

IN THE COURT OF SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AT SATHUPALLY.

Wednesday, this the 29th day of July, 2026.

Present: **Sri Shaik Meera Khasim Saheb,**
Senior Civil Judge,
Sathupally.

O.S.No.26 of 2018**Between:-**

Chaparala Sri Lakshmi, W/o.Late Ravindranath, Age:61yrs,
Occ:Housewife, R/o.H.no:48-12-15 Pavuluri Plaza, Zion High School
Road, Gunadala, Vijaywada,Krishna District.

.....Plaintiff.

//And//

Kondapally Raghuram Reddy, S/o.Late Damodar Reddy,
Age:52yrs,Occ:Business, R/o.10-4-59,Mamillagudem
Khammam town, Khammam District.

.....Defendant.

This suit is coming up before me for final hearing on 23.7.2026 in the presence of Sri K. Ravi, Advocate for the Plaintiff and of Sri.E.Ramachandra Rao Advocate for the Defendant; upon perusing the material on record and after hearing the arguments, this Court made the following:-

: J U D G M E N T :

1. This is a suit filed by the Plaintiff for Perpetual Injunction restraining the defendant, his henchmen, his agents etc from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment over the Plaint Schedule properties of A & B Schedule Properties and for the costs of the suit.

2. **The brief contents of the plaint, are as follows:-**

The Plaintiff is the absolute owner and possessor of agricultural dry and wet lands admeasuring Ac 14-16gts, in Sy.No.236/AA, 237/E, 238/AA,

238/E,236/EE, 72/A, 72/AA, 79/EE, 81/EE, 81/A and 81/EE of Bayannagudem village, Penuballi Mandal, Khammam District through registered document nos. 762/1982, 31.5.1982 Sy.NO.72/AA extent Ac 1.31gts, 79/EE Ac 0.22gts, total land Ac 2.13gts document no.475/1985 dt:29.4.1985 Sy.No.72/A, Ac 3.30gts 34/1985 dt:9.1.1985 Sy.Nos 81/A , Ac 1.19gts vide document no.561 of 1987 dt:25.5.1987 Sy.No.81/EE extent 0.20gts, document no.673/1987 dt:19.6.1987 Sy.No.236/E extent 1.32gts , Sy.No.236/AA extent Ac 0.35gts, Sy.No.237/E extent Ac 0.23gts total extent Ac 3.10gts vide document no.676/1987 DT:20.6.1987 Sy.NOS 238/AA, 1.06gts , Sy.No.238/E extent Ac 1.08gts total Ac 2.14gts, Document no.704/1990 dt;22.2.1990 Sy.No.81/EE extent AC 0.30gtis by virtue of purchase from it's original owners total extent Ac 14.16gts. The said lands were purchased by the husband of the plaintiff in the name of the plaintiff for the benefit of family members. The mutation has been affected in the name of the plaintiff by the revenue authorities. The pattadar pass book was issued by the revenue authorities to the plaintiff, right from the date of purchase itself the plaintiff is in physical possession and enjoyment over the said lands I.e, suit schedule properties.,

The plaintiff further submits that, the defendant got created an alleged agreement of sale on sada white paper dt:20.3.2016 by impersonating the signatures of the plaintiff on the alleged white paper in respect of the suit lands with a view to grab the land of the plaintiff herein and his family members. The defendant got filed OS.No. 138/2017 against the plaintiff herein for specific performance of allege agreement of sale dt;20.3.2016 based upon fabricated document which is not executed by the plaintiff herein infavour of the defendant herein, on the file of Prl.District Judge, Khammam in respect of the suit schedule properties, The same is not maintainable as per law and fact as the defendant created such fabricated document on white papers which is unstamped by saying that, the defendant paid the sum of Rs.84,00,000/- out of

Rs.86,00,000/- as an advance and remaining balance sale consideration of Rs.2,00,000/- to be paid to execute the register sale deed on or before 19^h March, 2018. It is clear on the perusal of the alleged document that, no buyer will pay such huge amount of Rs.84,00,000/- with a balance of Rs.2,00,000/- to the seller without entering into an agreement of sale with duly stamped or by way of registration. As such the alleged agreement of sale which is on white paper (unstamped) dt;20.3.2016 is unbelievable transaction. The defendant got created the alleged agreement of sale on white paper, in collusion with his henchmen with a view to grab the suit schedule property which belongs to the plaintiff.

The plaintiff further submits that, the defendant is nothing to do with the suit schedule properties, but under the guise of litigation, on 1.11.2017 the defendant along with his henchmen came to the suit schedule lands and tried to dispossess the plaintiff and again on 22.11.2017 the defendant along with his henchmen a came in innova car bearing no.AP 10TV 1614 and obstructed the plaintiff and threatened with dire consequences. Finally on 8.2.2018 the police VM Banjar registered a case in cr.no.20/18 for the offence under sec 427,447,506 r/w 34 IPC against the defendant and two others namely Dasari Sarath and Naga Prasad basing on the complaint of plaintiff. As such the plaintiff constrained to file the present suit for perpetual injunction restraining the defendant and his henchmen.

3. After receipt of summons from the Hon'ble Court the defendant appeared through his counsel and filed his written statement and interalia contended that and admitted that para no.1 of the plaint that plaintiff is owner and possessor of the suit schedule property. But specifically denied the para no.3 of the plaint that the defendant got created agreement of sale dt;20.3.2016 on sada white paper by forging the signatures of the plaintiff with

a view to grab lands is totally false and baseless. Further the said agreement of sale was signed by the plaintiff after receiving the cash in the presence of witnesses who affixed their signatures on the said agreement. Further using sada white paper for executing agreement of sale is not prohibited under law and is not declared invalid and it is settled law that stamp duty penalty as fixed by competent authority may be paid in order to cure irregularly if any. That the plaintiff who is in dire need for money has offered to sell the petition schedule agricultural lands to the defendant through the wife of her deceased brother, namely **Sri.Rama Krishna** i.e. the elder sister of the wife of this defendant, accordingly this defendant agreed to purchase the same considering the relationship and their urgent need for money as the defendant is also dealing in with real estate business, thus the rest of the allegations in the same para such as beliefs and imaginations are also false and baseless meant to escape from the legal consequences that may arise in OS NO.138/2017 which is pending on the file of Hon'ble District Judge,Khammam. Further in the entire allegations nowhere stated that the petitioner did not receive the consideration as alleged in the agreement of sale dt;20.3.2016.

That the defendant filed that **OS.138/2017** on the file of Honble District Judge for specific performance of contract of agreement of sale dt 20.3.2016 and the defendant filed the above suit when she came to know that the plaintiff trying to sell the suit schedule mentioned lands to 3rd parties for wrongful gain and to cause wrongful loss to this defendant and making hectic attempts and in the process, the plaintiff through her son **Mr.Chaparala Sailesh**, offered to sale Ac 9.14gts of land which is part and parcel of the suit schedule mentioned lands, through advertisement in "OLA On line Site" on 30.8.2017.

Further the defendant got issued a registered legal notice on 5.10.2017 calling upon her to come and receive the balance sale consideration and to

execute regular registered sale deed, which was returned as “addressee refused to take’ and the same is filled herewith. Again as part of abundant caution, after filing the suit no.138/2017 the defendant got published another public notice on 28.10.2017 duly cautioning the general public at large about the pendency of OS No.138/2017. For all these efforts there is no response from the Plaintiff.

Further the defendant specifically denied that he never interfered with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the property on 1.11.2017 and again on 22.11.2017 and further contended that as per the complaint averments made by the plaintiff dt 8.2.2018, prior to 29.1.2018, , the plaintiff is not the possession of the suit schedule land.

In view of the above compliant, the alleged threats on 1.11.2017 and 22.11.2017 becoming false and bald allegations only. Hence, request the Hon’ble Court to dismiss the suit with costs.

4. In view of pleadings of the both parties, the following issues are framed by my predecessor for settlement of trial on 25.7.2023.

- 1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for grating of perpetual injunction in her favour by restraining the defendant his agents, persons, subordinates?**
- 2. Whether the alleged agreement of sale dt;20.3.2016 is genuine or not?**
- 3. To what relief?.**

5. On behalf of the plaintiff, herself examined as Pw1 and got marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A23 and also examined Pws2 to 4.

6. On behalf of the Defendant, himself examined as Dw1 a got marked Ex.B1 and B2.

7. Heard arguments on both sides. Both the counsels filed their written statements and perused the record.

ISSUE No.1:

8. It is the case of the plaintiff is that she is the absolute owner and possessor of the suit schedule property total an extent of Ac 14.16gts covered under 10 sy numbers situated at Bayannagudem village and the same was purchased by the husband of the plaintiff in the name of her , for the benefit of family members under the 7 numbers of Registered Sale deeds, since then she has been in possession and enjoyment of the property and also filed the original pattadar, passbook and revenue pahanies and Dharani pahanies stands in the name of the plaintiff. And the plaintiff never executed any agreement of sale deed dt:20.3.2016 in respect of the suit schedule property infavour of the defendant and defendant not paid any sale consideration of Rs.84,00,000/- out of Rs.86,00,000/- and remaining balance consideration of Rs.2,00,000/- to be paid to execute the registered sale deed on 19.3.2018 and the said alleged agreement dt 20.3.2016 is created one and fabricated document. The defendant interfered with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of the property on 22.11.2017, and finally on 8.2.2018 and threatened her with dire consequences, as such she filed this suit against the defendant.

To substantiate the case of the plaintiff , plaintiff examined as a Pw1 and also examined Pw2 as independent witness and Pw3 neighbouring agriculturists and Pw3 who is the witness for intereference by the defendant

and also examined Pw4 who is the son of Pw1 and through the evidence of Pw1, Ex.A1 to A23 were marked.

On the other hand, the contention of the defendant is that the plaintiff offered to sale her suit schedule property i.e., total extent of Ac 14.17gts in different Survey numbers inorder to meet her urgent financial needs and accordingly the defendant agreed to purchase the same for a consideration of sale was entered on 20.3.2016 and defendant paid Rs.84,00,000/- on that day and further the defendant agreed to pay the balance sale consideration of Rs.2,00,000/- after measuring the land by the plaintiff through surveyor in order to execute the regular registered sale deed on or before on 19.3.2018 and the defendant is ready willing to complete part of her performance by paying remaining balance consideration. On demanding the plaintiff several times and meanwhile the plaintiff through her son offer to sale the some of the part of the suit schedule property to the other persons then he got published different notice in Namaste telegana and Sakshi 30.9.2017 when the plaintiff is tried to sale way the suit schedule property to the 3rd parties, then he filed OS No.138/2017 against the plaintiff for specific performance of contract of agreement of sale dt:20.3.2016 before the Hon'ble District Court, Khammam and it was transferred VI Additional District Judge, Sathupally and the said suit was decreed with costs infavour of him on 26.9.2025 directing the defendant to execute regular registered sale deed infavour of him. Hence, request the court to dismiss the suit with costs.

To substantiate the case of the defendant, himself examined as a Dw1 and got marked Ex.B1 and B2.

This suit is filed by the plaintiff to grant Permanent injunction restraining the acts of the defendant over the suit schedule property herein. Hence, this

court did not go in a deep discussion about the title over the suit schedule property as the suit was not for declaration of the title.

9. The burden of proof is always on the person who asserts positively. The expression burden of proof denotes legal burden and it never shifts, where as the onus of proof on the other hand means evidential burden it shifts, basing on the evidence adduced by parties in the suit. In the suit on hand, the plaintiff's are seeking the equitable relief of permanent injunction. In a suit for injunction what becomes relevant is the factum of possession over the suit schedule property as on the date of filing of the suit. Except, as a semblance of legal right to remain in possession, the law does not insist on existence of title in favour of the plaintiff's in a suit of that nature. Reference in title will be only to ensure that the possession claimed by the plaintiff's are not of an out right trespasser or encroacher, but is by a person having semblance of right, any one who wants pronouncement upon the title in his favour, must file a suit for declaration of title.

10. The plaintiff filed the suit for perpetual injunction restraining the defendant. Under such circumstances, the relevant factum of possession over the suit schedule property as on the date of filing of the suit has to be established.

11. The plaintiffs relied upon Exs.A1 to A23 . The burden lies upon the plaintiff for which the plaintiff examined as Pw2 to 4, and relied upon oral and documentary evidence.

12. The plaintiff herself examined as Pw1 and deposed in her evidence in toto the averments got mentioned in the plaint and got marked Ex.A1 to A23. **Ex.A1:**Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:19.6.1987. **Ex.A2:**

Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:20.6.1987. **Ex.A3:** Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:31.5.1982. **Ex.A4:** Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:9.1.1985. **Ex.A5:** Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:29.4.1985. **Ex.A6:** Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:25.5.1987. **Ex.A7:** Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:22.2.1990. **Ex.A8:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.237/E, dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A9:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.236/E, dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A10:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.236/AA,dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A11:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.238/E,dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A12:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.238/AA dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A13:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.81/A dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A14:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.81/EE dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A15:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.No..72/AA dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A16:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.No.72/A dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A17:** Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.No.79/EE, dt:7.10.2017. **Ex.A18:** Mee-seva Copy of ROR 1-B Namuna dt:7.06.2017. **Ex.A19:** Original Pattadar Old pass book in favour of plaintiff (Pw1). **Ex.A20:** Certified Copy of the FIR, Complaint in Cr.NO.20/2018. **Ex.A21:** Original Digital Pattadar Passbook of plaintiff (Pw1). **Ex.A22:** Dharani 1-B Namuna dt;2.12.2024 and **Ex.A23:** Dharani Pahani dt;2.12.2024 consisting of (10)pages.

13. Pw1/Ch.Srilaxmi filed her chief affidavit and reiterated the averments got mentioned in her plaint that she is the absolute owner of the suit schedule property total an extent of Ac 14.16gts and the same was purchased by her husband in favour of her under Ex.A1 to A7 registered sale deed from their vendors, since then she has been in possession over the suit schedule property as per Ex.A8 to A17 pahanies and Ex.A19 original pattadar

pass book ,Ex.A21 original digital pattadar pass book discloses that she is the owner of the total extent of Ac 14.16gts and she never executed any agreement of sale dt:20.3.2016 in favour of the defendant in respect of the suit schedule property and she never received any consideration from him and the agreement of sale deed dt:20.3.2026 fabricated document without any right the defendant interfered with her possession and enjoyment of the property.

14. **Pw2/Ch.Laxmi Krishan Prasad** who is the 3rd party projected as independent witness and he stated in his evidence that the plaintiff is owner and possessor of the suit schedule property total extent of Ac 14.16gts and in the month of November 2017 the defendant illegally interfered into the suit schedule property and damaged the crops. Later the plaintiff lodged a report before the VM Banjara P.S.

15. Pw3/P.Vanapathi Rao who is other neighbouring witness categorically stated that on the same lines of Pw2.

16. Pw4/Ch.Sailesh who is the no other than the son of the plaintiff he categorically stated on the same lines of Pw1.

17. To prove the contention of the defendant, himself examined as Dw1 and got marked Ex.B1 and B2. **Ex.B1:** Certified copy of the Judgement in OS No.138/2017. Dt:26.9.2025. **Ex.B2:** Certified Copy of FIR in Cr.NO.210/2022, U/Secs 420,504,506 r/w 34IPC of II Town PS, Khammam.

18. To substantiate the case of Dw1, he filed his chief affidavit and reiterated the contents of written statement and further stated that the Pw1 executed a agreement of sale dt:20.3.2016 in respect of the suit schedule

property total sale consideration is of Rs.86,00,000/- out of that Rs.84,00,000/- was paid on the date of agreement to Pw1 and the remaining balance of sale consideration of Rs.2,00,000/- would be paid to the Pw1 after measurement of land by Pw1 through surveyor executed regular sale deed infavour of him on or before the 19.3.2018 and when the defendant ready to perform his part of contract to paid the balance amount but the Pw1 postpone the same and trying to sale away the suit schedule property to the 3rd party and the Pw4 who is the son of Pw1 also made advertisements in respect of the sale` of the suit schedule property, then he filed OS No.138/2017 on the file of Hon'ble PDJ Court, Khammam later it was transferred to VI Additional District Judge, Sathupally and it was decreed in his favour on 26.09.2025. As the plaintiff approached this court and suppressed the real facts and filed his false suit against him and he never interfered with the suit schedule property. Hence, request the court to dismiss the suit.

19. The counsel for the defendant cross examined the Pws1 to 4 but no material points were elicited from the moth of the witness to suit the defence of the defendant.

As seen from the evidence of Pws1 to 4 and Dw1 they are relied upon Ex.A1 to A23 and Ex.B1 and B2 respectively.

20. The specific plea of the defendant /Dw1 is that the suit schedule property was purchased by him from the Pw1 under agreement of sale dt:20.3.2016 for total consideration of Rs.86,00,000/- out of that he paid Rs.84,00,000/- and when remaining amount of Rs.2,00,000/- is to be paid to the Pw1, but the Pw1 refused to perform on her part of contract, as such he filed a OS No.138/2017 against the Pw1 for specific performance of contract. And the said suit was decreed infavour of him on 26.9.2025. And he never

interfered with the suit schedule property of Pw1. Hence, request the court to dismiss the suit.

21. A perusal of evidence of Pw1 , Dw1 it is admitted by the Dw1 in his cross examination that the Pw1 is the owner and possessor of the suit schedule property. And she had the title, but the Dw1 specifically denied that he never interfered with the suit schedule property. But the claim of the Dw1 is that he purchased the suit schedule property under agreement of sale dt;20.3.2016 and he paid out of total Sale consideration of Rs.86,00,000/- , Rs.84,00,000/- was paid on the date of agreement and he is ready to pay the balance consideration of Rs.2,00,000/- to Pw1 , but the Pw1 not performed her part of contract , as such he filed OS No.138/2017 for specific performance of contract against the Pw1 and the said suit was decreed infavour of him against this plaintiff on 26.9.2025 but he never interfered with the possession over the suit schedule property.

Admittedly, Pw1 is the owner and possessor of the suit schedule property and a perusal of the Ex.A1 to A7 certified copy of the registered sale deeds, the Pw1 purchased the suit schedule property total an extent of Ac 14.16gts under the 10 survey numbers. Ex.A8 to A10 Meeseva pahanies for the Fasli 1427shows that the Pw1 is the pattadar and possessor of the suit schedule properties covered under Sy.No.237/E, 236/E, 236/AA, 238/E,, 238/AA, 81/A, 81/EE, 72/AA, 72/A, 79/EE and as per Ex.A18 Mee-seva pahani ROR 1-B namuna , Ex.A19 Original pattadar pass book , Ex.A21 Digital pattadar pass book discloses that the Pw1 had an extent of Ac 14.16ggs and the Ex.A22, A23 Dharani 1-B namuna and pahany dt;2.1.2024 consisting of 10pages shows that Pw1 is the pattadar and possessor.

So, as per the Ex.A1 to A7 certified copies of the registered sale deeds the Pw1 is the owner and she had title over the suit schedule property.

So, by filing the Ex.A1 to A23 registered sale deeds, revenue records Pw1 is the absolute owner and possessor of the suit schedule property as on the date of filing of the suit and the said facts was also admitted by the Dw1 in his cross examination.

22. Now, the whether the defendant interfered with the peaceful possession over the suit schedule property as contended by the Pw1. The evidence of Pw1 show that the defendant interfered with the suit schedule property on 22.11.2017 himself and his henchmen came in a Innovacar and threatened and obstructed plaintiff and then she informed to the police, but the police did not take any action, then she approached this court and filed this suit. And further alleged that on 8.2.2018 the police registered the case in Cr.no.20/2018 against the defendant . Pw2, 3 also categorically stated in their evidence that in the month of November 2017 the defendant interfered with the possession over the suit schedule property and damaged crops then the plaintiff given a report to the police. Pw4 also categorically stated about the interference of the defendant. Though the defendant cross examined the Pws1 to 4, no material points were elicited from the mouth of the witness.

23. The evidence of Pws2 and Pw3 who are the independent witness categorically stated about the interference of the defendant over the suit schedule property. So, the evidence of Pws2, Pw3 coupled with the evidence of Pw1 and 4 and also the contents of Ex.A1 to A23. So, the plaintiff proved by adduced the evidence of Pw1 to 4 and Ex.A1 to A23 documents, she is the absolute owner and possessor of the suit schedule property and through the evidence of PW2 to 4, the defendant interfered with the suit schedule

property. Therefore, the plaintiff is entitled for of perpetual injunction. Accordingly this issue is answered infavour of the plaintiff against the defendant.

24. **ISSUE No.2:**

The contention of the defendant is that he purchased the suit schedule property under agreement of sale dt:20.3.2016 and he paid the amount of Rs. Out of total sale consideration of Rs.86,00,000/- he paid Rs.84,00,000/- and two lakhs has to be paid on or before the 19.3.2018 and he is ready to willing to pay the said amount to the Pw1, but she did not come forward to execute the registered sale deed but she is trying to alienate some part of the the said property by way of advertisement through her son/Pw4. Then he field OS No.138/2017 on the file Hon'ble District Judge, Khammam, later this case was transferred to VI Addl.District Judge, Sathupally and the suit was decreed infavour of him on 26.9.2025 but the said Hon'ble court not grant perpetual injunction in the said suit against this plaintiff. And the defendant filed Ex.B1 certified copy of the judgement in OS No.138/2017,d t:26.9.2025.

A perusal of Ex.B1 Judgment and Decree in OS No.138/2017 the subject mater of suit schedule property in OS No.138/2017 and this suit are one and the same .Pw1 also admitted the said fact in her cross examination. So, as the said suit was decided by the Hon'ble VI Addl.District Judge in OS No.138/2017 and the said suit was decreed infavour of this defendant on 26.9.2025 and further the Dw1 admitted that this Plaintiff/pw1 who is defendant in the said suit OS No.138/2017 preferred First appeal No.552/2025 before the Hon'ble High Court against the Judgment and decree passed in OS No.138/2017 and the Hon'ble High Court was granted stay in the said appeal as per orders in IA 1/2025 . So, as the subject matter of

agreement dt:20.3.2016 filed in OS No.138/2017 and the said suit was also pending before the Hon'ble High Court. So, it is not necessary to discuss in respect of the agreement of sale dated 20.3.2016, as it is the case of permanent injunction as such it is not necessary to answer Issue no.2 in respect of the agreement of sale dt:20.3.2016 and moreover appeal is pending before the Hon'ble High Court filed by the Plaintiff in respect to suit schedule property, as such this court not necessary to answer this issue.

ISSUE NO.3:

25. In view of the above foregoing discussion, facts and circumstances of the case, this court comes to conclusion that Plaintiff is entitled for perpetual injunction against the defendant as prayed for.

26. **In the result**, the Suit is Decreed with costs by granting Perpetual Injunction restraining the defendant, his hench men, his agents etc., from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of plaintiff over the suit schedule properties i.e. A & B.

Dictated to the Grade-II Stenographer, transcribed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 29th day of July, 2026.

**SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
SATHUPALLI.**

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE **WITNESSES EXAMINED**

For Plaintiffs

PW.1 Ch.Srilaxmi dt:28.4.2025

PW.2 Ch.Laxmi Krishna prasad,
dt:22.8.2025

For Defendants

Dw.1 K.Raghurami Reddy ,
dt:2.4.2026

PW.3 P.Vanipathi Rao,
dt:10.10.2025.

Pw.4 Ch.Sailesh dt:10.11.2025

EXHIBITS MARKED

For Plaintiffs:-

Ex.A1: Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:19.6.1987.

Ex.A2: Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:20.6.1987.

Ex.A3: Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:31.5.1982.

Ex.A4: Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:9.1.1985.

Ex.A5: Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:29.4.1985.

Ex.A6: Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:25.5.1987.

Ex.A7: Certified Copy of the Sale Deed dt:22.2.1990.

Ex.A8: Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.237/E,
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A9: Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.236/E,
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A10: Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.236/AA
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A11: Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.238/E,
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A12: Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.238/AA
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A13: Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.81/A
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A14: Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.81/EE
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A15:Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.72/AA
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A16:Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO72/A
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A17:Mee-seva Pahani for the Fasli 1427 in respect of Sy.NO.79/EE,
dt:7.10.2017.

Ex.A18:Mee-seva Copy of ROR 1-B Namuna dt:7.06.2017.

Ex.A19: Original Pattadar Old pass book in favour of plaintiff (Pw1).

Ex.A20: Certified Copy of the FIR, Complaint in Cr.NO.20/2018

Ex.A21: Original Digital Pattadar Passbook of plaintiff (Pw1).

Ex.A22: Dharani 1-B Namuna dt;2.12.2024.

Ex.A23: Dharani Pahani dt;2.12.2024 consisting of (10)pages.

For Defendants:-

Ex.B1:Certified copy of the Judgment in OS No.138/2017. Dt:26.9.2025.

Ex.B2: Certified Copy of FIR in Cr.NO.210/2022, U/Secs 420,504,506
r/w 34IPC of II Town PS, Khammam.

**SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
SATHUPALLI.**

