

KABC010112682019



**IN THE COURT OF V ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND
SESSIONS JUDGE AT BENGALURU**

Dated this the 8th day of April 2026

Present : **SRI.VEDAMOORTHY B.S.**, B.A.(L.), LL.B.,
XXXI Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge, Bengaluru (CCH-14)
C/c V Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge, Bengaluru (CCH-13)

O.S.No.2450/2019

PLAINTIFFS : 1. Smt.Vishala C.,
W/o Sri.Ramesh,
Aged about 34 years,

2. Sri.K.V.Ramesh,
S/o Late Venkatappa,
Aged about 40 years,

Both are R/at No.38,
3rd Cross, Sriramnagar,
Bangalore – 560 017.

(By Sri.C.A.Ajit, Advocate)

V/s

DEFENDANT : Sri.K.Balakrishnan Kuniyil,
Aged about 56 years,
S/o Sri.Unnikrishnan,
R/at No.18, BBMP No.491, 9th Cross,
2nd Main, Vignana Nagar,
Bangalore-560075.

(By M/s Pramila Associates, Advocates)

Date of institution of the suit.	27.03.2019
Nature of the suit	Permanent Injunction
Date of the commencement of recording evidence	06.12.2021
Date on which the Judgment was pronounced	08.04.2026
Total duration	Years Months Days 07 00 12

(VEDAMOORTHY B.S.)XXXI Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.C/c V Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.**JUDGMENT**

The plaintiffs have filed this suit against the defendant for permanent injunction restraining the defendant, his servants, agents, supporters and henchmen or any persons claiming under him from in any way interfering with the suit schedule property and dispossessing them from the suit schedule property without due process of law.

2. The suit schedule property is the immovable property

hotel names “Sri Krishna Sagar Hotel” situated at No.369, Amar Jyothi Layout, Domlur, Bangalore – 560 008, together with all fixtures and fittings.

3. The brief facts of the case of the plaintiffs are that the defendant is the landlord of the suit schedule property. The plaintiffs are the tenants in the suit schedule property under the oral Lease Deed dated 09.07.2018. They are in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. The lease period is for a period of 11 months. The rent payable by the plaintiffs to the on the suit schedule property was Rs.1.80 lakhs per month which shall be payable on daily basis. An advance amount of Rs.5.00 lakhs was paid by the plaintiff to the defendant through cheque dated 05.07.2019. The plaintiffs have invested more than Rs.11.00 lakhs to develop the business in the suit schedule property. They have paid the rent to the defendant till 11.03.2019 without any delay. The plaintiffs requested the defendant to have one written Agreement for more better improvement of the business. Till 11.03.2019, the

defendant dragged the matter for the reasons best to known to him. On 10.03.2019, all of a sudden, the defendant approached the plaintiffs and demanded to vacate the suit schedule property to give the same to other persons. The plaintiffs requested the defendant not to make such demands. On 11.03.2019, all of a sudden, the Police came near the suit schedule property and shouted in some manner. Upon due enquiry had informed that there is a complaint against the plaintiffs by the defendant. On 12.03.2019, the plaintiffs went to the Police Station and on enquiry, they found fault of the defendant. A Panchayath was held in the Police Station. In the said Panchayath, the defendant admitted his fault and apologized the plaintiffs in writing stating that the defendant shall repay Rs.3.50 lakhs through cheque and remaining amount of Rs.9.00 lakhs is the expense amount to the plaintiffs which has not been mentioned on the condition that on the passing of the said cheque and payment the balance amount, the plaintiffs shall handover the physical possession of the suit schedule property to the defendant. As per the instructions of the

defendant, on 22.03.2019, the plaintiffs presented the cheque which returned unpaid for the reason "Stopped the Payment". When the plaintiffs question the defendant, he gave evasive reply stating that he know how to grab the suit schedule property from the plaintiffs and he has all means of persons in hand. On 23.03.2019, all of a sudden, the defendant along his agents started to interfere with the physical possession and enjoyment of the plaintiffs on the suit schedule property. It was protected by the neighbors and Police. The defendant threatened the plaintiffs that he know how to dispossess from the suit schedule property in illegal method and without dues process of law. The plaintiffs have invested huge amount by hand loan and other ways. It is the only means of their livelihood. They have developed the suit schedule property for profitable business. Due to jealous and to make illegal profit, the defendant started to interfere with the peaceful possession of the plaintiffs on the suit schedule property. Therefore, the plaintiffs have filed the present suit.

4. After due service of summons to the defendant, the defendant has appeared before this Court. He has filed his written statement denying the entire pleadings of the plaintiffs as false and made a counter claim directing the plaintiffs to pay Rs.59,422/- to the defendant with interest at the rate of 18% from the date of counter claim till the date of realization.

5. In the written statement filed by the defendant, he has contended that the suit is not maintainable either in law or on facts. On 11.03.2019, the plaintiffs have already handed over the possession of the suit schedule property. They are not possession of the suit schedule property as on the date of suit. Therefore, the suit is not maintainable. The suit is not properly valued and the Court fee paid is insufficient. The defendant is running the restaurant in the name and style of "Sri Krishna Sagar Hotel" in the suit schedule property since 6 years. In the month of July 2018, the plaintiffs approached the defendant claiming that they are interested in the restaurant business. They agreed that they

will run the day to day business of the hotel and they will take care of all the expenses, wages of workers, electricity and water, etc., of the said hotel as a licensee. The license fee of Rs.6,500/- per day payable by the plaintiffs to defendant was fix. The defendant agreed for the said offer of the plaintiffs. As security for the said arrangement, the 1st plaintiff paid Rs.5.00 lakhs to the defendant through cheque dated 05.07.2019. There was no landlord and tenant relationship between the plaintiffs and the defendant. The plaintiffs have paid the license fee of Rs.6,500/- per day only till November 2018. Thereafter, the plaintiffs claimed that the business was not going well and requested the defendant to accept Rs.6,000/- per day as license fee. The defendant reluctantly agreed for the same. However, the plaintiffs have paid the license fee only till January 2019. From 1st February 2019, they have stopped making the payments. In view of the failure on the part of the plaintiffs to pay the license fee as agreed by them and for the fact that in the month of March 2019, the defendant started to receive the complaints from the customers and

the workers about the mismanagement of the plaintiff which resulted in the defendant having to make verification and discrete enquiries and found that the complaints were genuine. That apart, since the plaintiffs have defaulted in payment of the license fee from February 2019, the defendant informed the plaintiffs that there was complete mismanagement and he did not want the services of the plaintiffs. Accordingly, the defendant terminated the license which was accepted by the plaintiffs. The defendant took back the management of the hotel from the plaintiffs. The plaintiffs demanded to return the security amount from the defendant claiming that all the up to date payments had been made. The defendant requested the plaintiffs to allow him some time to verify. But, even before the defendant could verify the claim of the plaintiffs, they started harassing and threatening the plaintiffs which forced the defendant to approach the Police on 11.03.2019. At Police station, the plaintiffs once again reiterated that they made all the payments to the workers and other incidentals. Based on the said calculation claimed that the defendant

has to return Rs.3.50 lakhs after adjusting the dues from the security amount of Rs.5.00 lakhs. Believing the claims made by the plaintiffs, the defendant issued cheque bearing No.206149 dated 13.03.2019 drawn on Punjab National Bank for Rs.3.50 lakhs in favour of the 1st plaintiff as demanded by the 2nd plaintiff. After issuing the said cheque, the defendant verified the accounts and found that the wages of the workers, the vendors, BESCO and BWSSB bills, GST, etc., have also not been paid by the plaintiffs responsibly. Nearly Rs.1.80 lakhs have to be paid as wages to the workers during the period the plaintiffs were managing the hotel. As on 01.03.2019, BESCO bill of Rs.30,802/-, BWSSB bill of Rs.30,620/- was due to pay by the plaintiffs. The defendant has paid the said bill amounts. The license fee of Rs.2.28 lakhs was due from the plaintiffs to the defendant from 01.02.2019 to 10.03.2019 at the rate of Rs.6,000/- per day. In that regard, the defendant addressed a letter to the 1st plaintiff and informed her that the defendant issued a stop payment instruction in respect of the said cheque. The carelessness and negligence of the

plaintiffs resulted in the generator and shutdown, other kitchen equipments like chimney etc. were spoiled. The defendant spent Rs.50,000/- to repair the generator and Rs.30,000/- to repair the kitchen equipments. Thus, the plaintiffs are liable to pay the defendant a sum of Rs.5,59,422/- apart from GST and other taxes. Even after adjustment of the security deposit amount of Rs.5.00 lakhs payable by the defendant to the plaintiffs, till date, the plaintiffs are due to pay Rs.59,422/- apart from GST and other taxes. This amount is the subject matter of the counter claim of the defendant. Once again, the 1st plaintiff issued the Legal Notice suppressing the true facts. Hence, prayed to dismiss the suit.

6. The plaintiffs have filed rejoinder to the counter claim of the defendants denying the entire written statement averments as false. Their contentions are that the plaintiffs have never approached the defendant claiming that they were interested in the restaurant business. They have reiterated the contentions taken in the plaint and denied their liability

to pay the counter claim amount. Hence, prayed to dismiss the counter claim of the defendant.

7. Based on the above pleadings of the parties, the following issues and the additional issue are framed.

1. Whether the plaintiffs proves that they are in lawful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as on the date of suit ?
2. Whether the plaintiffs prove that the alleged interference by the defendant ?
3. Whether the defendant is entitled for the relief of counter claim as sought for ?
4. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for the relief as sought for ?
5. What order or decree?

ADDITIONAL ISSUE

1. Whether the defendant has entitled the relief sought in the counter claim ?
8. To prove the above issues and the additional issue, on the part of the plaintiffs, the 1st plaintiff has produced her

oral evidences as PW1. She has produced the documentary evidences Ex.P1 to Ex.P7. During the examination of PW1, Ex.D1 to Ex.D4 are marked through confrontation on behalf of the defendant. The defendant has produced his oral evidences as DW1. He has produced the documentary evidences Ex.D5 to Ex.D21.

9. The learned Counsel for the defendant has filed written arguments. Heard the arguments of the learned Counsel for the plaintiffs. Perused the materials available on record.

10. My answers to the above issues and the additional issue are as follows;

Issue No.1	:	In the Negative,
Issue No.2	:	In the Negative,
Issue No.3	:	In the Negative,
Issue No.4	:	In the Negative,
Addl. Issue No.1	:	In the Negative,
Issue No.5	:	As per final order for the following;

REASONS

11. **ISSUE No.1** :- The burden to prove this issue is on the plaintiffs. Therefore, to prove this issue, the plaintiffs have

produced the oral evidences of the 1st plaintiff as PW1. She has filed her affidavit by way examination-in-chief. In the said affidavit, she has reiterated the plaint averments. In support of her oral evidences, she has produced the documentary evidences Ex.P1 to Ex.P7. Among them, Ex.P1 is the certified copy of Complaint in P.C.R.No.51/2019, Ex.P2 is the certified copy of Cheque issued by the defendant to the 1st plaintiff, Ex.P3 is the certified copy of Bank Memo, Ex.P4 is the certified copy of the Legal Notice issued by the 1st plaintiff to the defendant, Ex.P5 is the certified copy of Postal Receipt, Ex.P6 is the certified copy of Postal Acknowledgment and Ex.P7 is the certified copy of Judgment in C.C.No.677/2019.

12. Per contra, the 1st defendant has produced his oral evidences as DW1. He filed his affidavit by way of examination-in-chief. At para No.1 to 7 of the said affidavit, he has reiterated the facts averred in para No.7 to 13 of his written statement. During the examination of PW1, Ex.D1 to Ex.D4 are marked through confrontation on behalf of the

defendant. Among them, Ex.D1 is the copy of the Complaint dated 11.03.2019 given by the defendant to the jurisdictional Police Station, Ex.D2 is the copy of the Statement of the 2nd plaintiff, Ex.D3 is the Legal Notice issued by the 1st plaintiff to the defendant and Ex.D4 is the Office copy of the Reply issued by the defendant to the plaintiffs. The defendant has produced the documentary evidences Ex.D5 to Ex.D22. Among them, Ex.D5 is the Statement of Account, Ex.D6 is the office copy of the Intimation issued by the defendant to the 1st plaintiff, Ex.D7 is the Postal Receipt, Ex.D8 is the certified copy of the Legal Notice issued by the 1st plaintiff to the defendant Ex.D9 is the certified copy of the Reply Notice issued by the defendant to the 1st plaintiff, Ex.D10 is the certified copy of the Bank Passbook, Ex.D11 and Ex.D12 are the certified copies of the Cash Vouchers, Ex.D13 is the certified copy of the Water Bill, Ex.D14 is the certified copy of the Electricity Bill Payment Receipt, Ex.D15 is the certified copy of the Service Bill, Ex.D16 is the certified copy of the Appeal Memorandum, Ex.D17 is the certified copy of the Application, Ex.D18 is the certified copy of the Order Sheets

in Criminal Appeal No.23/2023, Ex.D19 is the Photographs, Ex.D20 is the Compact Disc and Ex.D21 is the certified copy of the Agreement of Lease dated 01.09.2012.

13. PW1 and DW1 are cross-examined by their respective adverse parties. On perusal of the pleadings and the evidences of both parties both oral and documentary, it appears that the plaintiffs were in possession of the suit schedule property by running the hotel is an admitted fact. What is the disputed fact that as on the date of suit, the plaintiffs are in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as tenants. The contention of the defendant is that the plaintiffs were running the hotel as license holders under the defendant and even before filing of the suit, the plaintiffs have handed over the possession of the suit schedule property to the defendant. PW1 in her cross-examination has expressed her ignorance that at present, the hotel is running in the name of "Srinidhi" and she does not remember when she went to the suit schedule hotel for the last time. These evidences go to show that at present, the

plaintiffs are not in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. There are no pleadings and the evidences by the plaintiffs that after filing this suit, the defendant has taken possession of the suit schedule property from the plaintiffs.

14. In the case between R.V.E.Venkatachala Gounder V/s Arulmigu Viswesaraswami & V.P.Temple & another (AIR 2003 SC 4548), the Hon'ble Supreme Court laid down the following principles of law:-

“There is an essential distinction between burden of proof and onus of proof; burden of proof lies upon a person who has to prove the fact and which never shifts. Onus of proof shifts. Such a shifting of onus is a continuous process in the evaluation of evidence. In our opinion, in a suit for possession based on title once the plaintiff has been able to create a high degree of probability so as to shift the onus on the defendant it is for the defendant to discharge his onus and in the absence there of the burden of proof lying on the plaintiff shall be held to have been discharged so as to amount to proof of the plaintiff's title.”

15. Though, the claim of the possession of the plaintiffs on the suit schedule property is not based on title, with regard to the possession over the suit schedule property, the above principles of law are applicable as the plaintiffs are claiming their possession over the suit schedule property as on the date of suit as tenants. Their claim of possession on the suit schedule property is based on oral Lease Agreement. It is not the case of the defendant that there was an Agreement entered into between the plaintiffs and the defendant when the defendant handed over the possession of the suit schedule property to run the hotel in it. However, as stated above, there is assertion and denial of the possession of the plaintiffs in the suit schedule property. Therefore, this issue was framed. In view of the above principles of law, the burden lies upon the plaintiffs to prove this issue. If the plaintiffs are able to prove this issue, then only, the onus shifts on the defendant to prove that even before filing of the suit itself, the plaintiffs have handed over the possession of the suit schedule property to the defendant and therefore, they are not in lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule

property as on the date of suit. Except the oral evidences of PW1, the plaintiffs have not produced any documentary evidences to show that as on the date of suit, the plaintiffs were in lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Ex.P1 to Ex.P7 produced by the plaintiffs are the cheque issued by the defendant to the 1st plaintiff, endorsement with regard to its dishonour for the reason “Payment Stopped by Drawer”, Legal Notice issued by the 1st plaintiff to the defendant, Postal Receipt, Postal Acknowledgment for having service of the said Legal Notice, Private Complaint and the Judgment of Conviction of the defendant for the offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act passed in C.C.No.677/2019. They does not prove the lawful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiffs on the suit schedule property as on the date of suit. Though, the oral and documentary evidences produced by the defendant does not prove that the plaintiffs have handed over the possession of the suit schedule property even before the filing of the present suit, since the plaintiffs have not proved that they are in lawful possession and

enjoyment of the suit schedule property as on the date of suit, it cannot be considered as the defendant has not disproved the case of the plaintiffs. For the above reasons, the plaintiffs have not proved that they are in lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as on the date of suit. Hence, I answer **Issue No.1 in the Negative.**

16. **ISSUE No.2** :- In the plaint, the plaintiffs have alleged about the interference to the possession and enjoyment of the plaintiffs on the suit schedule property and dispossession of the plaintiffs from the suit schedule property by the defendant. The said fact is denied by the defendant in his written statement. PW1 in his affidavit filed by way of examination-in-chief has reiterated the allegations made in the plaint. The said allegations are not supporting with any documentary evidences produced by the plaintiffs. It appears from the contents of Ex.D1 and Ex.D2 that the defendant approached the jurisdictional Police to assist the defendant to get back the possession of the suit schedule property. Though, it is not a due process of law and the attempt of the

defendant is to interfere with the possession and enjoyment of the plaintiffs on the suit schedule property and also dispossession of the plaintiffs from the suit schedule property, for the reasons stated in issue No.1, the plaintiffs have not proved their lawful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as on the date of suit, it cannot held that the plaintiffs have also proved the alleged interference of the defendant. The above reasons, the plaintiffs have not proved the alleged interference of the defendant. Hence, I answer **Issue No.2 in the Negative.**

17. **ISSUE No.4** :- The plaintiffs have filed this suit against the defendant for permanent injunction restraining the defendant, his servants, agents, supporters and henchmen or any persons claiming under him from in any way interfering with the suit schedule property and dispossessing them from the suit schedule property without due process of law. For the reasons stated in issues No.1 and 2, the plaintiffs have not proved that they are in lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as on the date of suit and the

alleged interference of the defendant. Therefore, the plaintiffs are not entitled for the reliefs as prayed. Hence, I answer **Issue No.4 in the Negative.**

18. **ISSUE No.3 AND ADDITIONAL ISSUE No.1** :- The findings on these issues are inter-related. Therefore, they are taken together for consideration.

In the written statement, the defendant has made the counter claim of Rs.59,422/- from the plaintiffs together with interest at the rate of 18% p.a. from the date of counter claim till the date of realization. This claim is the wages paid by the defendant to the workers in a sum of Rs.1.80 lakhs, expenses incurred for repair of generator in a sum of Rs.50,000/-, kitchen equipments in a sum of Rs.30,000/-, payment of BESCOM bills as on 01.03.2019 in a sum Rs.30,802/-, payment BWSSB bills in a sum of Rs.13,620/- and license fee payable for the period from 01.02.2019 to 10.03.2019 at the rate of Rs.6,000/- per day which amounts to Rs.2.28 lakhs after deducting Rs.5.00 lakhs paid by the plaintiffs to the defendant as security deposit amount. The plaintiffs in

their rejoinder filed to the counter claim of the defendant have denied the above liability. It is admitted fact that the plaintiffs have paid advance amount of Rs.5.00 lakhs to the defendant as security deposit. The plaintiffs have not produced any documentary evidences to prove that they have made investment on the suit schedule property more than Rs.11.00 lakhs to develop the business. It is also admitted fact that the defendant issued a cheque as per Ex.P2 for Rs.3.50 lakhs in favour of the 1st plaintiff towards payment of the part of the security deposit amount and it was dishonored. It is also an admitted fact that the security deposit amount paid by the plaintiffs to the defendant is not refunded by the defendant to the plaintiffs till date.

19. DW1 in his affidavit filed by way of examination-in-chief has reiterated the above expenses incurred by him as averred by him in the written statement. To prove that the defendant has paid Rs.1.80 lakhs as wages to the workers during the period the plaintiffs were managing the hotel in the suit schedule property, the defendant has produced Ex.D11 and

Ex.D12. The said document does not contain the fact that the said payments were made by the defendant. Moreover, the defendant has not produced any documentary evidences to show that the persons who received money by issuing Ex.D11 and Ex.D12 were the workers worked during the period of the plaintiffs were managing the hotel of the suit schedule property. Therefore, the defendant has not proved that he has paid Rs.1.80 lakhs as wages to the workers worked during the period the plaintiffs were managing the hotel in the suit schedule property.

20. Towards the expenses incurred in a sum of Rs.50,000/- for repair of generator and Rs.30,000/- for repair of kitchen equipments, the defendant has produced the service bill and invoice at Ex.D15. Nothing has been elicited during the cross-examination of DW1 to disbelieve the above evidences produced by the defendant. Therefore, the defendant is entitled for the said amount.

21. PW1 in her cross-examination has admitted that the responsibility of payment of electricity and water bills were on

the plaintiffs while they were running the hotel in the suit schedule property. Though, the plaintiffs have contended that they have paid aforesaid BESCO and BWSSB bills, they have not produced any oral and documentary evidences to prove the said contention. It appears from the documentary evidences produced by the defendant at Ex.D10 that on 22.03.2019, the defendant has paid the BWSSB bill of Rs.30,620/- and BESCO bills of Rs.30,802/-. Ex.D13 and Ex.D14 are the documents produced by the defendant to show that he has paid the above bills. Therefore, the defendant is entitled for the above BESCO and BWSSB bills.

22. It is undisputed fact that there was an understanding between the plaintiffs and the defendant to pay Rs.6,000/- per day by the plaintiffs to the defendant to run the hotel in the suit schedule property. The claim of the defendant is that from 01.02.2019 till 10.03.2019, the plaintiffs have not paid the license fee at the said rate and they were due to pay total license fee amount of Rs.2.28 lakhs. DW1 has deposed about

the said claim in his affidavit filed by way of examination-in-chief. The pleadings of the plaintiffs and the oral evidences of PW1 are that till 11.03.2019, they have paid the rent to the defendant without any delay. To prove this fact, the plaintiffs have not produced any documentary evidences. However, it is cleared from the above pleadings and the oral evidences that till 11.03.2019, the plaintiffs were running the hotel in the suit schedule property. For the above reasons, the defendant has proved his claim of Rs.2.28 lakhs as license fee payable by the plaintiffs to the defendant. Thus, the liability of the plaintiffs to pay to the defendant is Rs.3,69,422/-. This amount is deducted from the security deposit amount paid by the plaintiffs to the defendant in a sum of Rs.5.00 lakhs, there is no due payable by the plaintiffs to the defendant as made in the counter claim. For the above reasons, the defendant is not entitled for the counter claim amount as prayed in the counter claim. Hence, I answer **Issue No.3 and the Additional Issue No.1 in the Negative.**

23. **ISSUE No.5** :- In view of the findings on issues No.3

and 4 and additional issue No.1, the suit of the plaintiffs and the counter claim of the defendant are liable to be dismissed.

Hence, I proceed to pass the following;

ORDERS

The suit of the plaintiffs and the counter claim of the defendant are hereby dismissed.

Under the facts and circumstances of this case, the parties to the suit shall bare their own costs.

Draw the decree accordingly.

(Typed by the stenographer in the Court computer on my direct dictation, printout taken, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court today on this the 8th day of April 2026).

(VEDAMOORTHY.B.S)

XXXI Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.

C/c V Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.

ANNEXURE

List of witnesses examined for Plaintiffs :-

PW1 : Vishala C.

List of documents exhibited for Plaintiffs :-

- Ex.P1 : Certified copy of Complaint,
Ex.P2 : Certified copy of Cheque,
Ex.P3 : Certified copy of Bank Memo,
Ex.P4 : Certified copy of Legal Notice,
Ex.P5 : Certified copy of Postal Receipt,
Ex.P6 : Certified copy of Postal Acknowledgment,
Ex.P7 : Certified copy of Judgment.

List of witnesses examined for the Defendant :-

- DW1 : K.Balakrishnan Kuniyil.

List of documents exhibited for the Defendant :-

- Ex.D1 : Copy of Complaint,
Ex.D2 : Copy of Statement,
Ex.D3 : Legal Notice,
Ex.D4 : Office copy of Reply Notice,
Ex.D5 : Statement of Account,
Ex.D6 : Intimation Letter,
Ex.D7 : Postal Receipt,
Ex.D8 : Certified copy of Legal Notice,
Ex.D9 : Certified copy of Reply,
Ex.D10 : Certified copy of Bank Passbook,
Ex.D11 & 12 : Certified copies of Cash Vouchers,
Ex.D13 : Certified copy Water Bill,

- Ex.D14 : Certified copy of Receipt,
Ex.D15 : Certified copy of Service Bill,
Ex.D16 : Certified copy of Appeal Memorandum,
Ex.D17 : Certified copy of Application,
Ex.D18 : Certified copy of Order Sheet,
Ex.D19 : Photographs,
Ex.D20 : Compact Disc,
Ex.D21 : Certified copy of Sale Agreement.

(VEDAMOORTHY.B.S)

XXXI Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.

C/c V Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru.