

Witness present and Duly Sworn on: 10.04.2026.

Cross examination by Sri. MK Advocate for the Respondent No.1:

1. We have documents to show M. Leeladevi is senior most member of our family and I can produce documents. We have documents to show she is present administrator of the family properties. The acquired land survey number is 6/8C. Originally lands belong to Chandayya Hegde. After death of Chandayya Hegde, a partition was effected in the year 1955. Under Partition Deed Ex.R4, land Sy.No.6/8C was allotted to family dedication. Under 1955 Partition Deed, land Sy.No.6/8C was reserved for the purpose of religious and traditional practices. Land Sy.No.6/8C was not allotted to Leeladevi. Prior of death of Jeevandar Kumar, RTCs pertaining to land Sy.No.6/8C stand in his name. Naveen Kumar Respondent No.1 is son of Jeevandar Kumar. After death of Jeevandar Kumar, the records pertaining to land Sy.No.6/8C mutated in the name of children of Jeevandar Kumar. Challenging the mutation entry, we had preferred an appeal before Assistant Commissioner. A further appeal is pending before Deputy Commissioner with respect to change of mutation in RAP.No.163/2025.

2. A suit is pending in OS.No.98/2023 with respect to entitlement of 'E' schedule property under 1955 Deed after

death of Jeevandar Kumar. Since Jeevandar Kumar had sold properties which were reserved for family purpose, we filed OS.No.98/2023. During his lifetime he was administrator of 'E' schedule. As per terms of Will, he was administrator. He was not senior most member of the family. It is true in the partition deed 1955, there is no recital that after the death of Jeevandar Kumar 'E' schedule properties shall be managed by whom. Witness states the same was mentioned in Will. As per partition deed, the respective allottees became owners and in possession of respective schedules.

3. The suit filed by us challenging the sale transactions made by Jeevandar Kumar is still under consideration. I do not know how many years ago name of Jeevandar Kumar was mutated in the Revenue records. It is false to suggest that except Jeevandar Kumar children, no other family members are having any right and interest over land Sy.No.6/8C which was acquired by NHAI. We have filed objection not to grant compensation to Naveen Kumar. We have not filed objection with respect to determination of compensation and measurement of the property.

4. Leeladevi is claiming compensation on behalf of entire family and not in individual capacity. It is false to suggest that the property acquired Leeladevi is not an administrator. It is false to suggest that Leeladevi has no right in respect of

acquired land. It is false to suggest that the acquired property exclusively belonged to Jeevandar Kumar and after his death it belonged to his children. It is false to suggest that children of Jeevandar Kumar are only entitled for the compensation. It is false to suggest that till the decision in Civil suit filed, apportionment of compensation cannot be made in favor of Leeladevi.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

II Addl District and Sessions Judge,
Mangaluru, D.K.