

KACM700010832024



Presented on : 01-10-2024
Registered on: 01-10-2024
Decided on : 15-07-2026
Duration : 1 year, 9 months, 14 days

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

P R E S E N T

MUZAFFAR A. MANJARI,
B.A., LL.B.
SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
TARIKERE

DATED THIS THE 15TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

REGULAR APPEAL NO.28/2024

APPELLANTS :

1. Smt. Seethamma W/o Somanna,
Aged about 75 years,
R/o. Maravanji, Hochihalli,
Chowlahiriyuru Hobli, Kadur Taluk,
Chikkamagaluru District.
2. Smt. Shanthamma W/o Siddaramappa,
Aged about 60 years,
R/o Near Beeralingeswara Temple,
Gadihalli, Ajjampura Taluk.
3. Smt. Sarojamma W/o Manjappa,
Aged about 58 years,
R/o Attiganalu Village,
Kasaba Hobli, Tarikere Taluk.



(By Sri. B.P. Rajashekhar, Adv.)

V/s

RESPONDENTS :

1. Smt. Thimmamma
W/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 70 years,
R/o Gadihalli Village,
Ajjampura Hobli, Tarikere Taluk.
2. Smt. Manjamma
D/o Late Hanumanthappa,
W/o Venkatappa,
Aged about 45 years,
R/o Revannasiddeshwara Road,
Ajjampura Town, Tarikere Taluk.
3. Sri. Vasantha G.H.
S/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 39 years,
R/o Gadihalli Village,
Ajjampura Hobli, Tarikere Taluk.
4. Sri. Puttappa
S/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 36 years,
R/o Gadihalli Village,
Ajjampura Hobli, Tarikere Taluk.
5. Smt. Kamalamma
D/o Late Hanumanthappa,
W/o Govindappa,
Aged about 33 years,
R/o Shivani Village, Shivani Hobli,
Tarikere Taluk.
6. Sri. Basavarajappa
S/o Late Halli Hanumanna
@ Halyappa,
Aged about 66 years,



R/o Gadihalli Village,
Ajjampura Hobli, Tarikere Taluk.

7. Sri. Thippeshappa
S/o Late Halli Hanumanna
@ Halyappa,
Aged about 62 years,
R/o Gadihalli Village,
Ajjampura Hobli, Tarikere Taluk.
8. Sri. Malleshappa
S/o Late Halli Hanumanna
@ Halyappa,
Aged about 54 years,
R/o Gadihalli Village,
Ajjampura Hobli, Tarikere Taluk.
9. The Land Acquisition Officer/
Assistant Commissioner,
Tarikere Sub-Division, Tarikere Taluk.

(R1 to 4 & 6 to 8 – Absent)
(R5 – Ex-parte)
(R9 by ADGP)

Date and nature of decree : Judgment and decree dated
or order appealed against 25.10.2022 passed by Court
of Civil Judge & Addl. JMFC,
Tarikere in O.S.No.31/2019

Date of institution of appeal: 01.10.2024

Date of judgment : 15.07.2026

Total duration : Year/s Month/s Day/s
01 09 14

**SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
TARIKERE**



J U D G M E N T

This appeal is filed by appellants/original defendants No.5 to 7 against respondents/original plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 4 under Order XLI Rule 1 read with Section 96 of C.P.C. challenging judgment and decree dated 25.10.2022 passed by the Court of Civil Judge & Addl. JMFC, Tarikere in O.S.No.31/2019.

2. For the sake of convenience and brevity, the parties would be referred to in this judgment as per their ranks before the trial court.

3. Brief facts of the case leading to this appeal are as follows :

The plaintiffs/respondents No.1 to 5 filed a suit bearing O.S.No.31/2019 before the Court of Civil Judge and Addl. JMFC, Tarikere against the defendants No.1 to 7/respondents No.6 to 9 and appellants for partition and separate possession seeking 1/4th share in 1/5th share of Halli Hanumanna in suit item No.2 to 8 properties and compensation amount awarded in respect of suit item No.1 property and for such other reliefs.

4. The plaintiffs had filed this suit initially against the defendants No.1 to 4 only and they had averred in their original plaint before the trial court that one Hanumanthappa was husband of the plaintiff No.1 and father of the plaintiffs No.2 to 5. The said Hanumanthappa and defendants No.1 to



3 are children of one Halli Hanumanna S/o Hanumanna who was progenitor of the family. The husband of the plaintiff No.1 and father of the plaintiffs No.2 to 5 i.e. Hanumanthappa had filed a suit in O.S.No.203/1992 before the Court of the then Munsiff, Tarikere against the progenitor Halli Hanumanna and defendants No.1 to 3 for partition and separate possession seeking $1/5^{\text{th}}$ share in family properties bearing (1) Sy.No.123/2 measuring 36 guntas, (2) Sy.No.150/2 measuring 2 acres 16 guntas, (3) Sy.No.124/4 measuring 2 acres 36 guntas, (4) Sy.No.76/2 measuring 1 acre 3 guntas, (5) Sy.No.95/4 measuring 35 guntas, (6) Sy.No.97/4 measuring 3 acres 38 guntas, (7) Sy.No.151/5B measuring 11 guntas, (8) Assessment No.142 measuring 30x20 feet, (9) Assessment No.144 measuring 37x36 feet and (10) Assessment No.187 measuring 20x28 feet, all situated at Gadihalli Village and thereafter, he filed F.D.P.No.20/1995 and accordingly, he obtained $1/5^{\text{th}}$ share in the said properties and he was in possession and enjoyment of the said share of the properties during his life time. On the basis of the said final decree, khata of the properties bearing Sy.No.97/4 measuring 32 guntas, Sy.No.76/2 measuring 9 guntas, Sy.No.95/4 measuring $6\frac{1}{2}$ guntas and Sy.No.123/2 measuring 7 guntas is transferred in the name of Hanumanthappa vide M.R.No.2/1997-98 whereas, kihata of lands bearing Sy.No.124/4 measuring 22 guntas out of 2 acres 36 guntas, Sy.No.150/2 measuring 19 guntas out of 2



acres 14 guntas, Sy.No.151/2 measuring $3\frac{1}{4}$ guntas out of 11 guntas is not transferred but his was in possession and enjoyment of thereof during his life time. The said Hanumanthappa has died on 16.08.2018.

5. The plaintiffs further averred that as per the decrees passed in O.S.No.203/1992 and F.D.P.No.20/1995, the husband of the plaintiff No.1 and father of the plaintiffs No.2 to 5 i.e. Hanumanthappa has $\frac{1}{5}$ th share in the above said properties and after deduction of the said share, khata of remaining extent of the suit properties is continued in the name of progenitor of the family i.e. Halli Hanumanna and as such, the progenitor and defendants No.1 to 3 have joint share in the suit properties wherein, $\frac{1}{5}$ th share of Halli Hanumanna is also included. The progenitor Halli Hanumanna has died about 7-8 years and since then, his wife Mudiyyamma was in possession and enjoyment of the said share of the suit properties and now the said Mudiyyamma has also died in June 2014. After the death of Mudiyyamma, the plaintiffs demanded their legitimate $\frac{1}{4}$ th share in $\frac{1}{5}$ th share of the progenitor Halli Hanumanna in the suit properties but the defendants refused to effect partition and allot share to them. Further, suit item No.1 property has been acquired under Bhadra Upper Project and compensation has been awarded towards the same. Though the plaintiffs demanded their share in the said compensation amount, the defendants



refused to allot the same also. Therefore, the plaintiffs were constrained to file this suit before the trial court seeking $1/4^{\text{th}}$ share out of $1/5^{\text{th}}$ share of Halli Hanumanna in suit item No.2 to 8 properties and also, in the compensation amount awarded in respect of suit item No.1 property and accordingly, for all these reasons, they prayed before the trial court to decree their suit as prayed for.

6. In pursuance of service of suit summons, the defendants No.1 to 3 appeared before the trial court through their counsel, the defendant No.3 filed his written statement and the defendants No.1 and 2 adopted the same by filing a memo. In the written statement, the defendants No.1 to 3 admitted the relationship as asserted by the plaintiffs in the plaint but contended that the progenitor Halli Hanumanna has three daughters also in addition to four sons and they are Seethamma, Shanthamma and Sarojamma and since the said daughters are not impleaded in this suit, the suit is bad for non joinder of necessary parties. They specifically contended that in view of amendment to Hindu Succession Act, 1956, the above said daughters of the progenitor have equal share with the sons in the suit properties and as such, the calculation of share made by the plaintiffs in the plaint is incorrect. Since Hanumanthappa has already taken his share in the suit properties, the plaintiffs are not entitled for any share therein whereas, the defendants No.1 to 3 and



daughters have legitimate $1/6^{\text{th}}$ share each in the said properties. Therefore, for all these reasons, the defendants No.1 to 3 prayed before the trial court to dismiss the suit of the plaintiffs with costs.

7. Subsequently, the plaintiffs got impleaded the above said daughters of Halli Hanumanna in the suit as defendants No.5 to 7 by filing an application. In pursuance of service of suit summons, the defendants No.5 to 7 appeared before the trial court through their counsel but they failed to file their written statement to the plaint.

8. On the basis of the above pleadings and other material on record, the trial court framed the following :

ISSUES

1. Whether the plaintiffs prove that the suit schedule properties are the ancestral properties of themselves and the defendants?
2. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for $1/4^{\text{th}}$ share in $1/5^{\text{th}}$ share of Hanumanna?
3. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for the mesne profits as prayed?
4. Whether the suit is bad for non joinder of necessary parties?
5. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for the relief as sought for?
6. What order?



9. After framing of the issues, the plaintiffs led their evidence before the trial court by getting examined the plaintiff No.4 as P.W.1 and by getting marked documents as per Ex.P1 to Ex.P24. On the other hand, the defendants No.1 to 3 also led their evidence by getting examined the defendant No.3 as D.W.1.

10. Subsequently, the trial court after hearing the arguments and perusing the record, decreed the suit of the plaintiffs vide judgment and decree dated 25.10.2022 thereby awarding $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share out of $1/5^{\text{th}}$ share of Halli Hanumanna to them in suit item No.1 to 4 and 6 to 8 properties.

11. Being aggrieved by the impugned judgment and decree, the defendants No.1 to 3 alone have preferred this appeal on the following :

GROUND S

1. The calculation of share made by the trial court in the impugned judgment is incorrect since the suit properties are required to be divided among the defendants No.1 to 3, 5 to 7 and their father Halli Hanumanna to the extent of $1/7^{\text{th}}$ each and thereafter, $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share of Halli Hanumanna is required to be divided among plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 and as such, plaintiffs No.1 to 5 are entitled to $1/49^{\text{th}}$ share together whereas, defendants No.1



to 3 and 5 to 7 are entitled to $1/7^{\text{th}}$
 $+ 1/49^{\text{th}} = 7+1=8/49$ share.

2. The trial court erred in allotting $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share out of $1/4^{\text{th}}$ share of Halli Hanumanna to plaintiffs in the suit properties.
3. The trial court erred in not noticing that defendants No.5 to 7 being co-parceners, they are entitled to equal share in the suit properties in view of recent amendment to Hindu Succession Act, 1956.
4. The trial court erred in not properly appreciating oral and documentary evidence adduced by the parties before it.
5. The trial court erred in not considering the admissions of plaintiffs in the cross-examination of P.W.1.
6. The presumption drawn and conclusion arrived at by the trial court are perverse and capricious.
7. Viewed from any angle, the findings of the trial court are contrary to law and hence, the same are liable to be set-aside.

12. Hence, on the above among other grounds, the defendants No.5 to 7 have prayed before this court to allow their appeal, set-aside the impugned judgment and decree and thereafter, to partly decree the suit of the plaintiffs by modifying the shares.



13. In response to service of notice of the appeal, the respondent No.9/defendant No.4 has appeared before this court through his counsel and contested the appeal. However, despite service of the notice, the respondents No.1 to 8/plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 3 have failed to appear and therefore, they have been placed ex-parte.

14. This court has secured entire record of O.S.No.31/2019 from the trial court and it has heard arguments of the counsel for the defendants No.5 to 7 on the appeal and perused record of the case.

15. In view of the grounds of appeal made out by the defendants No.5 to 7/appellants, the following points arise for my consideration :

P O I N T S

1. Whether trial court erred in holding that plaintiffs are entitled to 1/7th share out of 1/4th share of Halli Hanumanna in suit item No.1 to 4 and 6 to 8 properties?
2. Whether trial court further erred in calculating the shares of the parties to the suit in the suit properties?
3. Whether trial court further erred that in not properly appreciating oral and documentary evidence placed before it by the parties?



4. Whether trial court also erred in decreeing the suit of plaintiffs and in granting 1/7th share to them out of 1/4th share of Halli Hanumanna in suit item No.1 to 4 and 6 to 8 properties?
5. Whether judgment of the trial court suffers from illegality?
6. Whether judgment of the trial court calls for interference by this court?
7. What order or decree?

16. After scrutiny of the oral and documentary evidence placed on record and after hearing arguments of both the counsel, my findings to the above points are as follows :

- POINT NO.1 :** In the **AFFIRMATIVE**
POINT NO.2 : In the **AFFIRMATIVE**
POINT NO.3 : In the **NEGATIVE**
POINT NO.4 : **PARTLY** in the **AFFIRMATIVE**
POINT NO.5 : **PARTLY** in the **AFFIRMATIVE**
POINT NO.6 : In the **AFFIRMATIVE**
POINT NO.7 : As per the final order
for the following :

REASONS

17. POINTS NO.1 TO 4 : Since all these points are inter-connected with each other and involve common discussion, they are taken up together for consideration in order to avoid repetition of facts and discussion.

18. I have gone through record of the case carefully and I have also heard arguments of the counsel for the



defendants No.5 to 7 at length. From the record, it can be borne out that the plaintiffs i.e. respondents No.1 to 5 herein filed this suit before the trial court against the defendants i.e. appellants and respondents No.5 to 9 herein seeking partition and separate possession of $1/4^{\text{th}}$ share out of $1/5^{\text{th}}$ share of Halli Hanumanna in suit item No.2 to 8 properties and compensation amount awarded in respect of suit item No.1 property.

19. In order to prove their case, the plaintiffs led their evidence before the trial court by getting examined the plaintiff No.4 as P.W.1 who testified that one Hanumanthappa was husband of the plaintiff No.1 and father of the plaintiffs No.2 to 5 and that the said Hanumanthappa and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 are children of one Halli Hanumanna S/o Hanumanna who was progenitor of the family. He further testified that his father Hanumanthappa had filed a suit in O.S.No.203/1992 before the Court of the then Munsiff, Tarikere against the progenitor Halli Hanumanna and defendants No.1 to 3 herein seeking $1/5^{\text{th}}$ share in family properties bearing (1) Sy.No.123/2 measuring 36 guntas, (2) Sy.No.150/2 measuring 2 acres 16 guntas, (3) Sy.No.124/4 measuring 2 acres 36 guntas, (4) Sy.No.76/2 measuring 1 acre 3 guntas, (5) Sy.No.95/4 measuring 35 guntas, (6) Sy.No.97/4 measuring 3 acres 38 guntas, (7) Sy.No.151/5B measuring 11 guntas, (8) Assessment No.142 measuring



30x20 feet, (9) Assessment No.144 measuring 37x36 feet and (10) Assessment No.187 measuring 20x28 feet all situated at Gadihalli Village and thereafter, his father filed F.D.P.No.20/1995 and accordingly, his father obtained 1/5th share in the said properties. He further testified that as per the decrees passed in O.S.No.203/1992 and F.D.P.No.20/1995, his father Hanumanthappa has 1/5th share in the above said properties and after deduction of the said share, the progenitor and defendants No.1 to 3 have joint share in the present suit properties wherein, 1/5th share of Halli Hanumanna is also included. He further testified that his father Hanumanthappa died on 16.08.2018 whereas, the progenitor Halli Hanumanna died about 7-8 years and accordingly, thereafter, he and other plaintiffs demanded their legitimate 1/4th share in 1/5th share of the progenitor in the suit properties but the defendants refused to effect partition and allot share to them. He further testified that now suit item No.1 property is acquired under Bhadra Upper Project and compensation is awarded towards the same and as such, he and other plaintiffs have legitimate share in suit item No.2 to 8 properties and in compensation amount awarded in respect of suit item No.1 property.

20. In support of the above testimony, the plaintiffs produced a copy of genealogy of their family as per Ex.P1 which reveals that they and defendants are lineal descendants of Halli Hanumanna. They also produced death



certificate of Halli Hanumanna as per Ex.P2 which reveals that he has died on 16.08.2018. Further, they produced record of rights in respect of suit item No.1 to 5 properties as per Ex.P3 to Ex.P8 respectively which reveal that the said lands are standing in the name of the ancestor Halli Hanumanna whereas, suit item No.5 property in the name of the government. They also produced khata extracts in respect of suit item No.6 to 8 properties as per Ex.P10 and Ex.P11 which reveal that suit item No.6 and 8 properties are standing in the name of the ancestor Halli Hanumanna whereas, suit item No.7 property in the name of the defendant No.1. Similarly, they produced certified copies of judgment and decree dated 16.09.1994 passed by the Court of Munsiff, Tarikere in O.S.No.203/1992 as per Ex.P12 and Ex.P13 respectively which reveal that the said suit was filed by Hanumanthappa against the ancestor Halli Hanumanna and defendants No.1 to 3 herein seeking partition and separate possession of his share in the family properties and accordingly, after trial, he was allotted with share in the said properties. They also produced certified copies of record of rights and other papers in respect of the properties involved in the said suit in O.S.No.203/1992 as per Ex.P14 to Ex.P24.

21. On the other hand, the defendants No.1 to 3 also led their evidence before the trial court by getting examined the defendant No.3 as D.W.1 who admitted the relationship as



asserted by the plaintiffs in the plaint but he testified that in view of amendment to Hindu Succession Act, 1956, the defendants No.5 to 7 being daughters of the progenitor, they also have equal share with the sons of the progenitor in the suit properties and as such, the calculation of share made by the plaintiffs in the plaint is incorrect.

22. Thus, in view of the above testimony of P.W.1 and documents marked as Ex.P1 to Ex.P24 and also in view of the testimony of D.W.1, it is clear that there is no dispute as to the relationship among the plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 and it is an admitted fact that they are all lineal descendants of ancestor of the family i.e. Halli Hanumanna. It is also clear that the suit properties are ancestral and joint family properties of the family of plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 inherited from the ancestor Halli Hanumanna. Accordingly, on the basis of these admissions and also on the basis of oral and documentary evidence on record, the trial court has held in the impugned judgment that the plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 constitute a joint Hindu family and the suit properties are joint family properties of their family and accordingly, the trial court decreed the suit and allotted share to the plaintiffs in the suit properties except suit item No.5 property.

23. It may be noted that the above judgment and decree of the trial court are not challenged by the defendants



No.1 to 3 and though the defendants No.5 to 7 have challenged the same in this appeal, the challenge is limited only to the extent of quantum of share allotted to the plaintiffs in the suit properties by the trial court and not to the entitlement of share in the suit properties by the plaintiffs. Therefore, in view of this, this court is of the opinion that it is not necessary to go through the record of the trial court in detail.

24. However, as observed above, there is challenge by the defendants No.5 to 7 to the quantum of share allotted to the plaintiffs in the suit properties by the trial court in the impugned judgment and decree *inasmuch as*, the plaintiffs claim that the suit properties are required to be divided among the ancestor Halli Hanumanna and defendants No.1 to 3 and thereafter, the share of Halli Hanumanna is required to be divided among them whereas, the defendants No.5 to 7 claim that the suit properties are required to be divided among the co-parceners first i.e. Halli Hanumanna and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 to the extent of $1/7^{\text{th}}$ each and thereafter, $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share of the Halli Hanumanna is required to be divided among the plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 to the extent of $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share each by way of notional partition.

25. In view of passing of Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act, 2005, the claim of the defendants No.5 to 7



is convincing and acceptable because, as per the said amendment, the daughters of a co-parcener are also treated as co-parceners and they are also entitled to equal share in the ancestral properties on par with the sons. Thus, since the husband of the plaintiff No.1 and father of the plaintiffs No.2 to 5 i.e. Hanumanthappa has already taken his share in the ancestral properties as a co-parcener in O.S.No.203/1992, his branch is not entitled to share again in the suit properties as co-parcener but merely in the separate share of ancestor Halli Hanumanna under Section 8 of Hindu Succession Act, 1956 and as such, the suit properties are required to be divided among the ancestor Halli Hanumanna and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 first to the extent of $1/7^{\text{th}}$ each and thereafter, $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share of Halli Hanumanna is again required to be divided among the plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 to the extent of $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share each by way of notional partition. If the same is calculated in relation to the entire suit properties, it would be that the plaintiffs No.1 to 5 are entitled to $1/49^{\text{th}}$ share together whereas, defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 are entitled to $7/49^{\text{th}} + 1/49^{\text{th}} = 7+1=8/49^{\text{th}}$ share each in suit item No.1 to 4 and 5 to 7 properties. Further, as per record of rights of suit item No.2 property marked as Ex.P4, the said land measures 34 guntas only but the plaintiffs have wrongly showed the extent of the said land as 38 guntas.



26. Thus, though the trial court has properly appreciated the oral and documentary evidence before it, it has erred in calculating the quantum of share to which, the parties are entitled in the suit properties and as such, there is no illegality in the passing of the impugned judgment and decree by the trial court but the same are required to be modified in respect of quantum of the shares.

27. Therefore, for all the above reasons, I hold that the trial court has not erred in properly appreciating oral and documentary evidence placed before it by the parties and in decreeing the suit of the plaintiffs but it has erred in holding that the plaintiffs are entitled to $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share out of $1/4^{\text{th}}$ share of Halli Hanumanna in suit item No.1 to 4 and 6 to 8 properties. The trial court has also erred in calculating the shares of the parties to the suit in the suit properties and in granting $1/7^{\text{th}}$ share out of $1/4^{\text{th}}$ share of Halli Hanumanna in suit item No.1 to 4 and 6 to 8 properties. Accordingly, I answer points No.1 and 2 in the **AFFIRMATIVE**, point No.3 in the **NEGATIVE** and point No.4 **PARTLY IN THE AFFIRMATIVE**.

28. POINTS NO.5 & 6 : Since both these points are inter-connected with each other and involve common discussion, they are taken up together for consideration in order to avoid repetition of facts and discussion.



29. In view of my findings on the above points, it is very much clear that the trial court has not committed any error in passing the impugned judgment and decree but it has committed error in granting 1/7th share to the plaintiffs out of 1/4th share of Halli Hanumanna in suit item No.1 to 4 and 6 to 9 properties and as such, the impugned judgment suffers from illegality in part and hence, interference of this court into the same is warranted into the same only to the extent of modifying the quantum of the shares. Therefore, for all these reasons, I answer point No.5 **PARTLY** in the **AFFIRMATIVE** and point No.6 in the **AFFIRMATIVE**.

30. POINT NO.7 : In view of my findings on the above points, I proceed to pass the following :

ORDER

Regular appeal filed by appellants/ defendants No.5 to 7 under Order XLI Rule 1 read with Section 96 of C.P.C. is hereby **ALLOWED WITH COSTS**.

The judgment and decree dated 25.10.2022 passed by the Court of Civil Judge & Addl. JMFC, Tarikere in O.S.No.31/2019 are hereby **CONFIRMED** with the following modifications.

Plaintiffs No.1 to 5 are jointly entitled to 1/49th share together whereas, defendants No.1 to 3 and 5 to 7 are entitled to 8/49th share each in suit item No.1 to 4 and 6 to 8 properties.



Office is hereby directed to draw preliminary decree accordingly.

Office is also hereby directed to return entire record of original suit to the trial court along with a copy of this judgment.

(Dictated to Stenographer, typed by him, corrected by me & then pronounced in open court on this the 15th day of July, 2026)

(MUZAFFAR A. MANJARI)
SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
TARIKERE