

IN THE VIII ASSISTANT CITY CIVIL COURT AT CHENNAI

Present :Tmt.A.Premavathy, B.A., B.L.,

VIII Assistant Judge

Wednesday, the 25th day of March 2026

O.S.No. 551 of 2024

C.N.R.No.TNCH01-003175-2024

S. Revathy, W/o. D. Sivaraman,
No.16, 40th Street, 8th Sector,
K.K. Nagar, Chennai – 600078.

... Plaintiff

..Vs..

1. P. Gopal, S/o. Late. A. Perumal
2. G. Jagdish, S/o. P. Gopal,
3. A. P. Jayachandran, S/o. Late. A.Perumal
all are residing at No. 18/25,
Ramapuram Ramasamy Street,
Saidapet, Chennai – 600015.
4. P. Jaganathan, S/o. Late. A. Perumal,
No.31, First Cross Street,
Pudhu Saram, Pondicherry - 605013

...Defendants

This suit came up before me for final hearing on 23.03.2026 in the presence of M/s. G. Anbil Magesh, K. Sangeetha and K. Sona counsels for the Plaintiff and M/s. V. Ramana Reddy, V. Chandrasekara Reddy, M. Dhayalan, S. Govarthanan, G. Sambath Kumar counsels for the 1st and 2nd Defendants, M/s. D.M. Nirmal Kumar counsel for 3rd Defendant, M/s. S.Yessudossan and A. Naveen Kumar counsels for 4th Defendant after hearing the arguments and upon perusal of materials on record and this case having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

This suit is filed under Order VII Rule 1 of CPC, a) for declaration declaring the partition deed bearing document No.1613/2023 dated 15.06.2023 and registered at SRO South Chennai Joint 2 executed between 1st defendant 3rd and 4th defendant, in so far as the plaintiff share are concerned as non-est, void and not binding on the plaintiff herein in any manner whatsoever; b) For Declaration declaring the settlement deed document No.1971/2023 dated 12.07.2023 registered at SRO South Chennai Joint-2, executed by 1st defendant in favour of 2nd defendant, in so far as the plaintiff's share are concerned as non-est, void and not binding on the plaintiffs herein in any manner whatsoever; to pay cost of the suit. c) for permanent injunction restraining the defendants his men, agents from alienating or from creating any encumbrance over the suit property.

1) Brief averments of the Plaint filed by the plaintiff is as follows:

The plaintiffs submits that the first defendant is the father of the plaintiff, the second defendant is the younger brother of the plaintiff, the 3rd and 4th defendant is her father's elder brothers. The plaintiff states that from her childhood, her father Mr.P.Gopal would not take care of his children and family and he would not go for work, he use to sit at home ideal and consume alcohol daily, and also he had the habit of abusing her mother on flimsy grounds and even physically attacked her on various occasions. The plaintiff states that on several days her family starved without food and at the young age, the plaintiff saw her father's brutal and cruel behavior before

her eyes and she was deeply affected mentally. The plaintiff states that to protect the plaintiff from the above said worst circumstances, her mother Mrs. Malliga took the plaintiff and came out from the matrimonial home, in the month of May 1980 by leaving her younger son Jagadish (the 2nd defendant) at home. The plaintiff states that her mother as a single person started a vegetable shop on the platform at Purasawakkam market and gradually she developed the business and it helped them to lead a better life. The Plaintiff states that her mother alone as a single parent with great difficulties raised and educated both of them well, from the income earned from her mother's vegetable shop. The plaintiff states that out of the savings of her mother Mrs. Malliga who had purchased a house in her name property bearing Door No.2, 2nd street, Baracca street, Nammalwarpet, Chennai-600012 of an extent of 901 Sq.ft by virtue of a Registered Deed of Sale dated 27.04.1991, Document No.1102/1991 registered at SRO., Purasawakkam and further she had purchased a back portion in the above mentioned property an extent of 765 Sq.ft, by virtue of a Registered Deed of Sale Dated 27.04.1991, Document No.1103/1991 in the name of her son Mr. Jagdish (the 2nd defendant) who was aged about 11 years at the time of purchase. The plaintiff states that as per her mother Mrs.Malliga's last wish she has settled the front portion of the property bearing door No.32/2 Barracca 2nd Street, Nammalwarpet, Chennai – 600012 to her grand sons (the plaintiff's sons) namely S. Dinesh and S. Kamesh through a settlement deed dated 24.01.2023 document No.500 of 2023 registered at SRO., Purasawakkam. The plaintiff states that the 2nd defendant Mr. Jagadish sent a legal notice dated 03.08.2023 to the plaintiff, to her husband, to her

two children and to her mother Mrs. Malliga stating that to come forward to cancel the above said settlement deed doc. No.500 of 2023. The plaintiff further states that her Grand Father Mr.A.Perumal who knows very well about his son Mr.Gopal (the 1st defendant) that he is an irresponsible and spendthrift, thus he wrote a Deed of Will dated 25.10.1990, document No. 64 of 1990 registered at joint SRO., Saidapet, in the said will her grand father allotted the schedule 'C' property in favour of his grand children viz., S. Revathy the plaintiff and the 2nd defendant Mr. Jagdish, after the life period of the 1st defendant Mr. Gopal. The plaintiff states that her mother Mr. Malliga who had constructed a ground and first floor in the said allotted portion to her children. The plaintiff states that instead of probating the said will before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras, the 2nd defendant who is in the ulterior motive to grab the entire property and denying the rights of the plaintiff, he intentionally gave a wrong guidance to the 1st, 3rd and 4th defendants and partitioned the said property by virtue of Partition Deed dated 15.06.2023, registered as document No. 1613 of 2023 at Sub registrar Office South Chennai Joint-2 and after obtaining the share in the said property on very next month i.e., 12.07.2023 the 1st defendant Mr. Gopal settled the said property in favour of his son Mr. Jagdish the 2nd defendant under the Settlement deed dated 12.07.2023, registered as Document No.1971 of 2023 at Sub registrar Office South Chennai Joint-2. As per the condition in the Will, regarding the share of the 1st defendant Mr. Gopal who only having a right to enjoy his share in the property upto his life period and after his life period it should be conveyed to his daughter S.Revathy (the plaintiff) and his son Jagdish (2nd defendant).

2) Brief averments of the Written Statement filed by the 1st and 2nd defendant :

The Defendants No. 1 & 2 submit that, the 1st Defendant is a vegetables vendor doing the said business before getting married. After his marriage the said business is running by him, along with his family members by involving his son Mr. G. Jagadish, i.e. the 2nd Defendant. Thereafter the 1st Defendant joined Defense Services and the said vegetable business was running by the 2nd Defendant Services and the said vegetable business was running by the 2nd Defendant at his young teenage who put his tireless efforts, because of which the business yielded good returns and out of the accrued profit, the 1st Defendant purchased a property to an extent of 901 Sq.ft and the constructed house thereon, comprised in Old Survey Nos. 3183/2 and 3184, New Survey No. 3183/22, bearing Old Door No. 2, New No. 32, Barakka Road 2nd Street, Nammalwarpet, Chennai – 600 012, and an adjacent property at the rear portion to an extent of 765 Sq.ft and the constructed house thereon, comprised in Old Survey No. 3183/2, 3184, New Survey No. 3184/13, bearing Old Door No.2, New No.32, Barakka Road 2nd street, Nammalwarpet, Chennai – 600012, situated at Purasaiwalkam Village, within the Registration District of Central Chennai, and Registration Sub-District of Purasaiwalkam. The Defendants No. 1 & 2 further submit that after the execution of the said sale deed, the 1st Defendant's wife and the 2nd Defendant have jointly mortgaged the subject property with the Catholic Syrian Bank, Purasaiwalkam Branch, vide Doc. No. 5440 of 2014, and it were the Defendants No. 1 & 2 herein, who repaid the loan out of their hard earned

money to redeem the property from the said bank from mortgage. While such facts are being so, in the year 2023, to the utter shock and dismay of the Defendants No. 1 & 2, the 1st Defendant's wife under the instigation of the Plaintiff herein and her husband executed a family settlement deed to and in favor of Mr. S. Dinesh and Mr. S. Kamesh, who are the sons of the plaintiff herein, by way of settlement deed without the concurrence of the 1st Defendant. The Defendants No. 1 & 2 herein further submit that all the acts and misdeeds of plaintiff and her family members who instigated made the Defendants No. 1 & 2 to be trapped under mental harassments. Hence to safeguard the interest of the Defendants No. 1 & 2, they caused a legal notice on 03.08.2023 to the plaintiff herein, her mother, her husband and her two sons. But it was blindly replied by them without any strong counter averment. Hence, the Defendants No. 1 & 2 herein forced to file the suit in O.S. No. 6662 of 2023 on the file of the Hon'ble V Assistant City Civil Court, at Chennai. In order to escape from the legal hurdles, and to retaliate the claim made therein in the above suit in O.S. No. 551 of 2024, without disclosing about the earlier suit. Hence the present suit in O.S. No. 551 of 2024 is per-se non-maintainable as willful concealment of facts. Further both in the earlier suit in O.S. No. 6662 of 2023 and in the present suit in O.S. No. 551 of 2024, the entire disput revolves with respect to the parties among the family members. Hence the plaintiff herein ought to have impleaded necessary parties viz. (1) Mrs. Malliga, (i.e. the mother of the Plaintiff and the 2nd Defendant and wife of the 1st Defendant), (2) Mr. Sivaraman who is the husband of the plaintiff, on whose instigation the entire chapter was concocted by the Plaintiff, (3) Mr. S. Dinesh, (4) Mr.

S. Kamesh, who are the two sons of the plaintiff. Since the plaintiff's mother under the instigation of the Plaintiff had executed a family settlement deed in Doc. No. 500 of 2023, dated 24.01.2023, which became the foremost cause of all the dispute herein. Hence the plaintiff ought to have implead the necessary parties, failing which the suit is liable to be dismissed on the ground of non-joinder of parties.

3) Based on the pleadings set out in the plaint, written statement, this court framed the following issues:

1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of the partition deed dated 15.06.2023 in so far as plaintiff share as void ?
2. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration of the settlement deed dated 12.07.2023 as null and void ?
3. Whether the suit is bad for non joinder of necessary parties ?
4. To what other relief ?
- 4) On the side of the plaintiff, the plaintiff was examined as PW1, and Ex.A1 to A6 were marked. On the side of the 1st and 2nd defendant, the 2nd defendant was examined as DW1 and Ex.B1 to Ex.B5 were marked. The 3rd and 4th defendants were called absent set exparte on 07.08.2025 for non filing of written statement.

5) Issue no. 1 and 2:

- (i) The relationship between the plaintiff and the defendants are admitted. It is the case of the plaintiff that the 1st defendant is the father of the plaintiff. The 2nd defendant is the younger brother of the plaintiff. The 3rd and 4th defendants are the elder brothers of the 1st defendant. The plaintiff mother purchased a house in her name

and also purchased another property in the name of 2nd defendant on 27.04.1991. The plaintiff mother's last wish she settled front portion of the property to her grandsons on 24.01.2023. The 2nd defendant issued a legal notice calling upon his mother to cancel the settlement deed dated 24.01.2023. The grand father of the plaintiff executed a will and allotted the 'c' schedule property in favour of the plaintiff and the 2nd defendant. The Will was not probated. The 1st, 3rd and 4th defendants partitioned the property on 15.06.2023. The 1st defendant executed a settlement deed on 12.07.2023 in favour of the 2nd defendant in respect of his share. The plaintiff was denied her share in the suit property. The learned plaintiff counsel filed written arguments in support of his oral arguments.

(ii) It is the arguments of the Learned defendants 1 and 2 counsel that they have filed a suit against the plaintiff seeking for a relief for declaration and mandatory Injunction in O.S.6662/2023 on the file of V Assistant City Civil Court at Chennai. The declaration is for to declare the settlement deed executed by Malliga in favour of her grandchildren vide Doc No.500/2023 dated 24.01.2023 as null and void. The 1st defendant is a vegetable vendor and thereafter joined defense services and the vegetable business was looked after by the 2nd defendant. The 1st defendant purchased a property measuring to an extent of 901sq.ft at Nammalwarpet and another property measuring 765sq.ft constructed house. The 1st defendant purchased the suit property in the name of Malliga and the adjacent property purchased in the name of the 2nd defendant who was a minor at the time of execution of the sale deed and therefore the sale deed was executed in the name of Malliga on behalf of the 2nd defendant. The 1st

defendant wife and the 2nd defendant jointly mortgaged in the year 2014 and the same was repaid by the defendants 1 and 2. In the year 2023 the defendants 1 and 2 came to know that the 1st defendant wife under the instigation of the plaintiff and her husband executed a family settlement in favour of the plaintiff sons by way of settlement deed. A Legal notice was issued on 03.08.2023 to the plaintiff in this regard a present suit is filed by the plaintiff in order to escape from the legal hurdles the entire disputes revolves with respect to the parties among the family members the plaintiff has suppressed the real facts of the pendency of the O.S.6662/2023 in the above suit. Hence the suit has to be dismissed.

In order to prove the claim of the plaintiff the plaintiff has filed Ex.A1 to A6.

On persual of Ex.A1 it is seen that the 1st defendant father Perumal has executed a registered WILL in favour of his sons and daughter. The E-Schedule property was allotted to the 1st defendant in the WILL which is as follows :

சென்னை, சைதாப்பேட்டை, சப் டிஸ்ட்ரிக்ட் சைதாப்பேட்டை, ராமாபுரம் ராமாசாமி செட்டித் தெரு, 25 ஆம் நம்பர் வீட்டில், வரைபடத்தில் ஆரஞ் நிறமிட்டுள்ள பாகம் வடக்கு தெற்கு 26 அடி கிழக்கு மேற்கு 14 அடி ஆக மொத்தம் 364 சதுர அடிகள் பரப்பளவு. In Ex.A1 it is stated that the suit property was purchased by the 1st defendant for the out of his hard earned money on 17.11.1938 under a registered sale deed. On persual of Ex.A1 it is seen that at the time of the execution of the WILL the plaintiff was aged about 14 years and the 2nd defendant was aged about 12 years both of them were minors. On persual of EX.A2 it is seen that the 1st defendant, the 3rd defendant and A.P.Jayachandaran entered into a

partition deed in respect of the suit property measuring to an extent of 2392 sq.ft. ground and building situated at No.18/25 Ramapuram Ramasamy Chetty street, Sidapet. The 'A schedule' property in Ex.A2 was allotted to A.P.Jayachandaran measuring to an extent of 364 sq.ft with ground and building. The 3rd defendant was allotted 'B' schedule property measuring to an extent of 364 sq.ft with ground and building. The 1st defendant was allotted 'C' schedule property measuring to an extent of 364sq.ft with ground and building. Ex.A3 is a settlement deed dated 12.07.2023 executed by the 1st defendant in favour of the 2nd defendant in respect of his allotted portion measuring to an extent of 364sq.ft along with common passage and undivided share of 546sq.ft. Ex.A4 and A5 of the exchange of legal notices.

6) The evidence of PW1 during the cross examination is as follows:

“இந்த வழக்கில் என்ன பரிகாரம் கேட்டுள்ளேன் என்றால் என் தாதா தன் சொத்தை என் அப்பா பாதுகாக்க வேண்டும் என்று எழுதியுள்ளார் ஆனால் என அப்பா என்னுடைய தம்பியான 2 வது பிரதிவாதிக்கு மட்டும் எழுதியுள்ளார் எனவே நான் அச்சொத்தில் உரிமை கேட்கிறேன். 3 மற்றும் 4 பிரதிவாதிகளுக்கு சொத்தில் என்ன உரிமை உள்ளது என்றால் அவர்களுக்கு சொத்தில் உரிமை உள்ளது. என் அப்பாவுக்கும் என சித்தப்பாக்களுக்கும் பாகப்பிரிவினை ஏற்பட்டதா என்றால் ஏற்பட்டது. வா.சா.ஆ.1 ன் சாராம்சம் என்னவென்றால் என் தாத்தா எழுதிய உயில் அதில் 9 பேரப்பிள்ளைகளுக்கு தான் சேர வேண்டும் என்றும் அவர் பிள்ளைகள் சொத்தை பாதுகாக்க வேண்டும் என்று எழுதப்பட்டுள்ளது. வா.சா.ஆ.1 யை நீதிமன்றத்தில் Probate செய்தோமா என்றால் எனக்கு தெரியாது. வா.சா.ஆ.2 குடும்ப சொத்தில்

2023 ல் பாகப்பிரிவினை ஏற்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரி. வ.சா.ஆ.2 ன் படி என் அப்பாவுக்குதான் அவருடைய சொத்தில் முழு உரிமை இருக்கிறது என்றால் சரி. அதன் அடிப்படையில்தான் என் அப்பா என் தம்பிக்கு வா.சா.ஆ.3 Settlement Deed எழுதி வைத்தார் என்றால் சரி. உயில்படி என் அப்பாவும் சித்தப்பாக்களும் பாகப்பிரிவினை செய்து கொண்டதால் உயில் invalid ஆகிவிட்டது என்றும் பாகப்பிரிவினைப்படி என் அப்பாவும் என் சித்தப்பாக்களும் பிரித்துக்கொண்டு அதன்படி தான் அவர்கள் ஆண்டு அனுபவித்து வருகிறார்கள் என்றால் சரி.” From the evidence of PW1, it is seen that the plaintiff is claiming right over the suit property based on the Ex.A1 the registered WILL dated 25.10.1990 executed by her grandfather Perumal. It is admitted by the plaintiff that the 3rd and 4th defendants have rights in the property. It is also admitted that the plaintiff's father and the 3rd defendant and his brother have entered a partition deed in respect of their father's property as per the WILL dated 25.10.1990. It is also further admitted that the WILL dated that on 25.10.1990 was not probated. It is further admitted that after the partition among the 1st defendant and his brothers the WILL dated 25.10.1990 becomes invalid.

7) On the other hand the defendant has filed Ex.B1 to Ex.B5 in support of his defense. On perusal of Ex.B1 which is the sale deed dated 27.04.1991. It is seen that a sale deed was executed in favour of the 1st defendant wife Malliga, the plaintiff mother in respect of the property situated at Kilpauk, Purasawalkam, Nammalwarpet. Ex.B2 is the sale deed dated 27.04.1991 executed in favour of the 2nd defendant who was a minor at that time and represented by the 1st defendant as guardian. In respect of the

property situated at Kilpauk, Purasawalkam, Nammalwarpet. Ex.A3 is the settlement deed dated 25.01.2023 executed by the plaintiff mother Malliga in favour of the plaintiff's sons Dinesh and Kamesh in respect of the property situated at Nammalwarpet. Ex.B4 is the plaint copy of the O.S.6662/2023. On perusal of Ex.B4 it is seen that the 1st and 2nd defendant have filed O.S.6662/2023 against the plaintiff and her mother and others seeking for a relief of declaration to declare the settlement deed dated 24.01.2023 as null and void and also for a Mandatory Injunction. Ex.B5 is written statement filed by the plaintiff herein in O.S.6662/2023.

8) On perusal of the evidence of DW1 he has deposed the following:

“ இந்த வழக்கு என்ன பரிகாரம் கேட்டு தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் என தகப்பனாரின் சொத்தை என் பெயருக்கு என் தகப்பனார் எழுதி வைத்தார், அந்த சொத்தில் பாதி பாகம் கேட்டு வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளார். தாவா சொத்தின் தற்போது உரிமையாளர் நான் என்றால் சரிதான். தாவா சொத்து குறித்து எனது தாத்தா பெருமாள் உயில் ஒன்று எழுதி வைத்த விவரம் எனக்கு தெரியுமா என்றால் தெரியும். வழக்கு சொத்து யாருக்கு சொந்தமானது என்றால் என் தகப்பனாருக்கு சொந்தமானது. காலி மனை எனது தாத்தாவிடமிருந்து சொந்தமானது, அதில் உள்ள கட்டிடம் என் தகப்பனார் கட்டினார். எந்த வருடம் கட்டிடம் கட்டினார் என்றால் 1995 ல் கட்டினார். சட்டப்படி சென்னை மாநகராட்சி எல்லைக்குட்பட்டுள்ள சொத்துக்களில் உயில் எழுதப்பட்டிருந்தால் அதனை மாண்புமிகு சென்னை உயர்நீதிமன்றத்தில் Probate செய்ய வேண்டும் அவ்வாறு ஏதேனும் Probate மனு தாக்கல் செய்யப்பட்டதா என்றால் இல்லை.” From the evidence of DW1 it is seen that the

2nd defendant has knowledge about the WILL and the same was not probated. It is also admitted that the suit building belongs to the 1st defendant, the vacant land belong to the 2nd defendant grandfather.

9) Admittedly the plaintiff has filed the above suit for declaration of the partition deed dated 15.06.2023 as null and void and the settlement deed dated 12.07.2023 as null and void. It is admitted by both the plaintiff and the defendant 1 and 2 that the suit property absolutely belongs to the 1st defendant father Perumal which is also evident from Ex.A1 the WILL dated 25.10.1990. It is also admitted by both the parties that a WILL was executed by the 1st defendant father in respect of his property and a share was allotted to the 1st defendant in the WILL. It is settled law that when a person claims right based on a WILL the same has **to be proved under section 68 of the Evidence Act 1872, which clearly states as follows:-**

“ If a document is required by law to be attested, it shall not be used as evidence until one attesting witness at least has been called for the purpose of proving its execution, if there be an attesting witness alive, and subject to the process of the court and capable of giving evidence:

[Provided that it shall not be necessary to call an attesting witness in proof of the execution of any document, not being a will, which has been registered in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Registration Act, 1908 (16 of 1908), unless its execution by the person by whom it purports to have been executed is specifically denied].” **In this aspect the Hon’ble High Court of Madras in the case of K.R. Sethupathy and another Vs Parvathy and others in its judgment dated**

14.09.2018 observed that “the burden of proving the existence or due execution of the WILL is on the person who asserts that a WILL has in fact been executed by the testator”. In this case the plaintiff has deliberately failed to prove the genuinity of the WILL under section 68 of the Evidence Act.

10) It is settled principles of law that a self acquired property does not automatically assume the character of ancestral /coparcenary property merely because it devolves upon heirs. On the death of the 1st defendant father, succession opened under section 8 of the Hindu Succession Act. The shares inherited by his sons were held by them in their individual capacity as absolute owners. Therefore the 1st defendant is entitled to enter into a partition deed with his brothers regarding the inherited property. Once a specific share is allotted to the 1st defendant, he becomes the absolute owner with full rights of alienation. The plaintiff, being the daughter of the 1st defendant cannot claim a birth right in property inherited by her father from his father when such property was the grandfather’s self acquired property devolving under section 8 of the Hindu Succession Act.

11) From the perusal of the plaint it is seen that the plaintiff has suppressed the pendency of O.S.6662/2023 on the file of V Assistant City Civil Court in the plaint. It is settled law that person suppressing material facts and approaching the court with unclean hands are not liable to get any relief from the court. **The Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of Arunima Baruah Vs Union of India and others reported in 2007 (6) SCC page 120 held that “law is well settled that the fact suppressed the material in the sense that it would have an effect on the merits of the case. The**

concept of suppression or non disclosure of facts transcends mere concealment.”

The above citation applies to this case.

12) Admittedly the plaintiff has not impleaded her mother who is the wife of the 1st defendant and the husband of the plaintiff Sivaraman and his sons S. Dinesh and S. Kamesh in the above suit. Therefore the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties. Accordingly issue no.1 to 3 are answered against the plaintiff.

13) Issue no. 4:-

As already issue no. 1 to 3 have been discussed elaborately the plaintiff is not entitled to any other relief.

14) From analysing the Oral and documentary evidence of both sides this court comes to conclusion that the plaintiff has deliberately failed to prove her case. Therefore she is not entitled for the relief as prayed for in the plaint. Hence the suit is dismissed.

In the result, this suit is dismissed. No costs.

Directly dictated to the steno-typist and directly computerized by her, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, on this the 25th day of March 2026.

**VIII Assistant Judge,
City Civil Court, Chennai.**

Plaintiff's side witness:

PW1 - S.Revathy

Plaintiff side Exhibits:

- Ex.A1 25.10.1990 - Deed of will Doc.No.64/1990 – Certified copy
- Ex.A2 15.06.2023 - Partition deed Doc.No.1613/2023 – Certified copy
- Ex.A3 12.07.2023 - Settlement Deed Doc.No.1971/2023 – Certified copy
- Ex.A4 03.08.2023 - Legal Notice sent by defendants to the plaintiff - Original
- Ex.A5 26.10.2023 - Reply Notice sent by the plaintiff's mother to
the defendants- Original
- Ex.A6 - Encumbrance Certificate – Online copy

Defendants side Witness:

DW1 - Jagdish

Defendants side Exhibits:

- Ex.A1 27.04.1991 - Sale deed vide Doc. 1102 of 1991 – Certified copy
- Ex.A2 27.04.1991 - Sale deed vide Doc. 1103 of 1991– Certified copy
- Ex.A3 25.01.2023 - Settlement Deed vide Doc.No.500 of 2023 – Certified copy
- Ex.A4 30.10.2023 - Complaint in O.S. No. 6662 of 2023 on the file of
V Assistant City Civil Court – Office copy.
- Ex.A5 14.06.2024 - Written statement in O.S. No. 6662 of 2023 on the file of
V Assistant City Civil Court – Office copy.

**VIII Assistant Judge,
City Civil Court, Chennai.**