

Received on	:	08/05/2019
Registered on	:	08/05/2019
Decided on	:	30/04/2026
Duration		Yrs Months Days
		06 11 22

**BEFORE THE 2<sup>nd</sup> ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL COURT**

**AT JUNAGADH.**

**SPECIAL CIVIL SUIT NO.23/2019**

**Ex.**

Prakash Dadubhai Basiya  
Age: 35 years, Occupation: Agriculture  
Religion: Hindu, R/o: Behind Ayurvedic Pharmacy,  
Joshipura, Junagadh.

... Plaintiff

Versus

Varshaben Savjibhai Visavadiya  
Age: 43 years, Occupation: Housework  
Religion: Hind, R/o. "Shriji Vandana" Apartment,  
4th Floor, Block No. 405, Lane near LPG Pump,  
Zanzarda Road, Junagadh.

... Defendant

APPEARANCES :

Mr. J. L. Thummar – Ld. Advocate for the plaintiff.  
Mr. B.M. Raval, Ld. Advocate for defendant.

Suit:- For declaring Sale Deed Registration No. 3658 dated 27/08/2018 as illegal, without consideration and void ab initio, and for cancellation of the said document.

**-:: J U D G M E N T ::-**

- (1) The plaintiff most respectfully submits as under:
- (1.1) The plaintiff is the owner and is in possession of the property situated within the limits of Junagadh Municipal Corporation, Junagadh Taluka, Junagadh

District, State of Gujarat, at village Zanzarda, Revenue Survey No. 39/P-5, admeasuring 1 Acre 0 Gunthas, converted to non-agricultural land for residential purpose. As per the layout plan, plots bearing Nos. 19 to 24 admeasuring total 672.15 sq. meters, upon which a multi-storeyed building known as “Shriji Vandana” is constructed. On the fourth floor of the said building is a residential Flat No. 405 having a built-up area of 38.28 sq. meters, which property stood in the name, ownership and possession of the plaintiff.

- (1.2) While the plaintiff intended to sell the said property and was showing it to prospective buyers, through a broker the plaintiff came to know that the defendant desired to purchase the property by taking finance from a finance company. The defendant contacted the plaintiff, and the plaintiff first asked her to inspect the property. After inspection, the defendant liked the property and requested for a reasonable price. After mutual discussion and negotiation, the deal was finalized for Rs. 9,99,000/-.
- (1.3) Pursuant to the finalized deal, the defendant paid Rs. 19,000/- as earnest money, and it was agreed that the remaining amount would be paid by cheque.
- (1.4) The defendant informed the plaintiff that she had a cheque of Rs. 8,60,000/- issued by Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd. in the plaintiff's name and also had Rs. 1,20,000/- in cash. On the date of execution of the sale deed i.e. 27/08/2018, the defendant paid Rs. 1,20,000/- in cash to the plaintiff. Together with the earlier earnest money of Rs. 19,000/-, the plaintiff received a total of Rs. 1,39,000/-. The defendant stated that the cheque of

Rs. 8,60,000/- drawn on Axis Bank, Ahmedabad Branch, Cheque No. 525854 dated 14/08/2018, issued by Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd., would be handed over to the plaintiff. The defendant stated that the cheque was sent for Xerox copy after mentioning its details in the sale deed and asked the plaintiff to register the document at the Sub-Registrar's office. At that time, Harshadbhai Hareshbhai Masaliya, an acquaintance of the plaintiff, stated that he knew the defendant well and assured the plaintiff to proceed with registration, saying the cheque Xerox would be returned. Trusting the defendant and the said witness, the plaintiff executed and registered the sale deed bearing Registration No. 3657 dated 27/08/2018.

- (1.5) Before registration of the sale deed, the defendant informed the plaintiff that she had no house to reside in. Hence, after the deal was finalized and before registration, the plaintiff permitted the defendant to reside in the property. The defendant shifted her household goods into the suit property, and the property is presently in possession of the defendant.
- (1.6) After paying Rs. 1,39,000/-, the defendant was required to pay the balance amount of Rs. 8,60,000/- by cheque of Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd., Axis Bank, Ahmedabad Branch. However, under the pretext of making a Xerox copy, the defendant never handed over the cheque. When the plaintiff contacted Harshadbhai Masaliya and informed him about initiating criminal proceedings and cancellation of the document, he assured the plaintiff that he would obtain and deliver the cheque and took responsibility, due to which the plaintiff did not immediately file a criminal complaint.
- (1.7) Till date, the defendant has not handed over the cheque of Rs. 8,60,000/-

mentioned in the sale deed. Since the full sale consideration has not been paid, the sale deed is void ab initio. Further, by mentioning cheque details and amount in the sale deed and thereafter not delivering the cheque, the defendant has committed cheating and breach of trust. Therefore, the plaintiff issued a legal notice dated 30/03/2019 through his advocate by Registered A.D., which was duly served on the defendant. Despite this, the defendant has neither complied with the notice nor paid the remaining amount.

- (1.8) The cause of action arose when, after fixing the total consideration of Rs. 9,99,000/-, the defendant paid only Rs. 1,39,000/- and failed to pay the balance Rs. 8,60,000/-, despite repeated demands and legal notice. The defendant has neither paid the amount nor vacated the property nor returned possession, and hence the cause of action is continuing.
- (1.9) The defendant, by deceit, got the sale deed executed by falsely promising to pay Rs. 8,60,000/-. The plaintiff is still entitled to recover the said amount with interest. If during pendency of the suit the defendant transfers, mortgages, gifts or otherwise alienates the property or gets revenue entries mutated, the plaintiff will suffer irreparable loss. Hence, an application for interim injunction has also been filed.

**Prayer:** Therefore, the plaintiff humbly prays that:

- (A) The sale deed dated 27/08/2018, Registration No. 3658, registered at Sub-Registrar Office, Junagadh, relating to Flat No. 405 in "Shriji Vandana" building situated at village Zanzarda, Junagadh, for which only Rs. 1,39,000/- was paid out of total consideration of Rs. 9,99,000/-, and the balance Rs. 8,60,000/- was neither paid nor cheque delivered, be declared illegal, bogus, without consideration and void ab initio, and be cancelled,

and directions be issued to the Sub-Registrar, Junagadh to cancel the registration.

- (B) The defendant be directed to hand over peaceful, vacant and actual possession of the suit property to the plaintiff.
- (C) A permanent injunction be granted restraining the defendant from transferring, selling, gifting, mortgaging, or otherwise alienating the suit property or getting any revenue entries mutated in her name.
- (D) Any other relief deemed fit in the interest of justice and costs of the suit be awarded against the defendant.
- (E) In the alternative, if cancellation of sale deed is not granted, the defendant be directed to pay the balance sale consideration of Rs. 8,60,000/- with interest @ 12% per annum, and the same be recovered from the defendant's movable and immovable properties.

2. The summons has been served upon defendant. The defendant has appeared through her learned advocate and filed an application vide exh.31 to open her right to file written statement of the suit. The application filed vide exh.31 was allowed with cost of Rs. 1,000/- to deposit before the DLSA. Though the defendant has not paid cost amount and not comply the condition of the order passed below exh. 31. The written statement was not recorded in toto.

3. The plaintiffs' side has led the oral evidence and produced the documentary evidence as under:

(A) **Oral evidence:**

Sr. No.	Exhibit	Details
1	Ex.18	Affidavit of examination in chief of the plaintiff Mr. Prakashbhai Dadubhai Basiya.
2	Ex.20	Affidavit of examination in chief of the plaintiff witness Mr. Harshadbhai Hareshbhai Masaliya.

**(B) Documentary evidence :**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Details</b>
1	22	Copy of the sale deed no. 3658.
2	23	Notice given by the plaintiff to defendant.
3	24	Window slip of R.P.Ad. Of notice.
4	25	Acknowledgment receipt of the notice.
5	26	Copy of the sale deed no. 4455/15.
6	41	A letter written by the plaintiff's witness.
7	54	Account statement of the plaintiff from the year 2018 to 2024 of ICICI Bank.
8	55	Closing pursis.

4. It appears on perusal of the record that the right of the Defendant to lead the evidence has been closed by the Court vide order passed below exh. 56 dtd. 14/08/2025
5. I have gone through the Oral and Documentary evidence produced by the plaintiff and also perused the record.
6. Following issues have been framed vide exh.14 for determination of the suit :

**I S S U E S**

1. Whether the plaintiff proves that, plaintiff and defendant entered into agreement to sale the property situated at Junagadh vide Revenue Survey No. 39/p-5 Acre 1.00 Guntha for converted into residential purpose upon plot No. 19 to 24, Multi Storey Building namely "Shreeji Vandana", 4th Floor, Plot No. 465, Plot open area 38.28 Sq.Mtr. ?
2. Whether the plaintiff proves that, defendant paid him Rs.19,000/- as an earnest money and Rs.1,20,000/- by by cash?
3. Whether the plaintiff proves that, defendant told him that he has written cheque No.525854 dt.14.8.2018 for Rs.8,60,000/- in

favour plaintiff Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd., Axis Bank Ltd., Ahmedabad Branch ?

4. Whether the plaintiff proves that, defendant told him that the original cheque No.525854 for Rs.8,60,000/- Capital dt.14.8.2018 Finance Company Ltd., Axis Bank Ltd., Ahmedabad Branch sent for xerox copy, execute sale deed in his favour and then after not given original cheque to him ?
5. Whether the plaintiff proves that, defendant not paid him cheque amount for Rs.8,60,000/- and did not receive full consideration of executed sale deed in favour of defendant ?
6. Whether the plaintiff proves that the said sale deed is found ab-initio, illegal and without consideration ?
7. Whether the plaintiff proves entitle to get remedy as prayed for ?
8. What order and decree ?
7. The following are the answers to the above issues in light of the material available on record :-

1. In affirmative.
2. In affirmative.
3. In affirmative.
4. In affirmative.
5. In affirmative.
6. In affirmative.
7. Partly in affirmative.
8. As per final order.

### **: REASONS :**

#### **Issue Nos. 1 to 6 :-**

8. Above issues are interconnected and inter linked with each other and findings of one issue depends upon another and to avoid

frequent repetition of the facts; I have decided to discuss the above issues together by common discussion and reasoning for the sake of convenience.

9. Considering the provisions of Sections 101 to 103 of the Indian Evidence Act, the primary burden of proof to prove the issues lie upon the plaintiff itself i.e. *factum probandum*. To discharge his burden, the plaintiff has submitted his oral evidence in form of affidavits at Exh. 18 as per the provisions of under Order 18 Rule 4 of the Code of Civil Procedure. He has stated the facts as per the plaint at Exhibit 1. Therefore, to avoid repetition, the same is not reproduced here. Further, the plaintiff's witness at exh. 18 Mr. Harshadbhai Hareshbhai Masaliya has filed his examination-in-chief in form of affidavit vide exh.20, wherein, he has submitted that I know both the plaintiff and the defendant of this case very well, when the plaintiff was to execute the sale deed, he informed me, and accordingly, I remained present at the Sub-Registrar Office, Junagadh on 27/08/2018 and at that time, an amount of Rs. 1,20,000 (Rupees One Lakh Twenty Thousand only) was paid in cash by the defendant to the plaintiff in my presence. That, as stated by both the plaintiff and the defendant, an earlier amount of Rs. 19,000 (Rupees Nineteen Thousand only) had already been paid by the defendant to the plaintiff towards the consideration of the property and the said property belongs to the plaintiff, situated within the limits of Junagadh Municipal Corporation, Village Zanzarda, Taluka Junagadh, District Junagadh, Gujarat State, bearing Revenue Survey No. 39/P-5, admeasuring 1 acre, converted into non-agricultural land for residential purposes. It is

also submitted that as per the layout plan, the land includes plots numbered 19 to 24, having a total area of approximately 672.15 sq. meters, upon which a multi-storey building named "Shrijivandana" is constructed. Further, the flat in question is Flat No. 405, situated on the fourth floor of the said building, having a built-up area of 38.28 sq. meters, the total sale consideration for the said property was agreed at Rs. 9,99,000 (Rupees Nine Lakhs Ninety-Nine Thousand only) and out of this, Rs.19,000 was paid earlier, Rs.1,20,000 was paid in cash on the date of execution of the document, the remaining amount of ₹8,60,000 (Rupees Eight Lakhs Sixty Thousand only) was to be paid by the defendant to the plaintiff and for this remaining amount, a cheque issued by Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd., drawn on Axis Bank, Ahmedabad Branch, bearing cheque number 5854, dated 14/08/2018, was mentioned in the sale deed. Further, the defendant stated that the original cheque had been sent for Xerox copying and that a copy would be provided, and accordingly, the registration process of the sale deed was initiated at the Sub-Registrar Office, at that time, he was present and since I knew the defendant, Mrs. Varshaben Savjibhai Visavadiya, well, I informed the plaintiff that he may proceed with the registration as the cheque copy would be provided, I assured that she is a good person and relying on his assurance, the plaintiff executed and registered the sale deed on 27/08/2018, bearing document number 3657. He signed the said document as witness before the Sub-Registrar Office, Junagadh. Thus, the plaintiff trusted the defendant and executed the sale deed by incorporating the cheque

details of Capital Fin Finance Ltd. in the document. However, the defendant has neither provided the original cheque nor its Xerox copy to the plaintiff. Even as of today, no payment as per the said cheque has been made by the defendant to the plaintiff. Therefore, when he asked the defendant to make the payment to the plaintiff, she did not give any response, therefore, I advised the plaintiff to take legal action, and accordingly, the present case has been filed by the plaintiff. Further, all the above facts are true to my personal knowledge, as I was present on the date of execution of the document, i.e., 27/08/2018, at the Sub-Registrar Office, Junagadh, and he had signed the sale deed bearing document number 3657 as witnesses.

It appears on perusal of the record that nobody on behalf of the defendant remained present to cross examine the plaintiff as well as his witness and also not come forward to lead any evidence in the matter, therefore, the right of the defendant to cross examine the plaintiff and his witness as well as the right to lead evidence of the defendant has been closed by the Court.

The plaintiff-side has produced documentary evidence at Exhibits 22 to 26, 41 & 54 in support of his case. The defendant-side has neither produced any documentary evidence nor led any oral evidence on record.

- 10.** Now, on perusal of the entire evidence on record in form of oral as well as documentary evidence produced by the plaintiff vide exh.22 to 26, 41 & 54, the plaintiff in his affidavit of examination-in-chief deposed that the plaintiff is the owner and is in possession of the

property situated within the limits of Junagadh Municipal Corporation, Junagadh Taluka, Junagadh District, State of Gujarat, at village Zanzarda, Revenue Survey No. 39/P-5, admeasuring 1 Acre 0 Gunthas, converted to non-agricultural land for residential purpose and as per the layout plan, plots bearing Nos. 19 to 24 admeasuring total 672.15 sq. meters, upon which a multi-storeyed building known as “Shriji Vandana” is constructed and on the fourth floor of the said building is a residential Flat No. 405 having a built-up area of 38.28 sq. meters, which property stood in the name, ownership and possession of the plaintiff.

It also becomes clear from the entire evidence on record that the defendant desired to purchase the property by taking finance from a finance company thus defendant contacted the plaintiff and the deal was finalized for Rs. 9,99,000/- and accordingly, pursuant to the finalized deal, the defendant paid Rs. 19,000/- as earnest money and it was agreed that the remaining amount would be paid by cheque but the defendant informed the plaintiff that she had a cheque of Rs. 8,60,000/- issued by Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd. in the plaintiff's name and also had Rs. 1,20,000/- in cash. It also becomes clear that on the date of execution of the sale deed i.e. 27/08/2018, the defendant paid Rs. 1,20,000/- in cash to the plaintiff, together with the earlier earnest money of Rs. 19,000/-, the plaintiff received a total of Rs. 1,39,000/- but the defendant stated that the cheque of Rs. 8,60,000/- drawn on Axis Bank, Ahmedabad Branch, Cheque No. 525854 dated 14/08/2018, issued by Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd., would be handed over to the plaintiff because the cheque was sent for Xerox copy after mentioning its details in the sale deed and asked the plaintiff to register the document at the Sub-Registrar's office and trusting the defendant and the said witness, the plaintiff executed and registered the sale deed bearing Registration No. 3657 dated 27/08/2018. However, under the

pretext of making a Xerox copy, the defendant never handed over the cheque of Rs. 8,60,000/- mentioned in the sale deed and thus since the full sale consideration has not been paid, the sale deed is void ab initio. It also appears from the record that the plaintiff issued a legal notice dated 30/03/2019 through his advocate by Registered A.D., which was duly served on the defendant. Despite this, the defendant has neither complied with the notice nor paid the remaining amount.

- 11.** The witness examined vide exh.20 namely Mr. Harshadbhai Hareshbhai Masaliya also supported the oral version of the plaintiff. It further appears from the record that above evidence of the plaintiff has not been challenged by the defendants by way of producing any documentary evidence, therefore, there is no reason to disbelieve the say of the plaintiff on oath. Considering the entire oral as well as documentary evidence as a whole, the defendant has neither appeared before this Court nor produced any rebuttal, contrary, cogent and convincing defending evidence on record. The plaintiff has also not been cross-examined by the defendant. Under these circumstances, as discussed above, the evidence submitted by the plaintiff side remain unchallenged and convincing.
- 12.** The plaintiff side has produced documentary evidence vide exh. 22 to 26, 41 and 54 in support of his oral evidence. Bare perusal of sale deed produced vide exh.26, it is found that the plaintiff has purchased disputed suit property from one Mr. Beren Manishbhai Gosai through sale deed registration no. 4455 dtd. 16/11/2015 and by way of said transaction, the plaintiff became sole owner of the

suit property. Moreover, on perusal of sale deed produced vide exh.22, it is found that the plaintiff has executed sale deed in favour of the defendant worth consideration of Rs. 9,99,000/-. It is stated in the sale deed that the defendant has paid Rs. 19,000/- in cash to the plaintiff and Rs. 1,20,000/- on 14/08/2018 as a earnest money. Together with the earlier earnest money, the plaintiff received a total of Rs. 1,39,000/-. Considering the same, the plaintiff remain successful to prove that the plaintiff and the defendant entered into agreement and the defendant had paid earnest money of Rs. 1,20,000/- by cash to the plaintiff. Hence, I answer Issue Nos. 1 & 2 in affirmative.

13. The plaintiff in his written deposition on oath deposed that the defendant told him that the cheque of Rs. 8,60,000/- drawn on Axis Bank, Ahmedabad branch bearing cheque no. 525854 dated 14/08/2018 issued by Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd., would be handed over to the plaintiff. It is further deposed that the defendant further told to the plaintiff that cheque was sent for xerox copy after mentioning its details in the sale deed and asked the plaintiff to register the document at the sub-registrar office. It is further deposed by the plaintiff that at that time, Harshadbhai Hareshbhai Masaliya, an acquaintance of the plaintiff, stated that he knew the defendant well and assured the plaintiff to proceed with registration, saying the cheque xerox would be returned, and trusting the defendant and said witness, the plaintiff executed and registered the sale deed bearing registration no. 3657 dtd. 27/08/2018.

14. It is further deposed by the plaintiff that before registration of the sale deed, the defendant informed the plaintiff that she had no house to reside in. Hence the deal was finalized and before registration, the plaintiff permitted the defendant to reside in the property. The defendant shifted her household goods into the suit property and the property is presently in possession of the defendant. It is further deposed that after paying Rs. 1,39,000/- the defendant was required to pay the balance amount of Rs. 8,60,000/- by cheque of Capital Fin Finance Company Ltd., however, under the pretext of making a xerox copy, the defendant never handed over the cheque.
15. The plaintiff has also produced bank statement vide exh. 54 and bare perusal of the same, the plaintiff remain successful to prove that the cheque amount was not deposited in the bank account of the plaintiff.

It further appears from the record that above evidence of the plaintiff has not been challenged by the defendant by way of producing any oral as well as documentary evidence. Therefore, no reasons to disbelieve the oral and documentary evidence produced by the plaintiff. Considering the same, the plaintiff side remain successful to prove that the defendant told him that he has written cheque no. 525854 dtd. 14/08/2018 for Rs. 8,60,000 in favour of plaintiff and also plaintiff proved that the defendant had told him that the original cheque of Rs. 8,60,000/- dtd. 14/08/2018 was sent for xerox copy and assure the plaintiff

to execute sale deed in her favour and then after not given original cheque to him. The plaintiff side also remain successful to prove that the defendant not paid him cheque amount of Rs. 8,60,000/- and the plaintiff did not received full consideration of sale amount. Hence, I answer the Issue no. 3 to 5 in affirmative.

**16.** The plaintiff in his deposition vide exh. 18 has deposed that till date, the defendant has not handed over the cheque of Rs. 8,60,000/- mentioned in the sale deed. Since the full sale consideration has not been paid, the sale deed is void ab initio. This Court has given its careful consideration to this submission of the plaintiff. It is an admitted position that the defendant did not step into a witness box. There is a specific pleading that the sale deed dtd. 14/08/2018 was null and void as the same was without consideration.

**17. Section 54 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1982 (for short "T.P.Act.) reads thus :**

**54.** Sale defined - "sale " is a transfer of ownership in exchange for a price paid or promised or part paid and part promised.

Sale how made - such transfer, in the case of tangible immovable property of the value of one hundred rupees and upwards or in the case of reversion or other intangible can be made only by a registered instrument.

In the case of tangible immovable property of a value less than one hundred rupees, such transfer may be made either by a registered instrument or by delivery of the property.

Delivery of tangible immovable property takes place when the seller places the buyer or such person as he directs, in possession of the property.

Contract for sale - a contract for the sale of immovable property is a contract that a sale of such property shall take place on terms settled between the parties.

It does not of itself create any interest in or charge on such property.

Hence, a sale of an immovable property has to be for a price. The price may be payable in future. It may be partly paid and the remaining part can be made payable in future. The payment of price is an essential part of a sale covered by sec.54 of the T.P.Act. If a sale deed in respect of an immovable property is executed without payment of price and if it does not provide for the payment of price at a future date, it is not a sale at all in the eyes of law. It is of no legal effect. Therefore, such a sale will be void. It will not affect the transfer of the immovable property.

- 18.** If we considered the fact of the case in hand, the sale deed record that the consideration has been paid. It is specific case made out in the plaint that the sale deed is void as the same is without consideration. No evidence was adduced by the defendant about the payment of the price mentioned in the sale deed. Hence, the sale deed will have to be held as void being executed without consideration. Hence, the sale deed did not

affect any right on the suit property. Thus, the sale deed dtd. 27/08/2018 will not confer any right, title and interest of the defendant as the sale deed will have to be ignored being void. At this juncture, the citation **Keval Krishan V/s. Rajesh kumar & Ors. etc., reported in 2021 Lawsuit (SC) 752 and the case of Shanti devi (since deceased) through Lrs. Goran V/s. Jagandevi & Ors. judgment passed in Civil Appeal No. 11795 of 2025** relied by the plaintiff are helpful to the case of plaintiff. In such circumstances, in absence of the sale consideration, the sale deed would be void and the plaintiff remain successful to prove that the sale deed is found ab void initio, illegal and without consideration. Hence, I answered Issue No. 6 in affirmative.

**Issue Nos. 7 & 8:-**

19. Considering all the above facts and circumstances of the case and evidence on record, the plaintiff remain successful to prove Issues nos. 1 to 6 in affirmative, therefore, the plaintiff is entitled for the relief as reasoning stated accordingly. Hence I answer Issue No.7 in affirmative and pass the following order in the interest of justice qua Issue no.8:-

**: O R D E R :-**

1. The suit of plaintiff is hereby allowed.
2. The sale deed dated 27/08/2018, Registration No. 3658, registered at Sub-Registrar Office, Junagadh, relating to Flat No. 405 in "Shriji Vandana" building situated at village Zanzarda, Junagadh, is hereby declared illegal, bogus, without consideration and void ab initio.

3. The Sub-Registrar, Junagadh is hereby directed to cancel the registration of the sale deed dated 27/08/2018, Registration No. 3658, registered at Sub-Registrar Office, Junagadh, relating to Flat No. 405 in “Shriji Vandana” building situated at village Zanzarda, Junagadh.
4. Yadi be made to the Sub-Registrar, Junagadh for compliance of this order within 60 days from the date of this order.
5. The defendant is hereby directed to hand over peaceful, vacant and actual possession of the suit property to the plaintiff within one month from the date of this order.
6. A permanent injunction is hereby granted restraining the defendant from transferring, selling, gifting, mortgaging, or otherwise alienating the suit property or getting any revenue entries mutated in her name from the date of this order.
7. The defendant to pay the costs of the suit to the plaintiff and bear her own.
8. Decree to be drawn accordingly.

Pronounced in the open Court on this 30th Day of April, 2026.

Place:Junagadh.  
Date:30/04/2026

[Gauravkumar Somabhai Darji]  
2<sup>nd</sup> Addl. Senior Civil Judge  
Junagadh.  
Code No. GJ01475