

KABG040023592025



Presented on : 19.07.2025

Registered on : 23.07.2025

Decided on : 30.06.2026

Duration : 00 year, 11 months, 11 days

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
AT : BELAGAVI.**

Form No.9
[Civil] Title
Sheet for
Judgment
in suits

Present : **Smt. Preeti L. Malavalli**, B.B.A. LL.B. (Hons.)
Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC, Belagavi.

Dated on this the 30th day of June-2026

ORIGINAL SUIT NO.885/2025

PLAINTIFF :

1)	Mr. Krishna A/F. Narayan Choudhari, Earlier known as Mr. Krishna S/o. Yamanusa, Age : 23 years, Occ : Nil, R/o : # 14, Dnyaneshwar Nagar, 3 rd Cross, Nazar Camp, Vadagaon, Belagavi, Tal : & Dist : Belagavi-590005.
	(By Shri. V. B. Patil, Adv.)

Vs.

DEFENDANTS :

1)	The Deputy Commissioner, Belagavi.
2)	The Secretary, Karnataka Secondary Education Examination Board, First Floor, 6 th Cross, Malleswaram, Bangalore-3.
3)	The Secretary and Ex-officio Joint Director, Karnataka Secondary Education Examination Board, Department of Public Instructions, Court Compound, Belagavi.
4)	The Director, Department of Pre-University Education, 18 th Cross, Sampige Road, Malleswaram, Bengaluru-560003.
5)	The Dy. Director of Public Instructions, Club Road, Belagavi.
6)	The BEO, Rural Belagavi, Chavat Galli, Belagavi.
7)	The Head Master, Govt. Kannada Higher Primary School No.14, Vadagaon, Tal : & Dist : Belagavi-05.
8)	The Head Master, Karnataka Public School, (High School), Vadagaon, Tal : & Dist : Belagavi-05.
9)	The Head Master, Govt. Pre-Primary School, Upparwadi, Tal : Gangavathi, Dist : Koppal.
10)	The Head Master, Govt. Pre-Primary School, Gundamma Camp, Tal : Gangavathi, Dist : Koppal.

11)	The Head Master, Govt. Higher Primary School, Chalavadi Oni, (Begarwadi), Tal : Gangavathi, Dist : Koppal.
12)	The Dy. Director of Public Instructions, Jilla Adalitha Bhavan, Hospete Road, Koppal-583231.
13)	The BEO Office, Main Road, Gangavathi, Koppal-583227.
14)	The Principal, Govt. College, D.D-219, Vadagaon, Belagavi.
	(Defendant No.1 to 13 by Learned A.G.P. & Defendant No.14 Ex-parte.)

Date of institution of the suit	19.07.2025						
Nature of the suit	Declaration & Mandatory Injunction						
Date of the commencement of recording of the Evidence	10.03.2026						
Date on which Judgment was pronounced	30.06.2026						
Total Duration	<table><tr><td><u>Year/s</u></td><td><u>Month/s</u></td><td><u>Day/s</u></td></tr><tr><td>00</td><td>11</td><td>11</td></tr></table>	<u>Year/s</u>	<u>Month/s</u>	<u>Day/s</u>	00	11	11
<u>Year/s</u>	<u>Month/s</u>	<u>Day/s</u>					
00	11	11					

(Smt. Preeti L. Malavalli)
Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC, Belagavi.

JUDGMENT

This suit is filed by the plaintiff against the defendants for the relief of Declaration to declare that the name of plaintiff is 'Krishna, adopted son of Narayan Choudhari' and 'Yamunabai Choudhari', his correct date of birth is '16.06.2001' and Mandatory Injunction to direct the defendants to rectify the name of plaintiff as 'Krishna, adopted son of Narayan Choudhari' and his date of birth as '16.06.2001' instead of '01.06.2001', the names of adoptive father and mother of plaintiff as 'Narayan Choudhari' and 'Yamunabai Choudhari' instead of 'Yamunasa' and 'Kalavati' by virtue of adoption deed in the concerned educational records of plaintiff.

2. Brief facts of the case of plaintiff in a nutshell, are as follows :

The plaintiff was born on 16.06.2001 at Gangavathi, Dist : Koppal. His biological parents are Mr. Yamanasa and Smt. Kalavati. The parents of plaintiff have given him in adoption to the adoptive parents by name Narayan Parashuram Choudhari and Smt. Yamunabai Narayan Choudhari by performing necessary rituals as per customs prevailing in Shree Somavansheeya Sahastrarjun Kshatriya Samaj and Hindu Law on 10.07.2004. The said adoption was reduced into writing and the same was

registered before the Sub-Registrar, Belagavi on 04.11.2023 bearing document No.BEL-4-00648/2023-24. After three years of his adoption, the adoptive parents of plaintiff had a natural son by name Nagaraj S/o. Narayan Choudhari and hence in order to avoid any further complications, the adoptive parents of plaintiff decided to reduce the fact of his adoption into writing and get the same registered and accordingly the adoption deed dated 04.11.2023 has been registered before the Sub-Registrar, Belagavi. The plaintiff was being looked after by his natural parents at Upparwadi, Taluka Gangavati, District : Koppal and he was admitted to primary school at Upparwadi and he studied upto 4th standard in defendant No.9 school. Thereafter the plaintiff joined defendant No.10 school and studied 5th standard and then joined defendant No.11 school and studied upto 7th standard. The plaintiff then joined defendant No.7 school and studied 8th standard and thereafter he joined defendant No.8 school and completed S.S.L.C. The plaintiff has studied 1st P.U.C and 2nd P.U.C. in defendant No.14 college. The name of plaintiff is shown as 'Krishna S/o. Yamanusa' and his date of birth is shown as '01.06.2001' instead of '16.06.2001' in the aforesaid school records. The plaintiff came to know about the wrong entries regarding date of birth recently when he obtained his birth certificate. The plaintiff is intending to be known and recognized with his adoptive family and his adoptive father's name and

surname are to be affixed with the plaintiff's name in view of registration of adoption deed on 04.11.2023. In order to avoid future complications in obtaining Government job and while acquiring immovable properties, the plaintiff is intending to get his school records rectified. Hence, the plaintiff got issued notice to defendants as per Section 80 of C.P.C. on 19.12.2024 requesting them to make necessary corrections with regard to the name, father's name, surname as well as date of birth of the plaintiff in the school records and marks cards. However, the defendant No.13 directed defendants No.9 to 11 to take action as per the present rules and regulations, but the defendants No.9 to 11 replied by stating that they are not empowered to make any corrections in the records and hence no action was taken by the defendants in that regard. Hence, the present suit has been filed by the plaintiff seeking the relief of Declaration and Mandatory injunction in order to declare that the name of plaintiff is 'Krishna Narayan Choudhari', his correct date of birth is '16.06.2001' and the names of adoptive parents of plaintiff are 'Narayan Choudhari' and 'Yamunabai Choudhari' and further to issue Mandatory Injunction against defendants to effect necessary corrections in the educational records of plaintiff.

3. The summons were served on defendants and the defendants No.1 to 13 appeared through the District Government Pleader. The defendant No.14 did not appear despite service of

summons and hence he was placed ex-parte. The learned D.G.P. filed written statement for defendant No.5 and adopted the same as written statement of defendants No.1 to 4, 6 to 12.

4. In the course of written statement filed by defendants No.1 to 13, the said defendants have denied the entire plaint averments and further contended that only on the basis of information provided by the plaintiff, the particulars have been entered in the educational records and there is no mistake on the part of defendants. As such, the defendants have contended that there is no mistake on their part in entering the said particulars and that the present suit is barred by law and this Court does not have jurisdiction to grant the relief sought for. It is further contended that the plaintiff has not issued notice U/Sec.80 of C.P.C. as required, before filing of the suit. It is further contended that the date of birth of plaintiff if rectified as prayed for, then it will not fulfill the condition of completion of mandatory age for completing S.S.L.C. That the minimum age required to complete S.S.L.C. is 15 years and hence the plaintiff cannot be permitted to get the same rectified. It is further contended that the suit of plaintiff also suffers from non-joinder of necessary party and there is no cause of action to file this suit. On these grounds, the said defendants have prayed to dismiss the present suit with costs.

5. On the basis of rival pleadings, the Court framed the following issues :

ISSUES

- 1) *Whether the plaintiff proves that he is the adopted son of Narayan Parashuram Choudhari and Smt. Yamunabai Narayan Choudhari as per Registered Adoption Deed dated 10.07.2004 ?*
- 2) *Whether the plaintiff proves that the names of adoptive father and mother of plaintiff are 'Narayan Parashuram Choudhari' and 'Smt. Yamunabai Narayan Choudhari' by virtue of Adoption Deed dated 10.07.2004 ?*
- 3) *Whether the plaintiff proves that his correct date of birth is '16.06.2001' and the same is wrongly entered as '01.06.2001' in his educational records, maintained by defendants ?*
- 4) *Whether the defendants No.1 to 13 prove that the suit of plaintiff is not*

maintainable in view of contentions taken in Para-6 of written statement ?

5) Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration as sought for ?

6) Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of mandatory injunction as sought for ?

7) What Order or Decree ?

6. In order to prove his case, the plaintiff got himself examined as PW-1 and got marked 40 documents at Ex. P.1 to Ex. P.40. The learned D.G.P. for defendants No.1 to 13, has cross-examined PW-1, and two documents at Ex. D.1 and Ex. D.2 were got marked on confrontation during the course of cross-examination of PW-1. But, the defendants have not got themselves examined before the Court.

7. Heard the arguments of learned counsel for plaintiff Shri. V. B. Patil and the learned D.G.P. appearing for defendants No.1 to 13. Perused the pleadings, oral and documentary evidence on record.

8. My findings on the above issues are as under :

Issue No.1 : In the Affirmative.

Issue No.2 : In the Affirmative.

Issue No.3 : In the Affirmative.

Issue No.4 : In the Negative.

Issue No.5 : In the Affirmative.

Issue No.6 : In the Affirmative.

Issue No.7 : As per final order for the following :

REASONS

9. Issue No.1 and 2 : These issues are interlinked with each other, hence they are taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid the repetition of facts.

10. The plaintiff got himself examined as PW-1 and the plaintiff has produced 40 documents at Ex. P.1 to Ex. P.40. Ex. P.1 is the copy of Legal Notice issued to defendants. Ex. P.2 to Ex. P.10 are the Postal Receipts and Ex. P.11 to Ex. P.19 are the Postal Acknowledgments for having served the notice to defendants. Ex P.20 is the copy of Letter issued to defendant No.9. Ex. P.20(a) is the Postal Envelope. Ex. P.21 and Ex. P.22 are the Postal Receipt and Postal Acknowledgment. Ex. P.23 is the Reply Notice issued by defendant No.10 to the plaintiff. Ex. P.23(a) is the Postal Envelope. Ex. P.24 and Ex. P.25 are the Postal Receipt and Postal Acknowledgment. Ex. P.26 is the Reply Notice issued by defendant No.11 to the plaintiff. Ex. P.26(a) is the Postal

Envelope. Ex. P.27 to Ex. P.30 are the Postal Receipts and Postal Acknowledgments. Ex. P.31 is the Correspondence made by defendant No.13 i.e., B.E.O., Koppal to D.D.P.I., Koppal and other school authorities. Ex. P.32 is the Registered Adoption Deed dated 03.11.2023 entered into between the biological parents and adoptive parents of plaintiff regarding adoption of plaintiff. Ex. P.33 is the S.S.L.C. Marks Card of plaintiff. Ex. P.34 is the P.U.C. Marks Card of plaintiff. Ex. P.35 and Ex. P.36 are the Bonafide Certificates of plaintiff issued by defendants No.9 and 10 schools. Ex. P.37 to Ex. P.39 are the Study Certificates of plaintiff issued by defendants No.11, 7 and 8 respectively. Ex. P.40 is the Birth Certificate of plaintiff. Per contra, the defendants No.1 to 13 have got marked two documents at Ex. D.1 and Ex. D.2 on confrontation to PW-1 during the course of cross-examination of PW-1. Ex. D.1 and Ex. D.2 are the Applications for Admission as submitted by parents of plaintiff to the school authorities.

11. It is the case of plaintiff that he is the adopted son of Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari by virtue of Registered Adoption Deed dated 04.11.2023. In order to substantiate his case, the plaintiff has produced the said Adoption Deed as per Ex. P.32 which shows that Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari have taken the plaintiff in adoption on 10.07.2004 and the same has been reduced into writing on

03.11.2023 and got registered on 04.11.2023. The said Ex. P.32 shows that as on the date of adoption, the plaintiff was aged about 3 years only and his natural parents i.e., Yamunasa and Kalavati have signed the adoption deed by acknowledging the giving and taking of adoption of the plaintiff to his adoptive parents i.e., Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari. In this regard, Section 16 of Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956 states that if a registered document is produced in the Court and signed by the person giving and taking the child in adoption the Court will presume that the adoption was made in compliance with the Act. Such presumption exists unless and until it is disproved. Therefore, the genuineness of the said adoption deed can be presumed and it can be said that by virtue of a valid adoption deed, the plaintiff has become the adopted son of Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari and it can also be presumed that the adoption was made in compliance with the aforesaid Act. The plaintiff got himself examined as PW-1. The learned D.G.P. appearing for defendants No.1 to 13 has cross-examined PW-1 in this regard and PW-1 has clearly deposed that his natural parents had three children and out of them, the plaintiff was given in adoption to Yamunabai who is none other than the sister of the father of plaintiff. He has further deposed that at the time of adoption, his adoptive parents did not have children and only after his adoption, one son by name Prasad Choudhari is

born to his adoptive parents. He has denied the suggestion put to him that the fact of filing of this suit by plaintiff is not known to his adoptive parents and a false case is filed before the Court. He has also deposed that when he approached the school authorities with the adoption deed for rectification of entries in school record, the school authorities insisted on order from Civil Court. Except the said suggestions, the defendants could not elicit anything worthwhile from the mouth of PW-1. The plaintiff has produced his Birth Certificate at Ex. P.40 which shows that he is natural son of Yamanursa and Kalavati. The said Birth Certificate has been issued in the year 2026 and as such it reveals the names of the biological parents of the plaintiff. Hence, it is clear that in Ex. P.32 Adoption Deed, the biological parents of plaintiff i.e., Yamanusa and Kalavati have given the plaintiff in adoption to Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari. The very fact that the said adoption deed is registered, it carries legal presumption with it regarding its genuineness and hence it can be presumed that there is valid adoption in the eye of law and the plaintiff is adopted son of Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari.

12. It is pertinent to note that in Ex. P.32 adoption deed it is clearly mentioned that the said adoption has been made out of the free will of the parties and the plaintiff shall be treated as adoptive son of Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari

from the date of said adoption deed and further that in all the school records of plaintiff, his adoptive parents' names have to be entered. Such being the case, it can be said that adoptive parents of plaintiff have complied the provisions of Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act for valid adoption and Section 11 of the said Act says that if the adoption is of a son, then the adoptive father or mother must not have a Hindu son, son's son, son's son's son living at the time of adoption. In the present case also, PW-1 has clearly deposed during his cross-examination that his adoptive parents did not have any child at the time of adoption of plaintiff and only later on a son was born to his adoptive parents. As such, it can be said that it is valid adoption and the plaintiff is lawfully adopted son of Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari. Except for few suggestions to PW-1 during his cross-examination, the defendants have not done anything in order to disprove the case of plaintiff. It is well settled principle of law that mere suggestion to witness during his cross-examination, do not take the place of proof.

13. Though the defendants have taken many contentions in their written statement regarding non-issuance of mandatory notice U/Sec.80 of C.P.C. to the defendants, regarding non-joinder of necessary parties and regarding maintainability of present suit, the defendants have not proved their contentions by

cogent evidence. It is also pertinent to note that so far as the notice U/Sec.80 of C.P.C. is concerned, in the present case the plaintiff has already issued notice to defendants U/Sec.80(1) of C.P.C. and the said copy of notice, postal receipts and postal acknowledgments are produced in the case which are as per Ex. P.1 to Ex. P.19 and as such, the suit of plaintiff will not fail on the said ground. Hence, the defendants could not elicit anything worthwhile from the mouth of PW-1. Hence, the defendants have failed to prove their contentions by cogent evidence. Per contra, the plaintiff has successfully proved his case. Accordingly, I answer **Issue No.1 and 2 in the Affirmative.**

14. Issue No.3 and 4 : These issues are interlinked with each other, hence they are taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid the repetition of facts.

15. It is the case of plaintiff that his date of birth is wrongly mentioned in his educational records maintained by the defendants. In order to show the wrong entries made by the defendants, the plaintiff has produced his S.S.L.C. Marks Card, Bonafide Certificates, Study Certificates issued by defendants at Ex. P.33, Ex. P.35 to Ex. P.39. In these documents, the date of birth of plaintiff is mentioned as '01.06.2001'. However, the plaintiff has produced his Birth Certificate at Ex. P.40 which

reveals that the plaintiff was born on '16.06.2001'. The said birth certificate is issued by the Registrar of Births and Deaths, Gangavati, Koppal District on 02.05.2026, but Ex. P.40 Birth Certificate also shows that the event of birth of plaintiff was registered on 30.07.2001 itself. Such being the case, the said birth certificate of plaintiff being his basic public document, it carries legal presumption with it regarding genuineness of entries made therein. Hence, it can be relied upon to say that the correct date of birth of plaintiff is '16.06.2001' only.

16. The plaintiff got himself examined as PW-1 and he has reiterated the plaint averments during the course of examination-in-chief. He has been cross-examined by learned D.G.P. and during the course of his cross-examination, PW-1 has deposed that the plaintiff has studied upto 4th standard in defendant No.7 school and thereafter he has studied in defendants No.8 to 11 schools. PW-1 has admitted during the course of his cross-examination that his mother Kalavati submitted application form while admitting him to 1st standard and also while admitting him to 5th standard and he has identified the said application forms which came to be marked as Ex. D.1 and Ex. D.2. No doubt, in the said documents, the date of birth of plaintiff is mentioned as '01.06.2001'. However, it is pertinent to note that the said applications are submitted to school by mother of plaintiff in order

to get admission of her child to the school and it cannot be placed on par with the public document like birth certificate issued by the Registrar of Births and Deaths. It is only the birth certificate which is the public document which can be relied upon to see what is the correct date of birth of the child. PW-1 has admitted during his further cross-examination dated 01.06.2026 that the birth certificate at Ex. P.40 was not at all submitted to the school to seek admission. He has denied the suggestion put to him that a false case is filed against the defendants by creating false documents. However, the defendants could not elicit anything worthwhile from the mouth of plaintiff/PW-1 during the course of his cross-examination. It is well settled that mere suggestions to witness during his cross-examination, do not take the place of proof of any contention. As such, the plaintiff has proved that his correct date of birth is '16.06.2001', by producing all the aforesaid documents.

17. The defendants No.1 to 13 have contended in their written statement at Para-6 that the present suit of plaintiff is not maintainable due to the reason that if the proposed date of birth i.e., '16.06.2001' is permitted to be mentioned in the school records of plaintiff by rectification in the records, then the norm prescribed by Government regarding the minimum age for completion of S.S.L.C. will not be fulfilled. However, it is pertinent

to note that the S.S.L.C. Marks Card at Ex. P.33 reveals that the plaintiff completed his S.S.L.C. in April 2018 which is when the plaintiff attained 16 years 10 months of age as per his date of birth given as 01.06.2001. As such, even if the date of birth of plaintiff would be rectified as 16.06.2001 which is a matter of 15 days later than the one given in the school records already, even then the plaintiff would fulfill the norms of completion of 16 years of age for completing S.S.L.C. Hence, it would not in any way affect the Government norms. The birth certificate of the child is the basic public document which would reveal the correct date of birth of the child and such document also carries legal presumption regarding the genuineness of entries made therein. Hence, it cannot be said that the very suit of plaintiff is not maintainable for it affects the norms made by the Government in respect of minimum age to be completed for taking admission to S.S.L.C. Hence, the present suit is very much maintainable in view of aforesaid discussion. Hence, I answer **Issue No.3 in the Affirmative and Issue No.4 in the Negative.**

18. Issue No.5 and 6 : These issues are interlinked with each other, hence they are taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid the repetition of facts.

19. The plaintiff has produced cogent evidence to prove that he is the adopted son of Narayan Choudhari and Yamunabai Choudhari as per Registered Adoption Deed dated 04.11.2023 and that the name of plaintiff after adoption is 'Krishna Narayan Choudhari'. Hence, the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration as prayed for. The plaintiff has also sought the relief of mandatory injunction directing the defendants to rectify his name and his date of birth and also the names of his parents as per adoption deed, in the educational records of plaintiff, maintained by the defendants. The plaintiff has averred in the plaint that the defendants refused to rectify the name and date of birth of plaintiff, and name of his parents in their records, when he approached defendants. As such, it is very much necessary to direct the defendants to correct the name and date of birth of plaintiff and the names of his adoptive parents in his educational records by virtue of this decree. Accordingly, I answer **Issue No.5 and 6 in the Affirmative.**

20. **Issue No.7 :** In view of the discussion and findings on Issue No.1 to 6, this Court proceeds to pass the following :

ORDER

***The suit of the plaintiff is hereby
decreed as follows :***

It is hereby declared that the plaintiff is the adopted son of 'Narayan Choudhari' and 'Yamunabai Choudhari' and the name of plaintiff is 'Krishna, Adopted S/o. Narayan Choudhari' as per the Registered Adoption Deed dated 04.11.2023.

It is hereby further declared that the correct date of birth of plaintiff is '16.06.2001'.

By way of mandatory Injunction, the defendants are directed to rectify the name of plaintiff as 'Krishna Narayan Choudhari' and the date of birth of plaintiff as '16.06.2001' and the names of father and mother of plaintiff as 'Narayan Choudhari' and 'Yamunabai Choudhari' as per Adoption Deed, in the educational records of plaintiff. While making the necessary entries, the defendants are directed to make reference to the decree of this suit.

Considering the nature of the suit and the relief claimed, the parties are directed to bear their own costs.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer, typed by her, edited & corrected by me & then pronounced in the Open Court on this the 30th day of June-2026.)

**(Smt. Preeti L. Malavalli)
Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC, Belagavi.**

ANNEXURE**1. List of witnesses examined by the plaintiff :**

PW-1 : Krishna Narayan Choudhari.

2. List of documents got marked by the plaintiff :

Ex. P.1 : Copy of Legal Notice issued to defendants.

Ex. P.2 to 10 : Postal Receipts.

Ex. P.11 to 19 : Postal Acknowledgments for having served the notice to defendants.

Ex P.20 : Copy of Letter issued to defendant No.9.

Ex. P.20(a) : Postal Envelope.

Ex. P.21 : Postal Receipt.

Ex. P.22 : Postal Acknowledgment.

Ex. P.23 : Reply Notice issued by defendant No.10 to the plaintiff.

Ex. P.23(a) : Postal Envelope.

Ex. P.24 : Postal Receipt.

Ex. P.25 : Postal Acknowledgment.

Ex. P.26 : Reply Notice issued by defendant No.11 to the plaintiff.

Ex. P.26(a) : Postal Envelope.

Ex. P.27 : Postal Receipt.

Ex. P.28 : Postal Acknowledgment.

Ex. P.29 : Postal Receipt.

Ex. P.30 : Postal Acknowledgment.

- Ex. P.31 : Correspondence made by defendant No.13 i.e., B.E.O., Koppal to D.D.P.I., Koppal and other school authorities.
- Ex. P.32 : Registered Adoption Deed dated 03.11.2023 entered into between the biological parents and adoptive parents of plaintiff regarding adoption of plaintiff.
- Ex. P.33 : S.S.L.C. Marks Card of plaintiff.
- Ex. P.34 : P.U.C. Marks Card of plaintiff.
- Ex. P.35 & 36 : Bonafide Certificates of plaintiff issued by defendants No.9 & 10 schools.
- Ex. P.37 to 39 : Study Certificates of plaintiff issued by defendants No.11, 7 and 8 respectively.
- Ex. P.40 : Birth Certificate of plaintiff.

3. List of witnesses examined by the defendants :

-Nil-

4. List of documents got marked by the defendants :

- Ex. D.1 & 2 : Applications for Admission as submitted by parents of plaintiff to the school authorities.

(Smt. Preeti L. Malavalli)
Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC, Belagavi.