

KABR320002972008



**IN THE COURT OF PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC., AT  
DEVANAHALLI.**

**Dated this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of April 2026**

**:PRESENT:**

**SRI. VENKATESHA.N., B.A.LL.B, LL.M.,  
PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.,  
DEVANAHALLI.**

**O.S.No.145/2008**

**Plaintiff/s :**

**Sri. Shivakumar**

S/o Late Munishamappa,

Aged about 40 years,

R/at Chikkanahalli Village,

Vijayapura Hobli,

Devanahalli Taluk.

**(By Sri. T.K.S., Advocate)**

**V/s**

**Defendant/s:**

**1. Sri. V. Muniyappa**

Dead by his LR's

**1(a). Smt. Parijathamma**

W/o Late V. Muniyappa,

Aged about 65 years,

**1(b). Smt. Dhanalakshmi**

S/o Late V. Muniyappa,  
Aged about 58 years,

**1(c). Sri. Shivanna**

Aged about 55 years,  
S/o Late V. Muniyappa,

**1(d). Sri. Venkatesh**

S/o Late V. Muniyappa,  
Aged about 52 years,

**1(e). Smt. Suguna**

D/o Late V. Muniyappa,  
Aged about 49 years,

**1(f). Sri. Krishnamurthy**

S/o Late V. Muniyappa,  
Aged about 45 years,

**1(g). Sri. Manjunath**

Dead by his LR's.

**(a). Smt. Malathi**

W/o Late Manjunath,  
Aged about 40 years,

**(b). Sri. Nikith**

S/o Late Manjunath,  
Aged about 21 years,

**(c). Sri. Nikhil**

S/o Late Manjunath,  
Aged about 19 years,

All are R/at Chikkanahalli Village,  
Vijayapura Hobli,  
Devanahalli Taluk.

**(By D-1 (a to g) Sri. B.M.S., Advocate)**  
**(D-1(f) Absent)**

Date of institution of the suit	<b>16.02.2008</b>		
Nature of the suit	<b>DECLARATION &amp; PERMANENT INJUNCTION</b>		
Date of commencement of recording of evidence	<b>26.03.2019</b>		
Date on which the Judgment was pronounced	<b>30.04.2026</b>		
TOTAL	<b>YEAR</b>	<b>MONTH</b>	<b>DAY</b>
	<b>18</b>	<b>02</b>	<b>14</b>

**PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.,  
DEVANAHALLI.**

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

The plaintiff has filed this suit against the defendants for the relief of declaration of title and permanent injunction in respect of suit schedule property.

**2. Brief case of the Plaintiff is as follows:-**

The plaintiff and his brothers are the absolute owners in possession of the suit schedule property i.e., the property measuring to an extent 21 guntas in Sy.No.37 (now the same as been given resurvey Nos. as 37/2 & 37/3) situated at Chikkanahalli Village, Vijayapura Hobli, Devanahalli Taluk bounded with:-

East by : Thoti inam land,  
West by : Defendant's property,  
North by : Plaintiff's property,  
South by : Road.

**3.** It is further submitted that, the plaintiff and his brothers are the absolute owners in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. The schedule property was originally belongs to the plaintiff's father having purchased the same through a registered sale deed dated 04.09.1979. Ever since he was in possession and enjoyment of schedule property till his death. The father of plaintiff died on 14.11.2007 leaving behind the plaintiff and other sons as his legal heirs. The plaintiff and other sons of late. Munishamappa are in joint possession and enjoyment of suit schedule property and the plaintiff filing the present suit on behalf of all his brothers. The plaintiff and his brothers are personally cultivating the schedule property by raising agricultural crops. Earlier the khata in respect of schedule property was mutated to the name of plaintiff's father vide MR.No.3/1979-80. The defendant is no way concerned with the schedule property and he is utter stranger to the plaintiff's family. The defendant in the year 2002 by giving false representation to the revenue authorities managed to got the khata with respect to 7 guntas in schedule property to his name, MR.No.9/2001-02 dated

14.06.2003. After the father of plaintiff came to know the illegal acts of defendant, he has challenged same before the Assistant Commissioner, Doddaballapura Sub Division in RA.No.64/2003-04. The learned Assistant Commissioner, after hearing the matter pleased to allow the regular appeal filed by the said Munishamappa and ordered to cancel the mutation order No.9/2001-02 dated 11.03.2005.

4. It is further submitted that, the plaintiff's father has given an application to the Tahasildhar for rectification of entries and the same is still pending for consideration. In the meantime the defendant by giving false representation to the revenue and survey authorities managed to get the re-survey numbers as No.37/1, 37/2 & 37/3 and it is shown that, the plaintiff and his family members are in possession of 14 guntas of land in Sy.No.37/2. The revenue authorities have no right to phode the schedule survey number and give resurvey numbers as stated above without the consent and knowledge of the plaintiff and his family members. However, ever since the plaintiff and his family members are in possession and enjoyment of schedule property till this date. The defendant owns some property in schedule. The western side of schedule and he has no manner of right, title or interest over suit schedule property. The defendant taking undue advantage of fact that, the revenue authorities till today have not rectified the entries as per the orders passed in RA.No.64/2003-04. Since from past two years

trying to knock of schedule property and put an eye on the same. That when on 12.02.2008 the plaintiff and his brothers are in schedule property, the defendant along with his henchmen interfered with the schedule property and tried to dig trenches in schedule property with an intention to put up stone slabs for the purpose of planting grape plants in schedule property on ground that, the khata in respect of schedule property is standing in his name. The plaintiff and his brothers with great difficulty resisted the same. Thereafter, the plaintiff has approached the jurisdictional police and lodged complaint against the defendant, the police refused to receive the complaint and advised the plaintiff to approach the civil court for suitable remedy. That, till today the defendant has not challenged the orders passed in RA.No.64/2003-04 and the same is final one. Therefore, the plaintiff has no other alternative except the file the present suit for the relief of permanent injunction against the defendant, restraining him from interfering with the suit schedule property. The cause of action arose for the suit on 12.02.2008 when the defendant came near the suit schedule property. Hence, the suit.

5. Upon service of suit summons defendant appeared through his counsel and filed written statement. It is contended that, the suit filed by the plaintiff not maintainable either in law or on facts and the same is liable to be dismissed. It is submitted that, land bearing Sy.No.37 of Chikkanahalli Village totally measures 1

acre 2 guntas. The said property was divided long back and western portion measuring 14 guntas fallen to the share of Hanummappa which is succeeded by his sons Pillappa and Narayanaswamy. The defendant submits that, out of the remaining extent in the said survey number an extent of 14 guntas of land in the said survey number has been in possession and enjoyment of defendant V. Muniyappa, who is the son of late Venkatarayappa. The defendant submits that, out of the remaining an extent of 14 guntas was in possession and enjoyment of V. Chikka Muniyappa, S/o Late Venkatarayappa and said V. Chikka Muniyappa is stated to have sold the 14 guntas of land in favour of Munishamappa S/o Late Chikkashettappa who is the father of the defendant. Said V. Chikka Muniyappa has wrongly stated the extent, while selling his portion of the land i.e., instead of 14 guntas, he has sold 21 guntas of land in the said survey number and the same is incorrect and what he has sold is only 14 guntas of land. The defendant submits that, accordingly, the LR's of Hanumappa i.e., Narayanaswamy S/o Hanumappa has been in possession and enjoyment of 11 guntas of land and Pillappa S/o Hanumappa was in guntas of land belonging to Hanumappa Munishamappa S/o Late Chikkeshettappa father of plaintiff was in possession of 14 guntas (and not 21 guntas) and the defendant V. Muniyappa has been in possession and enjoyment of 14 guntas out of the said Sy.No.37 (which measures a total extent of 1 acre 2

guntas) and the same was confirmed on the basis of actual possession and enjoyment of the said extents by the order of the Tahasildhar made in RRT.CR.437/2000-01 dated 03.06.2002 and the said order was made with due notice to said persons and accordingly, the Tahasildhar has directed the office to enter the names of the said persons to the extents as mentioned above in Col.No.9 of the RTC. The defendant submits that, accordingly, the mutation was effected and consequently, their names have been entered both in Col.No.9 & 12(2) of the RTC, which is disclosed from the RTC for the year 2001-02 and as per the entries made therein in Col.No.9 Pillappa S/o Hanumappa has been recognized as the khatedar to the extent of 3 guntas Narayanaswamy S/o Hanumappa has been recognized as the khatedar to the extent of 11 guntas, Munishamappa S/o Shettappa, father of the plaintiff had been recognized as the khatedar to the extent of 14 guntas and the defendant V. Muniyappa has been recognized as the khatedar to the extent of 14 guntas (All together measuring 1 acre 2 guntas). Even in Col.No.12(2) also their names have been entered and there has been no dispute with regard to possession and enjoyment of the said extents by the said persons and also as per the entries under the revenue records such as RTC. The defendant submits that, even as per the RTC for the year 2004-05, the names of the above said persons are mentioned both in Col.No.9 and also Col.No.12(2) to the extent they own and in possession.

The defendant submits that, consequent upon the orders made by the Tahasildhar, the survey and settlement has taken place and the respective extents of the said persons have been assigned with New Sy.Nos., as per the Atlas maintained by the authorities concerned. As per the survey and settlement the land belonging to Hanumappa's sons-Pillappa & Narayanaswamy have been assigned with Sy.No.37/1 measuring 14 guntas. Likewise, the defendant V. Muniyappa's name has been entered to the extent of 14 guntas of land by assigning the said extent as Sy.No.37/2 & the portion of the land in possession and enjoyment of V. Chikka Muniyappa S/o Venkatarayappa purchased by Munishamappa Bin Late Chikkashettappa has been assigned as Sy.No.37/3 to the extent of 14 guntas and the said lands have been measured and the survey authorities have prepared the Atals. As per the Hissa survey phodi V. Muniyappa has been recognized as the khatedar owner to the extent of 14 guntas in Sy.No.37/2 & accordingly, each one of the above said persons have been in separate possession and enjoyment of the extents of lands as stated above.

**6.** Consequent upon the survey and settlement and assigning of New survey numbers the mutation has been effected vide MR.No.22/2005-06 dated 06.04.2006 and from the same, it is clear that, Sy.No.37/1 measuring 3 guntas is made in the name of Pillappa S/o Late Hanumappa and an extent of 11 guntas in

Sy.No.37/1 has been made in the name of Narayanaswamy S/o Late Hanumappa and whereas Sy.No.37/2 measuring 14 guntas is made in the name of the defendant V. Muniyappa & Sy.No.37/3 measuring 14 guntas is made in the name of Munishamappa S/o Shettappa who is the father of the plaintiff and he is no more. The defendant submits that, as per the entry made in the RTC for the year 2006-07, the name of the defendant V. Muniyappa has been entered both as the khatedar in Col.No.9 and as the cultivator as entered in Col.No.12(2) to the extent of 14 guntas and there is no dispute with regard to the same. The defendant submits that, Munishamappa, the father of the plaintiff had filed the appeal in RA.No.64/2003-04 on the file of the Assistant Commissioner, Doddaballapura Sub-Division, Bengaluru as against the order made by the Tahasildhar in RRT.CR.437/2000-01 dated 03.06.2002 and the said appeal has been allowed on 11.03.2005 and the reasons assigned thereunder are contrary to the actual facts of the case and such an order is not sustainable both in law and facts and aggrieved by the said order, the defendant has filed the revision petition before the Spl. Deputy Commissioner in RP.No.143/2007-08 and the same is pending disposal. The defendant submits that, irrespective of the proceedings before the revenue authorities, the fact as to possession and enjoyment of the portions out of Sy.No.37 is as stated above.

7. The defendant submits that, the Assistant Commissioner has not fixed the date for pronouncement of the orders and the Assistant Commissioner is stated to have passed the order in the appeal filed by Munishamappa, the father of the plaintiff on 11.03.2005 and the same is not within the knowledge of the defendant and no endorsement was also issued to the defendant to that effect and whereas Munishamappa, the father of the plaintiff is stated to have filed a petition before the Tahasildhar on 20.08.2007 & it is only then the defendant has come to know of the order made by the Assistant Commissioner & immediately the defendant applied for the certified copy of the said order made by the Assistant Commissioner on 25.08.2007 and the same was delivered on 29.08.2007 and it is only then the defendant came to know the contents of the said order, which is the subject matter of the Revision Petition before the Spl. Deputy Commissioner, Bengaluru District. The defendant submits that, the order made by the Assistant Commissioner is opposed to law and facts of the case and the same is not sustainable both in law and facts and the said order is liable to be set aside and consequently, the order made by the Tahasildhar is liable to be confirmed, since the respective parties are in possession and enjoyment to the extents as stated by the Tahasildhar and also as entered in the revenue records based on the survey and settlement and besides, hissa phodi. The defendant submits that, thought the order

made by the Assistant Commissioner, which was made on 11.03.2005 said Munishamappa, the father of the appellant is stated to have approached the Tahasildhar on 20.08.2007 requesting to give effect to the order made by the Assistant Commissioner and on which basis, the Tahasildhar is bent upon changing the entries and the same is not permissible under law.

**8.** The defendant submits that, the reliance placed by the plaintiff on the revenue records is also not sustainable in law, since the revenue records or any entry made therein are not documents of title. The defendant submits that, it is the contention of the plaintiff to conduct the survey in order to find out as to who is in possession of the land in question and such a contention of the plaintiff is liable to be rejected. The defendant submits that, under law, the boundaries will prevail and not the extent of land, if any mentioned in the document. The defendant submits that, the schedule property as described is incorrect and the boundaries as furnished are also wrong and whereas survey number and the Sub.Nos., of the Sy.No., in question is admitted by the plaintiff and if so the long possession and enjoyment can be verified from the Revenue Records as well as from the survey authorities records.

**9.** The suit as brought about is highly doubtful in nature and consequently, the plaintiff is not entitled to any relief as sought for in the plaint and

for the very reason, the plaintiff is neither entitled to the relief of declaration nor a decree for permanent injunction or temporary injunction. The other allegations made in the plaint, which are not specifically met herewith are all hereby denied either as false or untenable.

**10.** It is stated that, the plaintiff's two brothers mentioned in the genealogical tree one by name Muniramaiah and another brother Krishnappa died during the pendency of the above suit and that has not been brought to the notice of this Hon'ble court by way of amendment and furthermore their LR's are not brought on record. As such, the genealogical tree furnished by plaintiff is defective and not in accordance with law. The plaintiff's family has been divided long back and they have been living in separate houses and as such, the suit filed by plaintiff contending that himself and other brothers are in joint possession of suit schedule property are all false and baseless. The suit filed by plaintiff individually against the defendant, though his brothers were divided long back and in the said context, the plaintiff cannot file the above suit for the alleged relief of declaration which is endowed with suppression of material facts. The above suit is vexatious and beset with several infirmities. The above suit is barred by limitation. The court fee paid by plaintiff is insufficient. This Hon'ble court has no pecuniary jurisdiction to try the above suit. Hence, prays to dismiss the suit.

11. After going through the pleadings and documents produced by both sides, the following issues were framed by my predecessor in office.

1. **Whether the plaintiff proves that, plaintiff and his brothers are in possession and enjoyment of the plaint schedule property as on the date of suit?**
2. **Whether the plaintiff proves that, plaintiff and his brothers are the absolute owners of the plaint schedule property?**
3. **Whether the defendant proves that, in the registered sale deed dated 14.09.1979 bearing No.503/1979-80 of Sub-Registrar Officer, Devanahalli, the vendor of the plaintiff's father wrongly stated the extent as 21 guntas instead of 14 guntas as stated in para 3 of the written statement?**
4. **Whether the suit of the plaintiff is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties?**
5. **Whether the plaintiff proves the alleged interference by the defendant?**
6. **Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction as claimed in the plaint?**
7. **Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the reliefs claimed in the plaint?**
8. **What order or decree?**

12. In order to prove his case, the plaintiff examined as PW.1, filed affidavit in lieu of examination in chief. Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.7 were marked. The defendant No.1(f) examined as DW.1, filed affidavit in lieu of examination in chief. Ex.D.1 to Ex.D.63 were marked.

13. Heard arguments.

14. After going through the oral and documentary evidence available on record and hearing both side argument this Court has answered the above said issues in the following manner:-

Issue No.1 : In the **AFFIRMATIVE**

Issue No.2 : In the **AFFIRMATIVE**

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

Issue No.4 : In the **NEGATIVE**

Issue No.5 : In the **AFFIRMATIVE**

Issue No.6 : In the **AFFIRMATIVE**

Issue No.7 : In the **AFFIRMATIVE**

Issue No.8 : As per the final order for the following:-

### **REASONS**

15. **Issue Nos.1 & 2:-** These issues are inter connected with each other. Hence, they are taken together for common discussion to avoid repetition. It is the case of the plaintiff that, he and his brothers are the absolute owner in possession of the suit schedule property. The defendant is trying to interfere with the suit schedule property. To prove his contention, plaintiff examined as PW.1 and filed affidavit in lieu of examination in chief. Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.7 were marked. PW.1 has reiterated the plaint averments in his chief examination. Ex.P.1 is the registered sale deed, Ex.P.2 is the G-tress, Ex.P.3 is the MR, Ex.P.4 is the certified copy of order and Ex.P.5 to Ex.P.7 are the RTCs.

**16.** PW.1 has reiterated the plaint averments in the chief examination. Ex.P.1 registered sale deed dated 11.09.1979 proves that, one Munishamappa purchased 21 guntas of land in Sy.No.37. In the said document extent has been clearly mentioned as 21 guntas. In Ex.P.3 MR extent has been mentioned as 14 guntas. The defendant has not disputed the genuineness of Ex.P.1 document. It is the only contention of the defendant that, extent has been wrongly mentioned as 21 guntas instated of 14 guntas. The said document is registered document executed at undisputed point of time. Defendant has not filed any suit to declare that, extent mentioned in Ex.P.1 sale deed is wrong.

**17.** Plaintiff has produced certified copy of the order in RA.No.64/2003-04 on the file of Assistant Commissioner Doddaballapura. On perusal of the said document it is clear that, Assistant Commissioner has cancelled the Ex.P.3 MR and order to restore the extent as 21 guntas in favour of plaintiff. In the said order it is clearly mentioned that, Tahasildhar has corrected the measurement without following due process of law. It is also mentioned that, Tahasildhar has passed orders in violation of Principles of natural justice. Ex.D.63 proves that, order of Assistant Commissioner has been set aside by Deputy Commissioner. In the said order it is clearly mentioned that, parties may approached the civil court to get their rights in respect of property. The oral and documentary evidence produced by

plaintiff proves that, plaintiff's father purchased suit schedule property for valuable consideration. It is settled principle of law that, possession follows title. Hence, plaintiff has proved that, plaintiff and his brothers are the absolute owners and they are in possession of the suit schedule property as on the date of suit. Hence, I answered **Issue Nos.1 & 2** in the **AFFIRMATIVE**.

**18. Issue No.3**:- It is the case of the defendant that, vendor of the plaintiff's father had only right over 14 guntas of land but, he has mentioned 21 guntas in the sale deed. It is contended that, there was a partition in the year 1965 and each got 14 guntas in the said partition deed. To prove his case defendant No.1(f) examined as DW.1 filed affidavit in lieu of his chief examination. Ex.D.1 to Ex.D.63 got marked. DW.1 has reiterated the written statement averments in his chief examination. On perusal of Ex.D.14 there is no recitals with regard to allotment of 14 guntas each to 3 sharers. On the contrary 21 guntas has been mentioned. In the cross examination DW.1 clearly admits that, he has no knowledge about the properties of his grand father. He further admits that, in Ex.D.14 it is mentioned that 21 guntas each allotted to Chikkamuniyappa and Muniyappa. He further admits that, as per the Ex.D.14 each sharer are in possession of their respective shares and they are paying tax to the concerned

department. To relevant portion of the cross examination he is extracted here below.

“ನನ್ನ ತಾತನಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಆಸ್ತಿಗಳು ಬಂದಿದೋ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಡಿ.14 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಮುನಿಯನಪ್ಪ ಮತ್ತು ಮುನಿಯಪ್ಪನಿಗೆ ತಲಾ 21 ಗುಂಟೆ ಎಂದು ನಮೂದು ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. 1965 ರ ನಿಡಿ.14ರ ವಿಭಾಗ ಪತ್ರದಂತೆ ಅವರವರ ಹಿಸ್ಸೆಗೆ ಅವರ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಅವರುಗಳ ಕಂದಾಯ ಪಾವತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ.”

**19.** Further, defendant has produced electricity bills which marked as Ex.D.6 to Ex.D.11. The said documents are not sufficient to prove the contention of defendant. Ex.D.16 to Ex.D.33 revenue documents proves that, Sy.No.37 has been phoded as Sy.No.37/1, 37/2 & 37/3. It is pertinent note that, Assistant Commissioner has already set aside the proceedings initiated as per Ex.D.16 to Ex.D.33. Hence, the said documents are not sufficient to prove that, extent has been wrongly mentioned as 21 guntas instead of 14 guntas in Ex.P.1 sale deed. In the cross examination of PW.1 suggestion were put with regard to wrong measurement in the sale deed and possession. The said suggestions were clearly denied by PW.1. No admissions are contradictions elicited in the cross examination of PW.1. Except oral evidence defendant has not produced any documentary evidence to prove that, vendor of the plaintiff's father had right only in respect of

14 guntas and not in respect of 21 guntas. Hence, **Issue No.3** is answered in **NEGATIVE**.

**20. Issue No.4:-** It is the contention of the defendant that, suit is bad for non joinder of necessary parties. It is contended that, brothers and sisters of plaintiff have not been impleaded in this suit. No documents is produced to show that, brothers and sisters of plaintiff have authorized the plaintiff to file this suit on behalf of them. Ex.P.2 G-tree proves that, plaintiff is son of Munishamappa. Defendant has also not disputed the relationship of plaintiff with Munishamappa. Plaintiff has stated that, he has filed suit on behalf of his family members. It is pertinent note that, initially suit was filed for permanent injunction. Thereafter, by way of amendment declaration also sought. It is settled principle of law that, a co-owner can file a suit for injunction against third parties. Admittedly, defendant has no right in the family of plaintiff. The family members of plaintiff can file suit against plaintiff for partition. Defendant has nothing to do with property of plaintiff family. It is settled principle that, every dispute shall be decided on merits. No case shall be dismissed on technical points. Hence, the defendant has failed to prove that, suit is bad for non joinder necessary parties. Hence, **Issue No.4** is answered in **NEGATIVE**.

21. **Issue No.5:-** It is the case of the plaintiff that, defendant is interfering with suit schedule property. Defendant has clearly disputed the measurement of suit schedule property and specifically claims that, he is in possession of 7 guntas land out of 21 guntas. This itself shows that, defendant is interfering with the suit schedule property. Hence, **Issue No.5** is answered in **AFIRMATIVE**.

22. **Issue Nos.6 & 7:-** The plaintiff has proved that, he is the owner and in possession of the suit schedule property and defendants are trying to interfere with suit schedule property. The plaintiff has sought relief of declaration and permanent injunction. Hence, there is no impediment to grant the relief claimed by the plaintiff. The plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration and permanent injunction. Hence, **Issue Nos.6 & 7** are answered in the **AFFIRMATIVE**.

23. **Issue No.8:-** For the reasons stated in Issue Nos.1 to 7 and discussion made above, I answer Issue No.8 as per the following:-

### **ORDER**

**Suit of the plaintiff is hereby decreed.**

**It is declared that, plaintiffs and his brothers are the absolute owners of the suit schedule property.**

**In the result, the defendants or anybody claiming under them are hereby restrained by way of permanent injunction from interfering with the plaintiffs peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property.**

**Considering the facts and circumstances of the case  
there is no order as to cost.**

**Draw decree accordingly.**

(Dictated to the Stenographer on computer and computerized by her, corrected by me and then pronounced in the open court on this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of April 2026.)

**(SRI. VENKATESHA.N)  
PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.,  
DEVANAHALLI.**

**ANNEXURE**

**The list of witnesses examined on behalf of Plaintiff:-**

P.W.1 : Sri. Shivakumar

**The list of documents exhibited on behalf of the Plaintiff:-**

Ex.P.1 : Sale Deed  
Ex.P.2 : G-tree  
Ex.P.3 : Mutation Extract  
Ex.P.4 : AC Order Copy  
Ex.P.5 to 7 : RTC Extracts

**The list of witnesses examined on behalf of Defendant:-**

DW.1 : Sri. Krishnamurthy

**The list of documents exhibited on behalf of Defendant:-**

Ex.D.1 & 2 : RTC Extracts  
Ex.D.3 : Death Certificate  
Ex.D.4 : MR  
Ex.D.5 : RTC Extract  
Ex.D.6 to 10 : Electricity Bill Paid Receipts  
Ex.D.11 : Tax Paid Receipt  
Ex.D.12 & 13 : Photos  
Ex.D.14 : C/c of the Partition Deed  
Ex.D.15 : C/c of the Partition Deed

Ex.D.16	:	C/c of the VA report
Ex.D.17	:	C/c of the Mahazar
Ex.D.18	:	C/c of the RI report
Ex.D.19	:	C/c of the Sketch
Ex.D.20	:	C/c of Amended Order
Ex.D.21	:	C/c of the Official Memorandum
Ex.D.22	:	C/c of the Amended Order
Ex.D.23	:	C/c of the Mahazar
Ex.D.24	:	C/c of the RI report
Ex.D.25	:	C/c of the Pakka Book
Ex.D.26 & 27	:	C/c of the Hissa Tippani
Ex.D.28	:	C/c of the Kardha Nakalu
Ex.D.29	:	C/c of the RR copy
Ex.D.30	:	C/c of the Akarband
Ex.D.31	:	C/c of the Mahazar
Ex.D.32	:	C/c of the Notice
Ex.D.33	:	Endorsement
Ex.D.34 to 42	:	C/c of the RTC Extracts
Ex.D.43	:	C/c of the MR
Ex.D.44 to 58	:	RTC Extracts
Ex.D.59 & 60	:	MR
Ex.D.61	:	C/c of the Order sheet in OS.No.439/2018
Ex.D.62	:	C/c of the Complaint Copy
Ex.D.63	:	C/c of the DC Order Copy

**PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.,  
DEVANAHALLI.**

