

KABK600011622021



Presented on : 25-08-2021
Registered on : 25-08-2021
Decided on : 06-03-2026
Duration : 04 years, 05 months, 12 days

**IN THE COURT OF SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
BANAHATTI**

**Present: Sri. ASHAPPA, B.Com., LL.M.
Senior Civil Judge & JMFC,
Banahatti.**

OS.No.120/2021

Dated on this 06th day of March - 2026

Plaintiff:

1. Smt. Sangeeta @ Shaila W/o: Shivanand Cholaki,
Age: 44 years, Occ: Household work,
R/o: KHB Colony, MIG 107 S-4, Near Hospital
Gokak, Tq: Gokak, Dist: Belagavi.

(By Sri. M.G.K. Adv)

// V/s //

Defendants:

1. Smt. Kavita W/o: Sanjeevakumar Hindivali,
Age: 45 years, Occ: Household work,
R/o: Somawar Peth, Banhatti, Tq: Rabakavi-
Banahatti.

2. Smt. Pooja W/o: Sadashiv Biradar Patil,
Age: 22 years, Occ: Household work,
R/o: Kulahalli, Tq: Rabakavi-Banahatti.
3. Kumari. Poorvi D/o: Sanjeevakumar Hindivali,
Age: 15 years, Occ: Student,
R/o: Banhatti, Tq: Rabakavi-Banahatti.

(Defendant No.3 is minor R/by his natural mother
defendant No.1)

(By Sri. B.N.G. Adv)

J U D G M E N T

The plaintiff has filed present suit against the defendants seeking the relief of partition, declaration and consequential relief of injunction

: Suit Schedule Properties :

a. House property bearing CTS.No.8637 measuring 48-50 sq. mtrs., CTS.No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq.mtrs., both constitute one property with following boundaries;

East : House of Hiremath
West : House of Baligheid
South : Road
North : Property of Vastrad.

b. Bin Shetki plot in land Sy.No.65/1+2+4/19 out of it plot No.40 measuring 9X12 meters situated at Rabkavi, having following boundaries;

East : Land Sy.No.66
West : Road to plot
South : Plot No.39
North : Plot No.41.

c. Golden Ornaments of 20 tolas, kept with Smt. Subhadra W/o: Basavaraj Hindivali purchased by her husband.

2. Brief facts of case of the plaintiff is as under:

a). It is stated that, the propositus of plaintiff and defendants namely Basavaraj @ Basavanneppa S/o Devendrappa Hindivali was died on 15.06.2002. He was Government servant and getting pension. His wife Subhadra also died on 11.02.2011. They got one son namely Sanjeevakumar who also died leaving behind the defendants as his heirs. The plaintiff is daughter propositus Basavaraj @ Basavanneppa. Thus, the plaintiff and defendant No.1 to 3 constituted Hindu undivided joint family members and suit schedule properties are their ancestral and joint family properties and they are in joint possession and enjoyment. It is stated that, there is no any partition has been taken place in between the plaintiff and defendants in the suit properties.

b). It is further stated that, after death of said Basavaraj @ Basavanneppa Hindivali, the name of his wife Subhadra and his son Sanjeevakumar and daughter Sangeeta came to be entered in the concerned records of rights.

c). It is stated that, plot No.40 measuring 9X12 meters situated in the land Sy.No.65/1+2+4/19 of Rabkavi was purchased by the propositus Basavannappa out of his pension funds and GPF amount in the name of his son Sanjeevakumar, out of love and affection on 04.08.1997 for total consideration amount of Rs.31,500/- from one Shanta Gunaki. Though, the said plot was standing in the name of Sanjeevakumar but it is also joint family property of plaintiff and defendants. The said Sanjeevakumar had no independent income to purchase the plot. Therefore, all suit properties are ancestral and joint family properties of plaintiff and defendants.

d). It is further stated, the deceased Sanjeevakumar has played mischief on the plaintiff and got entered his name in the concerned records on the basis of alleged release deed

executed by the plaintiff and her mother and without consent of plaintiff got mutated the properties in his name. After death of said Sanjeevakumar, the plaintiff issued notice dated 05.09.2020 to Commissioner of Municipality of Rabkavi-Banhatti and City Surveyor, objecting for warsa entry in the names of defendant No.1 to 3 in respect of suit properties. In spite of it, the concerned authorities entered the names of defendants in the concerned records. The plaintiff is having legitimate share in the suit properties. The alleged release deed dated 02.05.2008 is sham, bogus and prepared fraudulently colluding with bond writer and witnesses. Neither the plaintiff nor her mother have put their signature to the said release deed. Therefore, the release deed is not binding on the rights of plaintiff. The plaintiff is having half share in the suit properties.

e). It is further stated that, the defendant No.1 to 3 taking their names in concerned records are trying to alienate the suit properties and denied the share of plaintiff in the suit

properties. The plaintiff requested the defendants to allot her legitimate share in the properties but the defendants are denied the rights of plaintiff over the suit properties and therefore cause of action arise to file present suit. On these and other grounds sought to decree the suit.

3. After registration of suit, suit summons issued to defendants. The defendants appeared through their counsel and resisted the claim of the plaintiff by filing contesting written statement. In the written statement, the averments of plaintiff are categorically denied. It is denied that, the plaintiff and defendants are joint family members and they are in joint possession over suit properties. It is denied that, there is no any partition taken place in between the plaintiff and defendants in the suit properties. The plaintiff filed present suit by suppressing real facts.

a). It is stated that, the CTS.No.8637 and 8638/C are ancestral properties. Previously the propositus Basavaraj @ Basavanneppa Hindivali was owner and possessor of these

properties and he died on 15.06.2002, leaving behind his wife Subhadra, plaintiff and husband of defendant No.1 as his Class-I legal heirs. Accordingly, their names came to be entered in the concerned records. It is stated that, the plaintiff and her mother Subhadra with their own will and wish relinquished their rights in the said properties in favour of husband of defendant No.1 on 02.05.2008 and accordingly, the name of husband of defendant No.1 came to be entered in the concerned records. The husband of defendant No.1 died on 31.07.2020, leaving behind the defendant No.1 to 3 as his legal heirs.

b). It is further stated that, the suit plot No.40 situated in land Sy.No.65/1+2+3+4/19 measuring 9X12 meters, purchased by the husband of defendant No.1 i.e., Sanjeevakumar Hindivali on 04.08.1997 for total consideration amount of Rs.31,500/- from one Shanata W/o Sangappa Gunaki. The said property is self acquired property of husband of defendant No.1. The husband of defendant No.1 was a Class-I Contractor

and from his self earning has purchased the said plot and therefore it is not the joint family property of plaintiff and defendants. It is denied that, the said plot was purchased in the name of Sanjeevakumar Hindivali, by his father namely Basavaraj @ Basavanneppa Hindivali from retirement amount received from the government. The plaintiff resided in her husband's house from the date of her marriage and therefore, she is not contributed any money to purchase the said plot. After death of husband of defendant No.1, these defendants succeeded the said plot and they are enjoying the same as absolute owners and also paying tax to the concerned department.

c). It is further stated that, after death of husband of defendant No.1, this defendant No.1 looked into the mother of plaintiff i.e., Subhadra. The mother of plaintiff always suffering from illness and this defendant provided all facilities to the said Subhadra. She died on 13.02.2013. In spite of all, the plaintiff suppressed the real facts and filed present suit

without any cause of action. It is stated the suit of the plaintiff is not at all maintainable in eye of law. On these and other grounds, sought to dismiss the suit.

4. On the basis of pleadings of parties, the following issues have been framed;

ISSUES

1. Whether the plaintiff proves that, she and defendants constitute members of Hindu joint family and the suit properties are their ancestral and joint family properties and they are in joint possession and enjoyment of the same?
2. Whether the plaintiff further proves that, the release deed dated 02.05.2008 is void and same is not binding upon her share?
3. Whether the defendants prove that, the suit plot No.40 situated at RS.No.65/1+2+4/19 is self acquired property of the deceased husband of defendant No.1?
4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief as sought for?
5. What order of decree?

5. In order to prove the case, the plaintiff herself examined as PW-1. In support of the case, got marked the documents at Ex.P.1 to P-14. The defendant No.1 examined as DW-1. In support of the defence got marked the documents at Ex.D-1 to D-18. Deed writer namely Ravindra Bhuti has been examined as CW-1 and his signature got marked at Ex.D-16(c).

6. Heard arguments and perused the material on record.

7. My answer to the above issues are as under:

Issue No.1 : **In the Partly Affirmative.**

Issue No.2 : **Does not survive for consideration.**

Issue No.3. : **In the Negative.**

Issue No.4 : **In the Partly Affirmative.**

Issue No.5 : As per final order for
the following:

: REASONS :

8. **Issue No.1 to 3:** These issues are interlinked with each other and to avoid repetition of facts are taken into for discussion together.

As stated supra, the plaintiff contended that, the propositus Basavaraj @ Basavannappa Hidnivali was owner and possessor of suit schedule property CTS No.8637 measuring 48-50 sq meters and CTS No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq meters. The said Basavannappa died on 15.06.2002, leaving behind his wife Subhadra, daughter plaintiff and son Sanjeevkumar. It is further contention of the plaintiff is that, the said Basavannappa @ Basavaraj was government retired servant and pension holder and he himself purchased the suit plot No.40 measuring 9 x 12 meters situated in NA Land Sy.No.65/1+2+4/19 from his pension funds and GPF funds in the name of his son Sanjeevkumar, out of love and affection. It is case of the plaintiff that, all suit properties are ancestral and joint family properties. It is stated the husband of defendant No.1 i.e brother of plaintiff Sanjeevkumar has created alleged Release deed and mutated the suit properties in his name. It is stated that, the plaintiff is having equal share in the suit properties. Material averments of plaint are categorically

denied by the defendants. It is denied that, the plaintiff and defendants are joint in possession over suit properties and there is no any partition has been taken place. It is stated that, the suit property plot No.40 measuring 9 x 12 meters is self acquired property of the deceased Sanjeevkumar. It is further stated that, the plaintiff and his mother relinquished their rights and executed document in favour of husband of defendant No.1 in respect of property house properties. The plaintiff filed suit by suppressing real facts. It is well settled law that when the defendants denied the rights of the plaintiff in the suit properties, it is for the plaintiff to prove that, the suit properties are ancestral and joint family properties and alleged release deed is created document. The plaintiff and defendants led their oral as well as documentary evidence. I have perused evidence on record. The plaintiff herself entered into witness box and got examined as Pw.1. The oral evidence of PW.1 is in consonance with plaint averments. In support of case, the plaintiff produced 4 rulled cards in respect of suit properties

and same are marked as Ex.P.1 to 4. These documents reveals that, the propositus Basavannappa was previous owner and possessor of properties CTS No.8637 measuring 48-50 sq meters and CTS No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq meters. It is admitted fact that, the said Basavannappa died without intestate leaving behind his wife Subhadra, daughter i,e plaintiff and son deceased Sanjeevkumar. Ex.P.1 to 4 further reveals that, after death of said Basavannappa, the said properties are transferred in the name of plaintiff, her mother Subhadra and deceased Sanjeevkumar and their names appearing as joint owners and possessors. The defendants at para No.5 of written statement, clearly admitted that, the CTS No.8637 measuring 48-50 sq meters and CTS No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq meters are ancestral properties between themselves and plaintiff and succeeded by them from propositus Basavannappa Hindiwali. The defendant No.1 examined as Dw.1. In the evidence of Dw.1 at para 3 also stated that, the CTS No.8637 measuring 48-50 sq meters and

CTS No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq meters acquired by the said Basavannappa Hindivali under partition taken place in between himself and his brothers. Therefore, the admissions made in the written statement and evidence are admissible against them as proprio vigore. Meaning thereby by its own strength or by its own force. A thing admitted by way of pleadings, in view of section 53 of BSA-2023, they need not be proved by placing any evidence. Further Order 8 rule 5 of C.P.C also provides that, even a vague and evasive denial may be treated as an admission and court may pass a decree on such admission, in view order 12 rule 6 of code of civil procedure. If the parties themselves admitted that, the suit properties CTS No.8637 measuring 48-50 sq meters and CTS No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq are ancestral properties, the court can not insists on proof of the fact admitted in the pleadings. Hence, unless perusal of other material, on the side of either parties, it can safely conclude that, the property CTS No.8637 measuring

48-50 sq meters and CTS No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq are the ancestral properties of plaintiff and defendants.

9. With respect of suit plot No.40 measuring 9 x 12 meters situated in land Sy.No.65/1+2+4/19 is concerned, it is specific case of the plaintiff that, the said property is purchased by the father Basavannappa in the name of deceased Sanjeevkumar out of pension funds and GPF amount received by him at the time of retirement. On the other hand, the defendants categorically denied and stated that it is self acquired property of deceased Sanjeevkumar. So, heavy burden is shifted upon the plaintiff to prove that, the said property is joint family property purchased from retirement benefits of said Basavannappa in the name of Sanjeevkumar. The joint family property can be divided into two classes, namely ancestral property, and separate property of co-parceners thrown into common co-parcenary stock. Property jointly acquired by the members of a joint family, with the aid of ancestral property, is joint family property. Property jointly acquired by the members

of a joint family without the aid of ancestral property may or may not be joint family property; whether it is so or not, is a question of fact in each case. The term joint family property is synonymous with coparcenary property. Separate property includes 'self- acquired 'property.

10. Generally speaking, the normal state of every Hindu family is joint, presumably every such family is joint in food, worship and estate. In absence of proof of division, such is the legal presumption. It is needless to say that, there is no presumption that, a family, because it is joint possesses joint property or any property. When in a suit for partition, a party claims that any particular item of the property is joint family property, a party contends that the property is joint family property, the burden of proving it rests on the party asserting it.

11. To render the property joint, the plaintiff must prove that the family was possessed some property, with the income of which the property could have been acquired, or from which

the presumption could have be drawn that all the property possessed by the family is joint family property. Where the plaintiff failed to discharge the burden of proving that the property had been acquired out of joint family funds, and the defendant was able to prove separate earnings and other records were also in his name, the suit for partition is liable to be dismissed. Thus, when the properties were proved to be self-acquired properties, coupled with the fact that there was no evidence as regards joint family nucleus, such properties could be dealt with for disposition in any manner, as they were self-acquired.

12. In the background of these legal principles, let me see what is the nature of suit plot No.40 herein the case. As already repeatedly stated that, it is specific case of plaintiff that, the suit plot No.40 was purchased by propositions Basavanappa in the name of his son deceased Sanjeevkumar from his retirement amount and GPF amount. Plaintiff claiming a share in the said property contending that, it is a joint family

property. So, the burden of proving that, it is the joint family property rests on the plaintiff. In order to substantiate the same except oral evidence of Pw.1, nothing has been placed on record in support of claim of plaintiff. The plaintiff not at all produced pension documents, GPF withdrawal documents etc., of deceased Basavanappa. Even, the plaintiff not all pleaded in the plaint that, when the said Basavannappa was retired from service, how much pension and GPF amount was received by him. In that regard learned counsel for the plaintiff put many questions to the Dw.1 in the cross examination but nothing has been elucidated from her mouth in support of the case of the plaintiff. Dw.1 stated that, the said Basavannappa died after 15 years from date of his retirement. As per plaint averments, the said Basavanna died on 15.06.2022. So, somewhere he was retired in the year 1988 or 1989. The original sale deed got marked as Ex.D.6. On going through the said document, wherein it clearly goes to show that, the husband of defendant No.1 namely Sanjeevkumar had

purchased the plot No.40 from its previous owner one Smt Shanta W/o Sangappa Gunakai and Smt Soluchana W/o Khemanna Gunaki for valuable consideration amount of Rs. 31,500/- in the year 1997. The sale deed further reveals that, as on the purchase of said plot, the age of said Sanjeev kumar was 29 years and his occupation shown as business. So, no material placed from the date of retirement of said Basavanappa to purchase of this plot, in which bank the retirement amount etc was kept. Even, none of the witness or the vendors of said plot are not examined to prove that, the consideration was paid by the propositus Basavannappa. Therefore, though the plaintiff contended the said plot purchased from retirement benefits of her father but has failed to discharge the burden of proving that, the suit plot No.40 had been acquired out of joint family funds and nominally sale deed had executed in the name of husband of defendant No.1 Sanjeevkumar.

13. As stated, the plaintiff failed to prove that the suit plot No. 40 is the joint family property. If the plaintiff proved her case then only burden is shifted upon the defendants to disprove the case. Nothing has been proved by the defendants in this case, even I have perused the evidence of defence side. The defendants contended that, the said property is self acquired property of deceased Sanjeevkumar and it was purchased by him from his own earnings. It is specific contention of the defendants, that the deceased Sanjeevkumar was the Class-I contractor and having sufficient income. In order to prove the said fact, the defendants produced the document of license and marked as Ex.D.7. This document clearly goes to show that, the husband of defendant No.1 was a class-I contractor. Pw.1 in the cross examination clearly admitted that, the deceased Sanjeev Kumar was a class-I contractor in the KEB and he was sufficient income. Pw.1 further admitted that, during service of her father, his salary was very small. So, these material admissions in the cross

examination are sufficient to come to conclusion that, the husband of defendant No.1 was having sufficient income to purchase the property. Therefore without much discussion I have come to the conclusion that, the plaintiff has failed to discharge the burden of proving that the plot No.40 had purchased in the name of deceased Sanjeevkumar from the retirement benefits of her father and it is a joint family property of herself and defendants. Therefore, question of presumption that, the family is joint and the property is joint family property is unsustainable in law.

14. Yet another contention of the defendants that, the plaintiff and her mother were relinquished their rights in the suit property bearing CTS No.8637 and 868/C and executed the document dated 02.05.2008. In that regard, the defendant No.1 also deposed in her evidence. The alleged released deed produced and got marked as Ex.D.16. I have perused the Ex.D.16 carefully. It is pertinent to mention here that, the Ex.D.16 was impounded and deficit stamp duty was collected.

Now let me analyses whether the defendants have probablised their title over the said suit properties basing on Ex.D.16. The learned counsel for the defendants strenuously argued that, the defendants acquired absolute rights over suit properties by virtue of the release deed and on the basis of said document, the said properties were transferred in the name of deceased Sanjeevkumar. It is further argued that, after death of said Sanjeevkumar, these defendants succeeded the said properties and their names came to be entered in the concerned records as varasa and they become absolute owners and possessors of suit properties. It is further argued that, from the date of marriage, the plaintiff residing at her husband's house and therefore she is never in the possession over said properties. The arguments canvassed by the counsel for the defendants has derived my careful consideration. The alleged release deed marked as Ex.D.16. I have perused Ex.D.16 carefully. Though the document is nomenclatured as relinquishment deed and under said document the plaintiff

and her mother gave up rights in the said properties in favour of said Sanjeevkumar and on the basis of said document the name of deceased Sanjeevkumar came to be entered in the concerned records but Ex.D.16 is not registered document and no title has been passed in favour of deceased Sanjeevkumar on the basis of said document. An instrument of relinquishment deed needs registration as per section 17 of the Registration Act. At the cost of repetition, I may state that the deficit stamp duty was collected by this court as per section 35 of Karnataka Stamp Act 1957.

15. However, the insufficiency of stamp duty and non registration are two different things. In plethora of decisions, the Hon'ble Apex court has laid down law that, the insufficiency of stamp duty is curable defect wherein as non registration is an incurable one. I am aware that section 49 of the registration Act, 1908 postulates that an unregistered document can be looked into by the court for collateral transactions. However, in the present case on hand, the defendants trying to establish

their absolute title over the said properties based upon this deed of relinquishment alone. In other words the defendants relies upon this document not for any collateral transaction but for the main purpose of getting absolute rights over the said properties. Though the defendants deposited the insufficient stamp duty and penalty, even though the Ex.D.16 cannot be looked into any purpose for want of registration. Thus, the proviso to section 49 of the registration Act does not come in aid to the defendants. Therefore the relinquishment deed marked as Ex.D.16 cannot be looked into and on the basis of said document the defendants not acquired any absolute rights over said properties.

16. Besides, the defendants have not produced any other title documents so as to substantiate their absolute title over said CTS properties. The revenue records like, mutation register, extracts cannot be documents of title. Hence, in view of the above discussion, I am of the opinion that, the defendants failed to prove that, the plaintiff has relinquished

her rights over suit properties. The title of these two properties not transferred in accordance with law in favour of defendants and therefore declaration of alleged released deed as not binding or created etc., as claimed by the plaintiff does not arise at all. Therefore without much discussion I hold that, the plaintiff proved Issue No.1, on the other hand the defendants failed to prove Issue No.3. **Accordingly, the Issue No.1 answered in the Partly Affirmative, Issue No.3 answered in the Negative and Issue No.2 answered as does not survive for consideration.**

17. **Issue No.4:** The plaintiff seeking the partition and separate possession over suit properties. As already I have held that, the plaintiff proved that, the suit property CTS No.8637 and 8638/C are ancestral properties of herself and defendants. I have further held that, the defendants failed to prove that, the plaintiff has relinquished her rights over said properties in favour of deceased Sanjeevkumar. I have further held that, the suit plot No.40 situated in land

Sy.No.65/1+2+4/19 is self acquired property of deceased Sanjeevkumar. After his death, the defendants being legal heirs are succeeded the said property. However, the property CTS No.8637 and 8638/C being ancestral properties the plaintiff and deceased Sanjeevkumar are having $\frac{1}{2}$ share. The plaintiff also sought share in 20 Tola golden ornaments alleged to have been kept with her mother Smt Subhadra W/o Basavaraj Hindivali but no such material have been placed to show that, the mother of plaintiff left the golden ornaments. So, the plaintiff also failed to prove that, there was a 20 Tola golden ornaments left by her mother. Hence, the plaintiff is entitled $\frac{1}{2}$ share in the said properties and the defendants are entitled $\frac{1}{2}$ share jointly in the said properties. **Hence, without much discussion the Issue No.4 answered in the Partly Affirmative.**

18. Issue No.5: In view of discussion made above, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Suit of the plaintiff is hereby decreed with cost in part.

It is ordered and declared that, the plaintiff is entitled $\frac{1}{2}$ share in the suit schedule properties bearing CTS No.8637 measuring 48-50 sq. mtrs., and CTS No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq mtrs., situated at Banahatti Town, Tq: Rabkavi-Banahatti.

Further, it is ordered and declared that, the defendant No.1 to 3 are jointly entitled $\frac{1}{2}$ share in the suit schedule properties bearing CTS No.8637 measuring 48-50 sq. meters and CTS No.8638/C measuring 25-20 sq meters situated at Banahatti, Town, Tq: Rabkavi-Banahatti.

The suit of the plaintiff in respect of Plot No.40 measuring 9x12 meters situated at RS No.64/1+2+4/19 and golden ornaments of 20 Tolas is hereby dismissed.

If any IA's are pending also disposed accordingly.

Office is hereby directed to draw preliminary decree and register FDP and post the same before the court for further steps on 30.04.2026.

The parties are directed to note the date fixed for hearing of FDP on 30.04.2026 and to appear before the court on the said date.

It is made it clear that, no further notice would be issued to the parties in the FDP case.

(Typed to my dictation directly on computer by the stenographer, corrected, signed by me and then pronounced in the open court on this the 06th day of March 2026)

(Ashappa)
Senior Civil Judge and JMFC,
Banahatti

ANNEXURE

List of Witnesses Examined for the Plaintiffs:

PW.1 : Sangeeta @ Shaila W/o: Shivanand Cholaki.

List of Documents Marked for the Plaintiffs:

Ex.P.1 to 4 : 4 Rule cards
Ex.P.5 & 6 : 2 MR extracts
Ex.P.7 & 8 : Copies of notices
Ex.P.9 & 10 : 2 Postal receipts
Ex.P.11 & 12: 2 Postal acknowledgments
Ex.P.13 & 14: 2 Property register cards.

List of Witnesses Examined for the Defendants:

DW.1 : Smt. Kavita W/o: Sanjeevakumar Hindivali.

List of Documents Marked for the Defendants:

- Ex.D.1 : Application given to CMC Rabkavi-Banhatti
Ex.D.2 : Copy of Notice
Ex.D.2(a) : Signature of mother of plaintiff i.e., Subhadra
Ex.D.2(b) : Signature of plaintiff
Ex.D.3 : Reply
Ex.D.3(a) : Signature of mother of plaintiff i.e., Subhadra
Ex.D.3(b) : Signature of plaintiff
Ex.D.4 : Original Cheque
Ex.D.5 : RTC extract
Ex.D.6 : Original Sale deed
Ex.D.7 : License book
Ex.D.8 : Bank receipt
Ex.D.9 : CTS extract
Ex.D.10 to 15: 6 Tax paid receipts
Ex.D.16 : Relinquishment deed
Ex.D.17 : Challan
Ex.D.18 : Copy of application given to CMC Rabkavi-Banhatti.

**Senior Civil Judge and JMFC,
Banahatti**