4-that the parties are "Hindus" governed by the Hindu Succession Act- is itself an averment of applicable law on which the entire suit is founded and claimed by the plaintiff himself; and where the Plaintiffs' own admission on the record vide Para 4 of the Plaint vide Exhibit 1; of the very application filed to test that averment establishes, thus when it is clearly established parties to the suit belong to the " Schedule Tribe" and **thus there is no Question of Hindu Succession act, 1956 being applicable on them** and thus without any need for further evidence or trial, that the averment is legally unsustainable, the Court would be abdicating its statutory duty under Order VII Rule 11(d) CPC if it were to decline to examine the point at the threshold and instead relegate the parties to a full-fledged trial on a claim that cannot, as a matter of law, succeed.

8.6 For these reasons, this Court holds that the suit, as framed, is barred by law within the meaning of Order VII Rule 11(d) CPC, and Point No. (i) is answered accordingly, in favour of Defendant No. 1 and against the Plaintiffs.

9. ORDER

- 1.** For the reasons recorded above, the application filed by Defendant No. 1 below Exhibit 16 under Order VII Rule 11(d) read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 is hereby **ALLOWED**.

⁷ 4 SCC 467

2. The plaint in R.C.S. No. 213 of 2023 is hereby REJECTED under Order VII Rule 11(d) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, as being barred by law, namely, the Hindu Succession Act, 1956, in view of Section 2(2) thereof.
3. In consequence, the application for temporary injunction below Exhibit 5 does not survive and stands disposed of accordingly.
4. Parties are left to bear their own costs of the application and the Suit Proceedings.
5. The suit stands disposed of accordingly, Thus Suit File be assigned to the Central Record room as per Rules after the Revision/Appeal time period is over.

Pronounced in open Court on this 18th day of July, 2026

Date: 18/07/2026

Place: Vaghodia

(Vikas Seoul)
Principal Civil Judge Vaghodia
Judge Code: GJ01357