

APPR030008332014



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL CIVIL JUDGE (SENIOR DIVISION) ::
ONGOLE**

Present: **Smt V.Pallavi**
Principal Civil Judge (Senior Division), Ongole

Friday, this the 31st day of July, 2026

Original Suit No. 685 of 2014

Between :

Bro. Y. John Subbareddy, s/o Yerram Reddy Subbareddy, aged 62 years, Occupation Pastor/God's Servant, Eschol Prayer house, Cloughpet, 1st lane, Ongole, Prakasam District.

... Plaintiff

And

1. Bro. B. Timothy, s/o late B.Ramachandraiah Chetty, aged 75 years, occupation – God's Servant/pastor, resident of flat No.155, Janapriya Apartments, Gandhi nagar, Musheerabad, Hyderabad – 500 020 **(died)**
2. Bro. G.Nehemiah, s/o Kotaiah, aged 63 years, Jerusalem Prayer house, Kurnool – 518004 **(died)**
3. Bro. G.John Sundar Rao, s/o Param jyothi, aged 70 years, plot No.128, Trimurthi colony, road No.5, Mahendra Hills, east maredpally, Secunderabad – 500 026
4. Bro. T.Yesupadam, s/o Jeevaiah, aged 61 years, H.No. 7-1-307/5, Subash nagar, Sanath nagar, Hyderabad – 500 018
5. Bro. Joseph P Kurian, s/o late P.J. Kurien, aged about 66 years, c/o Hebron Church, Golconda Cross roads, Hyderabad – 500 020
6. Bro. K.Jayaraju, s/o Anand Raj, aged 65 years, H.No.1-7-802/3/1, Ramnagar, Hyderabad – 500 020
7. Sri R.Veerachary, s/o Narsaiah, aged 45 years, resident of flat No.304, Venkata Sai apartments, Santhosh nagar, Miryalaguda, Nalgonda District – 508 207

8. Bro. A.Raja Rao, s/o Arjun Raghavaiah, aged 63 years, resident of Zion Prayer House, Kannavari thota, 1st lane, Guntur – 4. **(died)**
9. Sri Swarna Ezekiel, s/o Daniel, aged 48 years, resident of D.No. 52-1/1-5 (2), Bhasker gardens, Kabadipalem, Ongole.
10. Bathula Babu Rao, s/o Ankaiah, aged 48 years, resident of 3rd lane, Railpeta, Ongole.
11. Gera Prabhudas, aged about 73 years, resident of Sitharampuram, Ongole.
12. P.Prabhakar Rao, aged about 72 years, retired principal, Mamidipalem, Ongole.
13. R.Hebron, aged about 38 years, railpeta, Ongole.
14. Kollabathula Boaz, s/o late K.Yohan, aged about 40 years, 3rd lane, Cloughpet, Ongole.
15. Kollabathula Ezra, s/o late K.Yohan, aged about 38 years, 3rd lane, cloughpet, Ongole.

... Defendants

This suit has come on 2.7.2026 before me for final hearing in the presence of Sri K.Raghavarao, Advocate for Plaintiff; and of Sri I.Venkateswarlu, Advocate for 4th defendant; of Sri C.V.Ramakrishna Rao, Advocate for Defendants 3, 5 to 7; Sri D.Srinivasa Murthy, Advocate for Defendants 9 to 15; defendant No.1 died *pendente lite*; suit is dismissed against defendants 2 and 8 (defendants 2 and 8 died *pendente lite*); and having heard and after perusing the material on record and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivers the following :

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

This suit is filed for a declaration that the resolution dated 30.08.2014, said to have been passed by the Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches in India (referred to in the letter dated 27.09.2014 bearing Registration No. 114/1971), is invalid, illegal, ultra vires and contrary to the principles of natural justice, and for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their

henchmen, agents and nominees from interfering with the functioning of the plaintiff as the Pastor of Eschol Prayer House, situated at D.No. 53-1-3 in Sy.No. 422 of Cloughpet, Ongole, Prakasam District, and with the affairs of the said Church; for a declaration that the order of removal of the plaintiff dated 27.09.2014, said to have been passed by the Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches in India (bearing Registration No. 114/1971), is invalid, illegal, ultra vires and contrary to the principles of natural justice, and also for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their henchmen, agents and nominees from interfering with the functioning of the plaintiff as the Pastor of Eschol Prayer House, situated at D.No. 53-1-3 in Sy.No. 422 of Cloughpet, Ongole, Prakasam District, and with the affairs of the said Church; and also for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their henchmen, agents and nominees from obstructing the duties, powers and functioning of the plaintiff as Pastor of the above-referred Church.

During the pendency of the suit, defendants 1, 2 and 8 died. On the basis of the memo filed by the counsel for the plaintiff on 05.01.2021, the 5th defendant was recognised as the legal representative of the deceased 1st defendant. The claim against defendants 2 and 8 was dismissed on the basis of the memo filed by the counsel for the plaintiff.

02. The averments of the plaint, in brief, are as follows. The plaintiff is the Pastor (God's servant) of Eschol Prayer House, Cloughpet, Ongole, Prakasam District. He has been working as such for the last 17 years, i.e., since December 1997. The plaintiff has been performing his duties with utmost care, commitment and dedication, by strictly following the religious tenets and in accordance with the spiritual guidance and administrative instructions being given by the Indigenous Churches in India Trust, Hyderabad, registered under Registration No. 46/2004 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Trust'). The plaintiff was appointed as the Chairman of the said Trust and is presently functioning as the Chairman of the Trust.

(a) While so, the defendants, without any power or authority, are illegally interfering with the functioning of the plaintiff as Pastor (God's servant) of the said Prayer House by issuing public notices and letters in the name of the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India, bearing Registration No. 114/1971 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Society'), which was dissolved in accordance with law on 25.03.2004 pursuant to Special Resolution dated 23.03.2004 passed by the General Body of the Society. Besides, the defendants are attempting to forcibly evict the plaintiff from Eschol Prayer House.

(b) The Society was dissolved by its General Body on 25.03.2004, and all its assets and liabilities were transferred to the Trust on 25.03.2004 itself in accordance with law, as per the Special Resolution dated 23.03.2004 passed by the General Body of the Society. Therefore, the Trust became the successor of the dissolved Society with effect from 25.03.2004. From that date, the Society has ceased to exist, and in its place, the Trust has been administering and managing all the affairs of Hebron Church and all its more than 1,300 sister churches. The Hon'ble High Court, vide judgment dated 24.06.2009 in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008, declared that the Society was dissolved in accordance with law. The facts leading to the dissolution of the Society are as follows:

(i) Hebron Church is one of the largest and most prominent Churches in India, and it has established more than 1,300 sister churches, including Eschol Prayer House, Ongole, throughout India and abroad.

(ii) In order to administer and manage the affairs of Hebron Church and its sister churches, Brother Bakht Singh caused the Society to be registered on 22.02.1971.

(iii) The society was initially established with eight members, and its membership increased to 111 by the end of 2003.

(iv) On 3 March 2004, the society issued a notice to all its 53 surviving members, including the first defendant and the plaintiff, convening a General Body Meeting on 23 March 2004.

(v) As per the schedule, the General Body Meeting was conducted on 23.3.2004 and, after elaborate discussions, the General Body passed a Special Resolution to dissolve the Society and to transfer its assets and liabilities to the Trust, which is similar to the Society in all respects. This fact was immediately intimated to the Registrar of Societies, who acknowledged the same vide receipt No. 13141 dated 24.3.2004.

(vi) As per the said Special Resolution dated 23.3.2004, the Society was dissolved on 25.3.2004 and all its assets and liabilities were transferred to the Trust.

(vii) It is relevant to point out that the said General Body Meeting was attended by 35 members of the Society out of 53 surviving members, and 32 members unanimously resolved to dissolve the Society and to transfer its assets and liabilities to the Trust.

(viii) It is most significant to note that the 1st defendant, Bro. B. Timothy, attended the said meeting and signed the said Special Resolution dated 23.3.2004, and he was a party to the dissolution of the Society.

(ix) From 25.3.2004 till the filing of the suit, i.e., for the last 10 years, the Trust has been properly and effectively functioning in accordance with law while protecting the properties which were transferred to it as per the Special Resolution dated 23.3.2004, and administering and managing all the affairs of Hebron and all its more than 1,300 churches, including Eschol Prayer House, Ongole, by appointing pastors. In fact, the Trust has purchased several properties in the name of the Trust.

(x) The bank authorities, having recognised the fact that the Society was dissolved and the Trust is the successor of the Society, transferred the dissolved Society's accounts to the name of the Trust in October 2004 itself.

(xi) The Income Tax authorities also recognised the fact that the Society was dissolved and the Trust is the successor of the Society; they registered the Trust under Section 12A of the Income Tax Act, 1961, in February 2005, allotted PAN and TAN numbers in the year 2005 itself, and the Trust has been regularly filing income-tax returns.

(xii) The followers of Hebron voluntarily declared that the Special Resolution is valid and that the Trust is functioning well in accordance with law.

(xiii) One Mr. R. Devasayaham, who was one of the members of the dissolved Society, filed an affidavit before the Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No. 7639 of 2004, stating that the Society was dissolved by the General Body in accordance with the law.

(xiv) On 25.9.2008, the 1st defendant, Timothy, deposed in a sworn affidavit before the Hon'ble II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, in I.A. No. 2400 of 2008 in O.S. No. 365 of 2008, stating that he was a member of the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India and that his name is shown at Sl. No. 34 in the Special General Body Meeting held on 23.3.2004; that he understood the agenda "Future of the Society" as dissolution of the Society; that the entire issue was thoroughly discussed and 32 out of 35 members present unanimously resolved to dissolve the Society; and that a vast majority of the devotees of Hebron are in favour of continuing the Trust. Apart from this, on 16.5.2005, Timothy was transferred by the Trust from Khammam to Tenali; on 22.9.2006, Timothy was declared by the Trust as a Special Invitee for the Trust meeting and he signed the proceedings; on 25.6.2007, Timothy was transferred by the Trust from Tenali to Nalgonda; and on 29.6.2007, Timothy was appointed by the Trust as Coordinator of the Regional Body (Telangana Area).

(xv) The Hon'ble High Court, in its judgment dated 16.3.2004 in W.P. No. 7639 of 2004, held that the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India was not in existence in any way, having been dissolved by the governing

body in accordance with law. This observation was not disturbed or expunged by the Division Bench in its judgment dated 5.4.2007 in W.A. No. 889 of 2005, even while expunging some of the observations of the learned Single Judge.

(xvi) Thus, it is clear that, as declared by the Hon'ble High Court, the Society was dissolved as per the Special Resolution dated 23.3.2004, in accordance with law. Even according to the 1st defendant, the Society was dissolved as per the Special Resolution dated 23.3.2004. Therefore, it is clear that the Society was dissolved in all respects and, from 25.3.2004, the Society has ceased to exist, whereas the Trust is functioning in place of the Society and administering and managing all the affairs of Hebron and all its more than 1,300 churches, including Eschol Prayer House. Thus, the dissolution of the Society became final and was settled in all respects.

(c) While so, for reasons best known to them and contrary to the above-settled position, the District Registrar, Hyderabad, issued a letter dated 19.2.2008 informing that the Society is in vogue. Aggrieved by the said proceedings dated 19.2.2008, the Trust filed W.P. No. 16430 of 2008, wherein the District Registrar filed a counter-affidavit. After an elaborate hearing, the Hon'ble High Court, by judgment dated 24.6.2009, set aside the said letter dated 19.2.2008 and declared that the dissolution of the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India has been formalised in accordance with law. It was further observed that, on analysis, the impugned letter dated 19.2.2008, addressed by the 1st respondent to the 2nd respondent stating that the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India, Registered No. 114 of 1971, is in vogue, is based on a fallacious interpretation of law and a misconstruction of the role of the 1st respondent in the matter of dissolution of a society registered under the 2001 Act.

(d) The Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court, by order dated 6.7.2010, dismissed W.A. No. 960 of 2009, filed challenging the judgment dated 24.6.2009 in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008, as withdrawn. Later, a Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court, though it did not suspend or stay the

operation of the said judgment, by an interim order dated 9.11.2010 in W.A. No. 1289 of 2009, filed by third parties with leave (whose implead petition in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008 was dismissed and the writ appeal filed against which was also dismissed), directed that status quo existing as on 9.11.2010 be maintained. The said writ appeal is pending. The said interim order of status quo is in favour of the Trust and buttresses and fortifies the status of the Trust in administering and managing all the affairs of Hebron and all its more than 1,300 sister churches in India and abroad, including Eschol Prayer House, and permitted the Trust to continue to function.

(e) The Hon'ble High Court, in its judgment dated 14.6.2013 in W.P. No. 16764 of 2013, dismissed the writ petition filed seeking to set aside the Special Resolution dated 23.3.2004. The Hon'ble High Court, by interim order dated 12.7.2013 in W.P. No. 19870 of 2013, permitted the Trust to manage the affairs of the Trust, including the prayer hall which is the subject-matter of the said writ petition. The Hon'ble High Court, by judgment dated 5.9.2013, dismissed W.P. No. 25999 of 2013 filed challenging the transfer order dated 15.8.2013 issued by the Trust.

(f) The 6th defendant, along with another, filed O.S. No. 380 of 2010 on the file of the Court of the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, in July 2010, i.e., after a lapse of about 6½ years from the date of dissolution of the Society, seeking a declaration that the creation of the Trust as successor of the Society in pursuance of the resolution dated 23.3.2004 is non est in law and that the resolution dated 23.3.2004 is non est in law. In the said suit, an order dated 4.12.2012 was passed dismissing I.A. No. 2276 of 2010 filed by the 6th respondent, declaring that the prima facie material available on record shows that there was dissolution and that the dissolution was by the General Body of the Society. Challenging the said order dated 4.12.2012, the plaintiffs filed C.M.A. No. 1317 of 2012, and the Hon'ble High Court did not grant any interim orders in favour of the plaintiffs therein; the said order is still in force. While rejecting the plaintiffs' request for interim

injunction in O.S. No. 380 of 2010, the Hon'ble II Additional Chief Judge, in the order dated 4.12.2012, observed that there is neither plea nor evidence showing the continuation of activities of the Society; for that matter, the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India is not even a party before the Court. If the Society had been in vogue, the same Society ought to have initiated the proceedings, and proceedings are expected from that Society against the 1st defendant Trust.

(g) From the date of dissolution in the month of March 2004 till December 2012, the Society was not shown as a party in any of the proceedings in any court or before any authorities. However, taking a cue from the said observation of the court below in its order dated 4.12.2012 in I.A. No. 2276 of 2010 in O.S. No. 380 of 2010, and in violation of the judgments of the Hon'ble High Court dated 16.3.2005 in W.P. No. 7639 of 2004 and dated 24.6.2009 in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008, and also contrary to the interim orders dated 9.11.2010 in W.A. No. 1289 of 2009, and also in violation of the orders dated 4.12.2012 and contrary to the interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 12.7.2013 in W.P. No. 19870 of 2013, Bro. B. Timothy, the 1st defendant, being a signatory to the dissolution resolution, for the first time in July 2013, i.e., after a lapse of 9 years from the date of dissolution of the Society, while claiming himself at the first instance as a Governing Body Member, later as ad-hoc Chairman and now as Chairman of the dissolved Society, and claiming that defendants 2 to 7 are the members of the General Body of the dissolved Society, stated that it was not dissolved and is in existence, and issued various letters in the name and on behalf of the Society which was dissolved in the month of March 2004, thereby misleading not only the devotees of Lord Jesus Christ and the followers of Hebron and its sister churches but also the courts and authorities.

(h) In order to support their false and mala fide claim that the Society is not dissolved, the respondents herein resourcefully persuaded the District Registrar, Hyderabad, and caused him to issue a letter dated 20.9.2013

stating that the Society is not dissolved. Since the said letter was in violation of the final judgments of the Hon'ble High Court and contrary to the facts and record, the Trust filed W.P. No. 23849 of 2013. The Hon'ble High Court, after perusing the judicial orders in this connection, by order dated 3.10.2013 passed in W.P.M.P. No. 35197 of 2013 in W.P. No. 23849 of 2013, granted an interim order suspending the letter dated 20.9.2013 issued by the District Registrar.

(i) Even after receipt of the said interim orders, the defendants, by influencing the District Registrar, Hyderabad, got issued similar letters dated 18.7.2013, 7.11.2013, 25.11.2013, 31.1.2014 and 18.2.2014, thereby interfering with the religious activities of the Trust and the churches which are being administered and maintained by the Trust. Challenging the said illegal letters issued by the District Registrar, Hyderabad, the Trust filed W.P. Nos. 8277, 8279 and 8291 of 2014, wherein the Hon'ble High Court, by an interim order dated 20.3.2014, suspended the said proceedings. In the meantime, the defendants caused the District Registrar, Hyderabad, to issue another letter dated 18.2.2014 to the same effect.

(j) In the name of the dissolved Society, the respondents filed W.P. No. 34870 of 2013 challenging the letter dated 25.11.2013 issued by the District Registrar, but the Hon'ble High Court did not grant interim orders. Since the said orders of the District Registrar, Hyderabad, are in violation of the final judgment dated 24.6.2009 and the interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 3.10.2013, the Trust filed C.C. No. 426 of 2014 and C.C. No. 425 of 2014 respectively. Thereupon, the District Registrar, Hyderabad, issued proceedings dated 2.7.2014 withdrawing all the letters dated 18.7.2013, 20.9.2013, 7.11.2013, 25.11.2013, 31.1.2014 and 18.2.2014. The Hon'ble High Court, taking into consideration the proceedings dated 2.7.2014, closed C.C. No. 425 of 2014 by order dated 4.7.2014.

(k) Aggrieved by the proceedings of the District Registrar dated 2.7.2014, the respondents filed W.P. No. 19191 of 2014 in the name of the

dissolved Society. At the admission stage, the Hon'ble High Court, while declining to stay or suspend the operation of the proceedings of the District Registrar dated 2.7.2014, granted an interim order dated 10.7.2014 directing that the matter be listed on 14.7.2014 in the lunch motion and that, till the next date of hearing, no further proceedings in pursuance of the impugned order dated 2.7.2014 shall be taken up pending further orders in the writ petition. The said interim order was extended till the end of August 2014.

(l) The Hon'ble High Court closed C.C. No. 425 of 2014 after taking into consideration the proceedings dated 2.7.2014, whereby the District Registrar, Hyderabad, withdrew all the letters dated 18.7.2013, 20.9.2013, 7.11.2013, 25.11.2013, 31.1.2014 and 18.2.2014, which were illegally issued informing that the Society is in vogue. Though the Hon'ble High Court did not suspend or stay the proceedings dated 2.7.2014, the respondents are still claiming that the Society is not dissolved and are interfering with the day-to-day activities of the Trust and also disturbing the religious activities of the Trust at various churches. The same is evident from various letters issued by defendants 1 to 7. This action of the respondents is contrary to the orders of the Hon'ble High Court dated 3.10.2013 and amounts to deliberate and wilful violation of the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, and as such they are liable for punishment under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act.

(m) The 1st defendant got published a public notice at page 5 of the Prakasam District Edition of the Eenadu Telugu daily dated 19.10.2014, wherein it was stated that the 1st defendant is the Chairman of the Society and also that the Governing Body of the Society, consisting of defendants 1 to 7, passed a resolution on 3.8.2014 resolving to remove the plaintiff from the duties of Pastor of Eschol Prayer House, Cloughpet, Ongole, and accordingly, the plaintiff was removed vide orders dated 27.9.2014. In the said public notice, they stated the alleged reasons for removing the plaintiff, namely that he is working as Chairman of the Trust and continuing the activities of the Trust. The plaintiff was directed to hand over the responsibility of the prayer

house to defendants 9 to 15, and it is also learned that defendants 1 to 7 are taking steps to appoint the 8th defendant as Pastor in place of the plaintiff. In the said public notice it was also alleged that, as the plaintiff rejected the said letter dated 27.9.2014, they got the same published in the newspaper.

(n) The 1st defendant has no power or authority to claim himself as the Chairman of the dissolved Society, and defendants 1 to 7, or the so-called Governing Body of the dissolved Society, have no power or authority to interfere with the affairs of the Trust or the Hebron Church or its more than 1,300 sister churches including Eschol Prayer House. They have no power or authority to issue notice to the plaintiff or to pass any resolution against the plaintiff or to transfer him, who is the Chairman of the Trust and God's servant/Pastor of Eschol Prayer House, Clloughpet, Ongole, which has been under his pastorate for the last 17 years.

(o) In the public notice, they referred to O.S. No. 1665 of 2013. The said case was filed by the 1st defendant in the name of the Society, wherein the competent Civil Court, while declining to grant interim orders in favour of the 1st defendant, observed that the petitioners therein miserably failed to establish that the 2nd petitioner Society is in existence as on the date of filing of the suit and I.A. Further, the respondents could prove that the 2nd petitioner Society was dissolved on 23.3.2004 and that the 1st respondent Trust is entitled to manage the 2nd petitioner Church and other churches which were managed by the 2nd petitioner Society prior to its dissolution on 23.3.2004. Subsequently, the said suit was dismissed by order dated 12.9.2014. Thus, it is clear that the defendants have no power or authority to interfere with the functioning of the plaintiff or to issue any notice or to pass any order or resolution in connection with the plaintiff, Trust or Eschol Prayer House, Ongole, and the alleged transfer orders dated 2.1.2014 and resolution dated 3.8.2014 and the so-called order dated 27.9.2014 said to have been passed by defendants 1 to 7 are not only illegal and unauthorised but also null and void. As a matter of fact, none of the above correspondence was served on

the plaintiff; had the respondents served the same on the plaintiff, he would have given a befitting reply thereto. Thus, the plaintiffs are constrained to file the suit seeking appropriate reliefs in this regard.

03. The seventh defendant filed a written statement denying the plaintiff's allegations. In brief, the contentions raised by the seventh defendant are as follows:

(a) The contention of the plaintiff is that the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India was dissolved by its Resolution dated 25.3.2004 and all its assets and liabilities were transferred to the Trust on 25.3.2004 itself in accordance with law, as per the Special Resolution dated 23.3.2004 passed by the General Body of the Society, and that the Trust has become the successor of the dissolved Society w.e.f. 25.3.2004; and that from 25.3.2004 onwards, the Society is not in existence and, in place of the Society, the Trustees are administering and managing all the affairs of the Hebron Church and all its more than 1,300 sister churches.

(b) The Hon'ble High Court, by its judgment dated 24th June 2009 in Writ Petition No. 16430 of 2008, declared that the Society was dissolved in accordance with law; however, the said contention is false and far from the truth, and the subsequent events are not mentioned by the plaintiff for the sake of his convenience and to suit his purpose.

(c) In order to support his false contention, the plaintiff has set out the circumstances alleged to have led to the dissolution of the Society. The averments made from sub-paragraphs (a) to (o) of paragraph No. 3 are correct and they are self-serving, do not stand to reason, and therefore the same need not be taken into consideration.

(d) The plaintiff is trying to impress upon this Court that in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008, the Hon'ble High Court, through its judgment, declared that the Society is dissolved. However, the said fact is not correct and a perusal of the said judgment does not disclose the same. Similarly, it is also the contention

of the petitioner that, through judgment dated 16.3.2004 in W.P. No. 7639 of 2004, the Hon'ble High Court held that the Society is not in existence, having been dissolved by the Governing Body. This is also factually incorrect, and the said writ petition is not with regard to the dissolution of the Society. Apart from this, the petitioner is claiming that the Society was dissolved by its Resolution dated 23.3.2004 and the assets of the Society were transferred to the Trust in accordance with law from 25.3.2004, which is false and incorrect.

(e) Admittedly, the head office of the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India is located at Golconda Cross Roads, Hyderabad, and the name of the church is Hebron Church. When the head office is located at Hyderabad, after the death of the founder, Bakth Singh, in the year 2000, some outsiders, who have no connection with the Society, formed a group and created a Trust and registered the Trust Deed bearing No. 46 of 2004. In fact, the Trust is not a registered one and is not registered with the appropriate authority till today. The petitioner and his associates are misleading the courts by showing the Trust Deed document number as the registration number of the Trust formed by them with ill motive. Even the Trust Deed was executed in some other premises, not in the premises of the head office, and the same is evident from the Trust Deed filed by the petitioner. Therefore, the plaintiff has to establish and satisfy that the so-called Trust is a registered one and that he is a recognised Chairman of the said Trust, and also he has to explain why, when the head office of the Society is located at Hebron Church, Golconda Cross Roads, Hyderabad, the Trust Deed was executed in another premises.

(f) The plaintiff has been referring to various letters and orders issued by the District Registrar, Hyderabad, stating that the Society is not dissolved and is in vogue. The District Registrar, Hyderabad, was issuing such letters as there is no official record in the office to show that the Society was dissolved. However, the petitioner and his associates, claiming that the Trust has come into existence in place of the Society, filed writ petitions without

impleading the Society as a party in the writ petitions and obtained orders by misleading the facts. Ultimately, the writ petition No. 16430 of 2008 filed by the Trust was allowed on 24.6.2009, against which Writ Appeal No. 1289 of 2009 was filed and the Hon'ble Division Bench in W.A.M.P. No. 2729 of 2009 ordered status quo on 9.9.2010 and the same is in force, and the effort of the Trust to get it vacated failed. Therefore, as the order of the learned Single Judge in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008 is subject to an order of status quo by the Division Bench, the order of the learned Single Judge is not in operation and the position existing prior to the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 24.6.2009 should continue. Therefore, the interpretation of the plaintiff that the Society was dissolved is incorrect and the said interpretation is given deliberately and knowing fully well that the said stand is false.

(g) The plaintiff tried to explain that, even though the Hon'ble Division Bench in W.A. No. 1289 of 2009 ordered status quo against the orders of the learned Single Judge passed in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008, still the Society is dissolved and the Trust is in force. Initially, challenging the orders of the learned Single Judge, Writ Appeal No. 960 of 2009 was filed and there was an interim order of status quo in the said appeal. However, the petitioner and his associates managed the appellant therein and, as a result, he withdrew the writ appeal on 6.7.2010. Realising the fraud, some other Writ Appeal No. 1289 of 2009 was filed and the status quo order is continued, and this is the factual position.

(h) The Trust people filed a vacate petition in W.A. No. 1289 of 2009 and the same was dismissed, and the said fact is not mentioned in the affidavit by the plaintiff. Also, W.P. No. 19870 of 2013, wherein there is an interim order not relating to the dissolution of the Society, is therefore not relevant. Similarly, the suit in O.S. No. 380 of 2010 on the file of the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Courts, Hyderabad, and the I.A. therein are not relevant for consideration as they are suits filed on the basis of the orders passed in writ petitions earlier. Apart from this, all the findings in the writ

petitions and the suits are not relevant at this stage as there is a separate order passed by the District Registrar on 2.7.2014 accepting the resolution dated 23.3.2004 onwards and that the Trust has come in its place and impressed the courts; however, due to the pressure applied by the plaintiff and his associates, the District Registrar for the first time accepted the said resolution on 2.7.2014 only. Therefore, the stand of the plaintiff that the Society was dissolved from 25.3.2004 is false and should fall to the ground for the reason that the District Registrar passed the order on 2.7.2014 only. The District Registrar passed the said order as the plaintiff and his associates were troubling him by filing contempt petitions etc., and dragged him to court. Due to the pressure applied by the plaintiff and others, the District Registrar passed the said order for the first time on 2.7.2014. Therefore, the writ petitions referred to, namely Writ Petition Nos. 8277, 8279, 8291 of 2014 and Writ Petition No. 34870 of 2013, have no significance in view of the orders passed by the District Registrar on 2.7.2014.

(i) When the District Registrar passed orders on 2.7.2014, accepting the resolution dated 23.3.2004 and stated that the Society is deemed to have been dissolved from 23.3.2004 onwards, the Society filed W.P. No. 19191 of 2014 and the Hon'ble High Court granted an interim order on 10.7.2014 stating that no further proceedings in pursuance of the impugned order dated 2.7.2014 shall be taken up pending further orders in the writ petition, and the interim order is extended from time to time. As per the Societies Registration Act, once the Society is dissolved under Section 24 of the Act, the other proceedings like transfer of assets and liabilities to the similarly situated society shall follow under Section 25 of the Act.

(j) Recognising the position of law, the Hon'ble High Court passed an interim direction not to take up any further proceedings in pursuance of the order of the District Registrar dated 2.7.2014; therefore, virtually no effect has been given to the orders of the District Registrar and the assets of the Society and the management still remained intact. In view of the interim orders passed

in W.P. No. 19191 of 2014, it cannot be said that the Society is dissolved and the assets and liabilities are transferred to the Trust, much less from 25th March 2004 onwards. The plaintiff did not file even a single document to show his possession and enjoyment on the date of filing the suit, which is crucial for grant of temporary injunction pending the suit. In the absence of any such material, the plaintiff is not entitled to obtain any interim order.

(k) The Society gave a newspaper publication stating about the resolution passed on 3.8.2014 resolving to remove the plaintiff as Pastor and that the plaintiff was removed on 27.9.2014, and in the said resolution reasons were also given for removing the plaintiff as Pastor. Admittedly, when the plaintiff is working against the objects of the Society and claiming that the Society was dissolved, there is no reason to continue the plaintiff as Pastor of the church. When the Society was dissolved, it is nothing but fraud on the part of the plaintiff; that the Society is in existence is a false averment and that itself is sufficient to remove the plaintiff as Pastor. The averments with regard to the findings in O.S. No. 1665 of 2013 are prior to the order passed by the District Registrar on 2.7.2014. In all the suits and proceedings, the plaintiff and his associates are misleading the courts by showing only the orders passed in writ appeals. Therefore, the findings in the civil court are not relevant.

(l) The contention of the plaintiff is that the Society was dissolved and he continued his services as Pastor, which cannot be accepted at all. From the order of the District Registrar and the interim order passed against the said order, the matter shall be looked into for the purpose of deciding the present dispute. No document has been filed by the plaintiff to show that he has been appointed as the Pastor of the church. By claiming himself to be the Chairman of the Trust, he is seeking an injunction order. The resolution passed by the Society is a valid one and, by taking all precautions, only the said resolution was passed. The petitioner, who has been removed as Pastor, has filed the present suit on 26.10.2014 challenging the validity of the resolution dated 30.8.2014. The petitioner has to establish that from 30.8.2014

onwards he was in possession and enjoyment of the subject-matter of the church. The plaintiff, having obtained an interim order in W.P. No. 19191 of 2014, passed a resolution and removed the plaintiff as he is one of the persons causing threats to the very existence of the Society.

(m) The allegation that the resolution was passed with a dishonest and mala fide intention and for extraneous considerations in interfering with the affairs of the Eschol Prayer House at Ongole is incorrect; on the other hand, it is the mala fide intention of the plaintiff. The very fact that the plaintiff did not say anything about other churches which are in possession and enjoyment of the Society is sufficient to hold that the plaintiff has not come to court with clean hands. It is submitted that in place of the plaintiff, one Br. M. Koteswara Rao and Br. Vanapaul are posted as Pastors on 21.10.2014 and they have taken charge, and not the 8th defendant as stated by the plaintiff.

(n) The plaintiff, having obtained an injunction order on 28.10.2014, forcibly entered into the church premises and took away all the registers, electricity bills, telephone bills etc., to establish his false possession. The very fact that the plaintiff did not even produce a single document to show his possession and enjoyment as on the date of filing the suit. There is no occasion to give any threats to the plaintiff, as he was already removed and the Society has taken absolute control of the schedule property by appointing two Pastors, as the schedule church is a big one. There are no threats at all from anyone, and the alleged threats are only invented.

(o) The plaintiff suppressed the real facts and filed the suit with unclean hands. The plaintiff is acting against the interest of the believers. The plaintiff is not having any bona fides in filing this suit. The plaintiff filed this suit in his personal interest, projecting community interest. The framing of the suit itself is not correct and thereby this suit is not maintainable. The plaintiff is not entitled for the main relief in the suit. The plaintiff filed the suit without adding the necessary and proper parties, i.e., the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India, and sought injunction against the representatives of the

Society. This suit is not maintainable before this Court. The plaintiff, being a member of the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India, and the suit being filed against the members of the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India, claiming interest in the subject-matter of the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India, has to file proceedings under Section 23 of the Societies Registration Act but not by way of a civil suit. Hence, this Court is not to entertain the disputes between the members of the Society and thereby the suit is liable to be dismissed. The plaintiff suppressed the real facts and he is not entitled for the equitable relief.

04. The defendants 1 to 6 filed memo adopting the written statement of 7th defendant.

05. The defendants 9 and 10 filed a written statement denying the plaintiff's allegations. In brief, the contentions raised by the defendants 9 and 10 are as follows:

(a) The suit is not framed properly and this Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the plaint under Section 23 of the A.P. Societies Registration Act. As per Section 5. The defendants 9 and 10 filed a written statement denying the plaintiff's allegations. In brief, the contentions raised by the defendants 9 and 10 are as follows:

(b) There is no cause of action against defendants 9 and 10. The plaintiff has no locus standi to question defendants 9 and 10 about the administration of the Church at Ongole. The plaintiff was only an employee of the Society, namely the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India, which is registered as No. 114 of 1971 under the A.P. Societies Registration Act. The plaintiff has no locus standi to file the suit for the suit schedule property. Under the bye-laws of the Society, the God's Servants, fellow elders and believers should purchase the property and establish the church and administer the same locally to manage the same.

(c) The alleged meeting said to have been conducted by the individuals on 23.3.2004 is utterly false and the connected meeting notice dated 3.3.2004 is also utterly false. There was no explanation or discussion made, nor were any reports received from anybody, to show inability to maintain the Churches, and there was no discussion on the purpose and necessary need to dissolve the running Society which was developing in nature and strength. Any Society will be dissolved only if the members are unable to maintain the Society or to run the Society, but no such things happened and there were no such reports or discussions made. The alleged meeting said to have been reported is only a myth and was not acted upon.

(d) The Society No. 114 of 1971 was not dissolved in the eye of law, in the eye of God, and in the hands of God's Servants and believers. The alleged dissolution of the Society was not recorded. It is only a fictitious story created for the personal profit of the plaintiff. The acts and actions of the plaintiff are only for his personal benefits, though he himself acted as God's Servant. If the alleged dissolution dated 23.3.2004 is correct, why did the plaintiff execute a registered General Power of Attorney in favour of Mr. M. Ruben Francis and M. Pratapa Reddy under Document No. 81 of 20.4.2009 to protect the vision and the Society 114 of 1971, to take all necessary legal steps to safeguard it from grabbing of property and for protection of legal and spiritual rites, to appear before all courts and to file civil and criminal cases and for other purposes

(e) As per the plaintiff's own document, the Society No. 114 of 1971 is in existence and is running on 20.4.2009. Hence, it is clearly established and proved through the plaintiff's own document that their alleged resolution on 23.3.2004 was not enforced, did not come into force and was not acted upon. After the above-said GPA, the plaintiff and other eleven God's Servants met together on 11.5.2009 at Prayer House, Ongole, and agreed to withdraw their cases in various Courts and also resolved to work all of them under the control of the 114 of 1971 Society. Defendants 9 and 10 are also included in the

eleven members along with the plaintiff. Subsequently, the plaintiff acted against the 114 of 1971 Society by showing his own Trust and establishing and interfering with the administration of the Prayer House. At that stage, the 9th respondent herein filed O.S. No. 478 of 2008 for injunction and the injunction was granted and the suit is pending for disposal. Some of the believers and God's Servants of Ongole gathered and pooled funds and purchased the suit schedule property from Kesanapalli Gurumurthy and others and got it registered in the name of Rapolu Deva Sahayam, Bhaktha Singh Chabra and Gosala Suvarna Rao, as they are elderly God's Servants of the Society. Subsequently, the Society was registered as 114 of 1971, in which Deva Sahayam, Bhakta Singh Chabra and Gosala Suvarna Rao are the founder members of the Society. With the funds raised from the believers by the God's Servants and fellow brothers, the Prayer House and quarters were constructed. The smooth running of the Prayer House is according to the inspiration of the Society founded by Bhaktha Singh Chabra. As per the bye-laws of the Society 114 of 1971, every local Church has its own believers; with the advice and direction of the elders of Society 114 of 1971, the defendants Nos. 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 and Pilli Ramesh, Narasula Ram and others got together and constituted a Society under the name and style of Eschol Prayer House Committee with the address 53-1-2, Cloughpet, 1st Lane, Ongole, and registered it with the Registrar of Societies on 13.6.2008 with the memorandum of association with the rules and regulations under No. 159 of 2008, and the Society is running smoothly with the advice of the elders of Society 114 of 1971, and the suit schedule property and Prayer House are under the control and administration of the Governing Body of Eschol Prayer House Committee 159 of 2008.

(f) Br. Rapolu Deva Sahayam executed a Will on 19.9.2009 bequeathing the suit schedule property to the Eschol Prayer House Committee 159 of 2008 and subsequently, on 30.8.2010, Br. Devasahayam died and the Will came into force and was acted upon, and the same was submitted to the concerned

officials for mutating the name of Society 159 of 2009 as per the Will. The plaintiff is only a God's Servant and employee of the Society 114 of 1971; they got him trained and then he was appointed as God's Servant in Peddivari Palem Church; then he was transferred to Chirala Church and the plaintiff misbehaved and also did wrongs for his selfish gain at Chirala and then he was transferred to Ongole on 8.9.1998. Since then he worked as God's Servant at Ongole till he was transferred to Kandukur. The plaintiff changed his mind and worked against the mother Society 114 of 1971. The plaintiff rendered his services under the control of the local Society 159 of 2009 by the overall observation of the mother Society 114 of 1971.

(g) Being the local Society 159 of 2008, it obeys the orders and directions of the mother Society 114 of 1971 and is obliged and also honours the postings and transfers of the mother Society 114 of 1971. In fact, the alleged plaintiff's Trust is not in existence and is not in running, and the said alleged Trust has no connection or relation with the Society 114 of 1971. The plaintiff was set aside by the mother Society 114 of 1971 and he is nothing with the Society 114 of 1971 and local Society 159 of 2009. In fact, as per the facts mentioned supra, the mother Society 114 of 1971 is intact and not dissolved or not merged with anybody and is continuously running and operating day-to-day business by maintaining nearly 1,100 Churches all over India. The mother Society 114 of 1971 issued orders appointing Munnangi Koteswara Rao as God's Servant and the local Society 159 of 2008 also accepted the same and he took charge and is participating in the day-to-day business. The plaintiff high-handedly occupied the hostel quarters without any right. The plaintiff is not in service. There is no prima facie case and balance of convenience in favour of the plaintiff. The plaintiff filed irrelevant documents relating to the suit schedule property and against the local Society and misrepresented to the Court and obtained ex parte orders. Defendants 9 and 10 have got a prima facie case and balance of convenience in their favour.

(h) The various Churches in the District follow the local Society and accept the overall control of the local Society. Hence, the plaintiff has no **locus standi** to file the suit. The 9th defendant filed O.S. No. 478 of 2008 against the plaintiff and his follower G.J. Roy for permanent injunction from interfering in any way with the functioning and administration of the Eschol Prayer House and the suit is pending before the Additional Junior Civil Judge, Ongole, and interim injunction was also granted against him. Suppressing the fact, the plaintiff got filed the suit with false allegations. In fact, the Society 114 of 1971 is in existence and not dissolved and the plaintiff has no right to file the suit against the Society 114 of 1971, and the Society is not dissolved at any point of time and not merged with any other body. On 29.6.2009, Bale Satyanandam, Chebrolu Raja Ratnam and Kothapa gave a registered GPA in favour of the 10th defendant and Ch. Prem Babu to protect the vision and run the Churches of 114 of 1971, and also gave a registered GPA on 26.6.2012 by A. Ruben, S. Joseph, Sanam Samyulu, I. Prabhu Das and Devadanam executed GPA in favour of the 10th defendant and Ruben Frances and K. Ashok Kumar to protect the Society 114 of 1971. Likewise, on the same day, Ch. Raja Ratnam, B. Timothy, Ajjam Raja Rao, H. Sundar Raju gave GPA in favour of the 10th defendant, K. Ashok Kumar and Ruben Frances to protect the Society 114 of 1971, and also on 5.6.2012 Vanaapal executed a GPA in favour of the 10th defendant and nominated him to protect the Society 114 of 1971.

(i) All the above persons who executed the GPAs are the original members of the Society 114 of 1971, who are alleged to have signed in the alleged resolution dated 23.3.2004 and other alleged resolutions said to have been signed by them as alleged by the plaintiff. They executed a registered GPA in favour of the 10th defendant and others, which is a valid one. Whereas the alleged resolution said to have been signed by them as alleged by the plaintiff is not a genuine document and it is a created one by the plaintiff and

his non-believer followers. The registered GPA itself clearly proves the existence and function of the Society 114 of 1971 till today.

(j) Some of the members of the Society 114 of 1971 gave an undertaking on 26.5.2012 and nominated M.F. Peter and Ruben Frances to protect the vision of the Society 114 of 1971 and authorised them to make necessary applications. On 25.5.2009, the general body members present at Hebron resolved unanimously to call J.C. Rao, Augustine, Samson, Androos, Peter, Elias, Babu Rao, Moses, Prabhu Das, Krupavaram as special invitees for the Society 114 of 1971 to be part of the meeting or meetings and also for legitimate functioning of the Society. Likewise, the Society 114 of 1971 conducted meetings on 17.1.2009 and also passed necessary resolutions on various dates. All the above documents clearly prove the existence of the Society 114 of 1971.

(k) Now the Eschol Prayer House is under the control of Eschol Prayer House Committee, a Society No. 159 of 2008. The suit is not maintainable as there is misjoinder of parties and non-joinder of necessary parties. There is no cause of action against defendants 1 to 7. The allegation of the plaintiff that the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. confirmed their Trust and merging of the Society is not correct. The Hon'ble Court passed an order on 27.11.2014 under W.P. No. 19191 of 2014 in favour of the Society 114 of 1971 and the interim order granted earlier was extended until further orders. The plaintiff openly misappropriated the funds of the Society by purchasing the properties with the funds of the Society in his personal name. The plaintiff transferred the funds of the Society to various persons without following any legal procedure, without passing any resolution with a majority of members and brothers who are nominated by the Society. The plaintiff John Subba Reddy, along with his follower G.J. Roy, jointly misused the funds. On 5.10.2009, the alleged resolution shows that the funds of the Society Rs. 60,000/- were gifted to Srisailam and also Rs. 30,000/- gifted to Karedu, and also he himself received Rs. 40,000/- as a token gift for his 40 years of ministry. In fact, the plaintiff has

not served 40 years. He himself passed a resolution and he himself received Rs. 40,000/- and all other resolutions show the same. The resolution dated 4.2.2013 shows that they sent Rs. 20,00,000/- as advance to Mumbai for purchase of a prayer house in Mumbai, but there is no document or sale deed or any receipt in favour of the Society and no prayer house was launched at Mumbai till today. In fact, the said amount was sent to his brother.

(l) On 7.4.2013, the plaintiff and his follower G.J. Roy passed a resolution to withdraw Rs. 50 lakhs from the funds of the Society to purchase land of Ac. 1.70 cents in Koppolu. No land was purchased till today and no document was submitted to the Society, but the amount was withdrawn by the plaintiff. Likewise, on 5.8.2013, a resolution was passed by the plaintiff and his follower G.J. Roy to gift Rs. 50,000/- for purchase of a site for a prayer house in Miriyalaguda and no such sale deed was produced till today. The resolution dated 3.2.2014 shows that they paid Rs. 1,83,600/- for conversion charges for the land Ac. 1.70 cents, but there is no such conversion order in the name of Eschol Prayer House. Likewise, they passed a resolution on 7.4.2014 by paying Rs. 1,00,000/- to purchase a site for a prayer house in C.S. Puram, but no such document was filed.

(m) The defendants 9 and 10 are the members present in the resolutions dated 5.2.2007, 26.3.2007 and the resolution dated 22.10.2007; they recommended to form a Society of Eschol and other Churches of Prakasam District. Accordingly, the Society was registered as 159 of 2008. The plaintiff himself purchased the property from Kakumanu Vidyadhar and Mahidhar under registered sale deed 2612 of 2006 with the funds of the Society. The plaintiff himself gave an affidavit with false information; he does not possess any educational qualification and is an illiterate person, and he gave this affidavit on 30.10.2006 for passport, but he signed in English. On 27.6.2008, K. Manohar Augustine, member of the Society 114 of 1971, gave a registered GPA in favour of the 15th defendant to protect the vision of the Society 114 of 1971. The Eschol Prayer House Society 159 of 2008 is having

Churches all over the Prakasam District having branches and God brothers.

(n) The plaintiff Y. John Subba Reddy and K. Caleb executed a registered GPA in favour of Ruben Frances and Pratapa Reddy to protect the Society 114 of 1971. On 11.5.2009, the plaintiff, G.J. Roy, T. Immanuel, Peter Babu, Prasad, Babu Rao (10th defendant), Ezekiel (9th defendant), Ramesh, Samuel, Paul, Prabhakara Rao and Daniel met at Eschol Prayer House, Ongole, and discussed the disputes that arose on 9.5.2009 and the disputes were pacified and the plaintiff and 9th defendant were authorised as Pastors to conduct prayers and also agreed to withdraw all the cases and also agreed to affiliate to the Society 114 of 1971. With the above GPA and meeting resolution, it clearly proves the existence of the Society 114 of 1971. The claim and allegations of the plaintiff are not sustainable or tenable. The plaintiff filed the suit and obtained an ex parte injunction as he is habituated to eat the funds of the Church and misappropriated and diverted them for his personal use and mis-guided the innocent believers and to continue the eating of funds of the Church. Except that, there is no other reason or cause of action to file the suit. In fact, he has no belief in God. Moreover, he is not a born Christian and he is only a make-believe Christian and misguided the real Christians and believers of the Eschol Prayer House, Ongole, with his cunning actions and motives. The elders of the Society 114 of 1971 transferred him

06. The defendants 11 to 15 filed memo adopting the written statement of defendants 9 and 10.

07. Based on the above pleadings, my learned predecessor-in-office, settled the following issues for trial :

1. **Whether this court has no jurisdiction to entertain this suit ?**
2. **Whether the suit is not maintainable for not adding necessary and proper parties ?**

3. **Whether the suit is in the present form i.e., filed by the plaintiff it is individual capacity, representing the community interest, is not maintainable, as alleged in the written statement of defendants 1 to 7 ?**
4. **Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration that the resolution dt.30.8.2014 passed by the Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches of India is invalid ?**
5. **Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration, that removal orders dt.27.9.2014 passed by the Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches of India is invalid ?**
6. **Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of perpetual injunction against the defendants, as prayed for ?**
7. **If so, to what relief ?**

08. On behalf of the plaintiffs, P.W. 1 and P.W. 2 are examined and Exs. A.1 to A.41 are marked. During the cross-examination of D.W. 1, Exs. A.42 and A.43 are marked. On behalf of the defendants, D.W. 1 is examined. However, during the cross-examination of P.W. 1, Ex. B.1 is marked.

09. Heard the learned counsel for both the parties and perused the material on record.

10. **ISSUE NO.1:-**

Whether this court has no jurisdiction to entertain this suit ?

It is the contention of the plaintiff that the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India was dissolved by its Resolution dated 25.3.2004 and all its assets and liabilities were transferred to the Trust on 25.3.2004 itself in accordance with law, as per the Special Resolution dated 23.3.2004 passed by the General Body of the Society; and that the defendants, and the

1st defendant, published a notice (Eenadu, 19.10.2014) claiming chairmanship and announcing the Governing Body's resolution (3.8.2014) removing the plaintiff as Pastor of Eschol Prayer House and directing handover to defendants 9 to 15, and the notice alleged reasons for removal and stated steps to appoint the 8th defendant as new Pastor after the plaintiff purportedly rejected the removal order dated 27.9.2014; and that the 1st defendant and defendants 1 to 7 lack any power to style themselves Chairman or to interfere with the Trust, and consequently the alleged transfer order (2.1.2014), resolution (30.8.2014) and removal order (27.9.2014) are illegal, unauthorised and void.

11. In support of his contention, he got himself examined as P.W. 1 and got marked Exs. A.1 to A.43. His examination-in-chief is nothing but replica of contents in the plaint. Ex. A.1 is the publication. It discloses that a public notice was published in the newspaper Eenadu on 19.10.2014, whereby the first defendant, in his capacity as Chairman of the Society, announced the removal of the plaintiff from the post of Pastor of Eschol Prayer House. Ex. A.2 is the letter addressed by the Chairman of the Society. It discloses that the letter addressed to the plaintiff by the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India stated that a meeting was held on 30.08.2014 and he was removed as Pastor of Eschol Prayer House. Ex. A.3 is the letter addressed by Governing Body members dated 8.9.1998. Ex. A.4 is the orders in W.P. No. 2729 of 2009. Ex. A.5 is the certified copy of orders in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008. It discloses that the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad gave a finding that there is no infirmity in the conduct of the 1st respondent, that is, the Registrar of Societies, in addressing the impugned letter dated 19.02.2008 to the 2nd respondent, but holds and declares that the information that the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India, Registered No. 114 of 1971, is in vogue is erroneous in so far as the 1st respondent is concerned, having regard to the Special Resolution passed by the said Society on 23.03.2004 and intimation of such resolution furnished to the 1st respondent on 24.03.2004. Ex. A.6 is the certified copy of orders in W.P. No. 28349 of 2013. Ex. A.7 is the certified copy of orders in W.P. No. 19870 of 2013. Ex. A.8 is the certified copy of orders in I.A. 635 of 2013. Ex. A.9 is the certified copy of decree orders in I.A. 912 of 2013. Ex. A.10 is the certified copy of memorandum of association of the Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India. Ex. A.11 is the appointment letter of Br. John Subbareddy dated 22.3.2001. This shows that the plaintiff is appointed as a pastor to Eschol Prayer House. Ex. A.12 is the appointment letter of the plaintiff dated 30.1.2004. Ex. A.13 is the certified copy of deed of trust dated 24.3.2004. It discloses that the trust was formed on 24.03.2004 in the name of

“Indigenous Churches in India Trust,” with the following trustees: Bro. Kuruvilla Philip, Bro. G.T. Benjamin, Bro. Theodore Reginald, Bro. F.C.S. Peter, and Bro. Paul Sudhakar. Ex. A.14 is the certified copy of rectification deed dated 22.2.2005. Ex. A.15 is the certified copy of supplementary trust deed dated 24.3.2004. Ex. A.16 is the authorisation letter given by the Trust to the Indian Bank dated 17.2.2008. It discloses that the trustee, namely Bro. K. Philip, issued an authorisation letter authorising the plaintiff herein, Bro. G.J. Roy, Elder, and Bro. T. Emmanuel, Deacon, to approach the Manager of Indian Bank to open and operate a bank account in the name of “Eschol Prayer House. Ex. A.17 is the copy of account. Ex. A.18 is the original deed of cancellation of registered General Power of Attorney. Ex. A.19 is the certified copy of common orders in W.P. Nos. 7639 and 24352 of 2004. Ex. A.20 is the orders of the District Registrar dated 2.7.2014. It discloses that the District Registrar passed orders that the resolution dated 23.03.2004 is deemed to have been taken into record and also deemed to have been dissolved from the date of its resolution. Ex. A.21 is the bunch of electricity payment receipts. Ex. A.22 is the bunch of payment receipts of telephone. Ex. A.23 is the certified copy of S.R.O.P. No. 3 of 2014. Ex. A.24 is the certified copy of paper publication. Ex. A.25 is the certified copy of letter of authorisation dated 30.09.2014. Ex. A.26 is the certified copy of paper publication. Ex. A.27 is the certified copy of letter addressed by Chairman of the Trust dated 27.9.2014. Ex. A.28 is the certified copy of letter addressed by the Trust to Munnangi Koteswara Rao dated 21.10.2014. Ex. A.29 is the certified copy of letter addressed by the Trust to the plaintiff dated 2.1.2014. Ex. A.30 is the certified copy of resolution dated 11.05.2009. Ex. A.31 is the certified copy of affidavit in S.R.O.P. No. 3 of 2014. Ex. A.32 is the certified copy of affidavit of Swarna Ezekiel vide O.S. 478 of 2008. Ex. A.33 is the certified copy of counter in I.A. 166 of 2008 filed by the Trust. Ex. A.34 is the certified copy of counter filed by R.3/plaintiff in I.A. 166 of 2008. Ex. A.35 is the certified copy of written statement filed by the Trust vide O.S. 478 of 2008. Ex. A.36 is the certified

copy of written statement by the plaintiff vide O.S. 478 of 2008. Ex. A.37 is the certified copy of affidavit given by Swarna Ezekiel vide O.S. 478 of 2008. Ex. A.38 is the certified copy of plaint in O.S. 478 of 2008. Ex. A.39 is the certified copy of decree in O.S. 478 of 2008. Ex. A.40 is the certified copy of orders in I.A. 932 of 2015 in O.S. 280 of 2015. Ex. A.41 is the certified copy of orders in C.R.P. 2692 of 2016. In the cross-examination of PW-1, nothing was elicited in support of the defence set up by the defendants that the society was not dissolved, that no trust was formed, and that the properties were not transferred from the society to the trust. On the contrary, it was elicited that the members of the society are also the members of the trust, this statement having been made in response to questions put by the learned counsel for defendants 3 and 5. If that is so, even the defendants may be taken to have admitted the existence of the trust. PW-1 thus successfully withstood cross-examination, and nothing was brought out therein to discredit or disbelieve his evidence.

12. He also examined PW-2, who is one of the elders of the Eschol Prayer House. His examination-in-chief supports the version given by PW-1. PW.2 also withstood cross-examination. During cross-examination, PW.2 clearly stated that, as per Ex.A13, Philip was the chairman of the Trust. In the very same cross-examination, he also stated that Philip has since died and that the plaintiff is now acting as chairman of the Trust.

13. During the cross-examination of DW-1, the plaintiff got marked Exs. A-43 and A-44, being the certified copy of the Memorandum of Association and the certified copy of the petition, affidavit of DW-1, petition and docket orders, respectively. However, Exhibit A-42 was inadvertently omitted during the marking process, and the subsequent documents were incorrectly marked as Exhibit A-43 and Exhibit A-44. This has now been rectified by renumbering

the exhibits so as to maintain proper chronological order: Exhibit A-43 is corrected to Exhibit A-42, and Exhibit A-44 is corrected to Exhibit A-43.

14. On the other hand, it is the contention of the defendants that the society was never dissolved and continues to exist; that the trust never came into existence; and that the plaintiff and others executed a registered General Power of Attorney (GPA) in favour of Ruben Frances and Pratapa Reddy to protect Society No. 114/71. It is further contended that, on 11.05.2009, a meeting held at the Eschol Prayer House resolved the disputes dated 09.05.2009, authorised the plaintiff and the 9th defendant as Pastors, and agreed to withdraw the cases and to affiliate with Society No. 114/71. According to the defendants, this establishes the continued existence of the society and renders the plaintiff's suit unsustainable, being motivated by alleged misappropriation of church funds and personal gain. They further allege that the plaintiff lacks bona fides, having been accused of misleading believers and not being a true Christian; that the elders purportedly transferred and removed him from the society and from his post, leaving him without locus standi to seek relief with reference to Society No. 114/71; and that the plaintiff's allegation that the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh confirmed their trust and the merger of the society is incorrect. It is stated that the Hon'ble Court passed an order on 27.11.2014 in W.P. No. 19191 of 2014 in favour of Society No. 114/71, whereby the earlier interim order was extended until further orders. The defendants further allege that the plaintiff openly misappropriated the funds of the society by purchasing properties in his personal name using society funds, and that he transferred society funds to various persons without following any legal procedure or passing any resolution. On this basis, they contend that he was removed and that the order passed by the society is legal.

15. In support of their contentions, apart from the 15th defendant, none of the other contesting defendants that is Defendants 3 to 7, 9 to 14 were examined as witnesses. Consequently, their case remained confined to the pleadings, unsupported by any oral or documentary evidence. The 15th defendant alone was examined as DW-1. The examination-in-chief of DW-1 is nothing but replica of contents in the written statement. However, Ex. B-1, which is a certified copy of the registered sale deed dated 15.06.1966, was marked during the cross-examination of PW-1. This document, being a sale deed executed in favour of Eschol Prayer House in 1966 for transferring the property into the name of the said Church under the Society. It is not the plaintiff's case that the society never existed; accordingly, this assertion does not materially assist the defendants. In the cross-examination of DW-1, it was elicited that he could not recall whether he had filed his written statement. He, however, admitted that the plaintiff is the pastor of Eschol Prayer House. If DW-1 himself is unable to remember filing his written statement, it is difficult to see how he can reliably recollect the specific pleas contained therein so as to effectively contest the present case. This significantly undermines the credibility of DW-1's evidence. Apart from his self-serving testimony, which, in any event, is inconsistent with his pleaded case, there is no other cogent or convincing evidence to establish that the society continues to exist or that it has the right to remove the plaintiff from the post of church pastor due to his alleged illegal actions.

16. After perusing the entire evidence adduced on record, it is not in dispute that the plaintiff pastor was removed from his position at the Eschol Prayer House. It is also not in dispute that the communication of removal, namely Ex. A-1, was published and duly communicated to the plaintiff. The defendants contend that the plaintiff church is registered as a society and therefore, under Section 23 of the A.P. Societies Registration Act, 2001, only the District Court has jurisdiction to entertain disputes relating to the society, and this court Senior Civil Judge lacks jurisdiction and prays to dismiss the suit. Section 23 of the A.P. Societies Registration Act, 2001 provides for the settlement of disputes relating to registered societies and typically confers jurisdiction upon the District Court within whose jurisdiction the society is functioning to entertain and decide disputes concerning the constitution, management, or affairs of the society, disputes between members, validity of elections, resolutions, or office-bearers, and other internal matters of the society. However, the present suit is not a pure society dispute under Section 23 of the A.P. Societies Registration Act, 2001. The critical facts are- The society stands dissolved:

The plaintiff's case rests on a coherent chain of documentary evidence which, when read chronologically, establishes the dissolution of the original society and the lawful succession of the trust. First, in Ex.A5, the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad, while upholding the propriety of the 1st respondent (the Registrar of Societies) in issuing the impugned letter dated 19.02.2008 to the 2nd respondent, expressly declared that the assertion that the society known as "Society of Trustees of Indigenous Churches in India," registered under No. 114 of 1971, continued to exist was erroneous. Thereafter, in Ex.A7, the same Hon'ble High Court passed orders dated.12.07.2013, drawing upon its earlier findings in W.P. No. 16430 of 2008 dated 24.06.2009, held that the petitioner is the successor to the said society registered under No. 114 of 1971; this position was reinforced by the orders passed in I.A. Nos. 2276 and 2665 of 2010 in O.S. No. 380 of 2010 dated

04.12.2012 on the file of the II Additional Chief Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad, which recognised the petitioner-trust as the lawful owner conducting the affairs of the trust, including management of the prayer hall, thereby confirming that the trust is the successor to the erstwhile society. Subsequently, by Ex.A20, the District Registrar, in his order dated 02.07.2014, recorded that the resolution dated 23.03.2004 was deemed to have been taken on record and that the society stood deemed to have been dissolved from the date of that resolution. On the basis of this sequence of judicial and administrative findings, the plaintiff pleads that, consequent to such dissolution, the church has been functioning as a trust under a registered trust deed, as proved by Ex.A13. On the other hand, the defendants contended that the order in W.P. No. 19870 of 2013, which contains only an interim order not dealing with the dissolution of the society, is irrelevant. However, beyond merely taking this plea, the defendants adduced no evidence to demonstrate why the said order is irrelevant, particularly in the face of a clear finding that the trust is the successor to the society. In these circumstances, the plaintiff has successfully proved that: (i) the society registered under No. 114 of 1971 stood dissolved with effect from 23.03.2004; (ii) the trust is the lawful successor to that society; and (iii) the trust is the owner and manager of the prayer hall and its related affairs. Accordingly, the dispute pertains to a trust and not to a subsisting society. The plaintiff sues independently, having been removed as Pastor of Eschol Prayer House by the now-dissolved society. The impugned resolution and removal orders were passed by a body purporting to act as the "Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches of India," but the governing instrument of the church at the relevant time was the trust deed, not the society bye-laws. The suit seeks declaration that the resolution and removal orders are invalid and void and Injunction against interference with the trust's administration. These reliefs pertain to the trust's governance, not to the internal management of a subsisting registered society. Section 9 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 provides that civil courts have jurisdiction to try

all suits of a civil nature unless their jurisdiction is expressly or impliedly barred. For Section 23 of the A.P. Societies Registration Act, 2001 to oust the jurisdiction of this court, the following must be established:

1. The dispute must relate to a registered society that is still in existence;
2. The relief sought must fall squarely within the matters enumerated in Section 23; and
3. The statute must expressly or by necessary implication bar the jurisdiction of other civil courts.

In the present case:

The society stands dissolved, and the church is governed by a trust.

The dispute essentially concerns the validity of the plaintiff's removal as pastor of Eschol Prayer House, which is registered as a trust. It does not pertain to the internal management of a subsisting society.

There is no express bar preventing this court from entertaining a suit concerning a trust that was formerly a society but is now a trust.

In *P. Veera Swamy v. Gandham Chandra Sekhar Rao* (2013), the Andhra Pradesh High Court considered the scope of Section 23 of the A.P. Societies Registration Act and held that the provision applies to disputes within the framework of a registered society. Where the entity in question is no longer governed by the society structure, the ordinary civil court jurisdiction applies.

17. In view of the above discussion and decision, the Eschol Prayer House is no longer a society but a trust. Section 23 of the A.P. Societies Registration Act, 2001 applies only to subsisting registered societies; There is no statutory bar preventing this court from entertaining the suit; and this court has territorial and pecuniary jurisdiction over the subject matter. Therefore, the defendants' objection that only the District Court has jurisdiction under Section 23 of the

A.P. Societies Registration Act, 2001 is not sustainable. **Issue No.1 is decided in favour of the plaintiff**

18. **ISSUE NO.2: Whether the suit is not maintainable for not adding necessary and proper parties?**

It is well settled that a 'necessary party' is one without whom no effective decree can be passed, whereas a 'proper party' is one whose presence enables the court to adjudicate more completely, but whose absence does not render the decree inexecutable. In suits directly affecting trust property or seeking a scheme of administration, all trustees and, in many cases, beneficiaries are regarded as necessary parties. However, where the suit is essentially for declaration of the plaintiff's individual right to an office as a pastor and for injunction against specific persons who are interfering, and does not seek to re-constitute the trust or alter the rights of beneficiaries, the absence of other trustees or members is not fatal. In the present case, the defendants on record are the persons who passed and are enforcing the impugned resolution and removal orders. The relief sought is confined to declaration of the resolution and removal orders as void and restraint against these defendants. An effective decree can be passed between the existing parties. The suit does not seek administration of the trust, alienation of trust property, or determination of rights of all beneficiaries. Hence, the suit is not bad for non-joinder of necessary parties. **Issue No.2 is decided in favour of the plaintiff.**

19. **ISSUE NO.3: Whether the suit in the present form, filed by the plaintiff in his individual capacity representing community interest, is not maintainable, as alleged in the written statement of defendants 1 to 7 ?**

The plaintiff sues primarily to protect his personal legal right to the Eschol Prayer House as he was removed as a pastor and to prevent

interference with his duties. Although he also represents the broader interest of the community, the core relief is vindication of his own individual legal status and entitlement under the trust deed. Order I Rule 8 CPC (representative suits) is permissive and not compulsory in all cases where a community interest is involved. Where a person's individual right to an office or property is directly affected, he can sue in his individual capacity even if the outcome may affect a larger group. Under Section 34 of the Specific Relief Act, 1963, a suit for declaration is maintainable if the plaintiff is entitled to a legal character or right to property and the defendant denies or is interested in denying that right. Here, the plaintiff claims a legal character that is right to office as a Pastor, which is denied by the defendants through the impugned resolution and removal order. The suit is not a bare declaration; it is coupled with a prayer for injunction, further strengthening maintainability. There is no requirement under law that a dispute concerning the office-bearer of a trust must be filed only in a representative capacity or by the entire congregation. The plaintiff, as the directly affected office-holder, is competent to challenge the removal and seek declaration and injunction. **Issue No.3 is decided in favour of the plaintiff.**

20. ISSUES NO.4 : Whether the plaintiff is entitled to declaration that the resolution dated 30.8.2014 passed by the Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches of India is invalid ?

The evidence shows that the resolution was passed by a meeting convened under the purported authority of the "Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches of India" after the Eschol Prayer House had already transitioned to a trust structure. Once the society was dissolved and the trust created, the governing instrument became the trust deed, and any resolution by a defunct or irrelevant society concerning the trust's office-bearers is without jurisdiction. The plaintiff has established that the procedure prescribed under the trust deed/bye-laws for removal of the Pastor was not followed. Such mandatory

procedural violations render the resolution invalid. The plaintiff was not afforded a reasonable opportunity to meet the allegations before removal. Principles of natural justice require that a person likely to be adversely affected must be given notice and a hearing. Where a body acts beyond the powers conferred upon it by its governing instrument or by law, its acts are ultra vires and void. The resolution in question, being passed without authority and in violation of mandatory procedures, is a nullity. **Issue No.4 is decided in in favour of the plaintiff.**

21. **ISSUE NO.5:**

Whether the plaintiff is entitled to declaration that removal orders dated 27.09.2014 passed by the Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches of India is invalid ?

The removal orders are founded solely on the impugned resolution dated 30.08.2014. Once that resolution is held to be void and without legal effect, the removal orders based thereon are likewise void ab initio. The trust deed/bye-laws prescribe the manner in which the plaintiff can be removed (if at all). The defendants failed to follow that procedure, and purported to remove the plaintiff through a body lacking authority. The removal was effected by a dissolved society is procedurally unfair and liable to be struck down. **Issue No.5 is decided in favour of the plaintiff.**

22. **ISSUE NO.6:**

Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of perpetual injunction against the defendants, as prayed for?

The plaintiff has proved that the defendants, relying on the invalid resolution and removal orders, are actively interfering with his functioning as Pastor, creating confusion and disruption in the administration of the trust.

Having established his legal right to the office and the invalidity of the removal, the plaintiff is entitled to the protection of the court to prevent further unlawful interference. A perpetual injunction is the appropriate equitable remedy to secure the peaceful enjoyment of his rights. Under Section 34 and Section 38 of the Specific Relief Act, 1963, where a plaintiff is entitled to a declaration of resolution and removal orders as illegal and void, the court may also grant a consequential injunction to prevent infringement of that right. Granting a perpetual injunction will prevent repeated disputes and multiple suits over the same issue, ensuring finality and stability in the administration of the trust.

Issue No.6 is decided in favour of the plaintiff.

23. **ISSUE NO.7:** If so, to what relief?

In the result the **suit is decreed with costs** in the following manner:

1. by declaring that the resolution dated 30.08.2014 passed by the Society of Trustees Indigenous Churches of India is invalid, illegal, void and inoperative;
2. by declaring that the removal orders dated 27.09.2014 passed by the said Society are invalid, illegal, void and inoperative; and
3. by granting a permanent injunction restraining Defendants 3 to 7, 9 to 15, their henchmen, agents, nominees, and all persons claiming through or under them, from obstructing or interfering with the duties, powers, and functions of the Plaintiff as the Pastor of Eschol Prayer House, situated at D.No. 53-1-3, in S.No. 422 of Cloughpet, Ongole, and from interfering with the administration and affairs of the Eschol Prayer House.

The suit against Defendant No.1 is dismissed, he having died during the pendency of the proceedings. The suit against Defendants Nos. 2 and 8 is dismissed on 16.03.2022, in view of the plaintiff's memo indicating that he is not taking any steps against them.

Typed to my dictation by the Stenographer, corrected and pronounced by me, in open Court, on this the 31st day of July, 2026.

Sd/- xxx
Principal Civil Judge
(Senior Division), Ongole

// APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE //
Witnesses Examined/

For Plaintiff:

Name of witness	Description
Pw.1 : Y.John Subba Reddy	Plaintiff
Pw.2 : G.J.Roy	Third party

For Defendants :

Name of witness	Description
Dw.1 : Kollabathula Ezra	15 th defendant

Documents marked

For Plaintiff :

Exhibit number	Description of document	Proved by/attested
Ex.A.1	Publication	Pw.1
Ex.A.2	Letter addressed by Chairman of the Society	Pw.1
Ex.A.3	Letter addressed by Governing body members dt.8.9.1998	Pw.1
Ex.A.4	Orders in W.P.No.2729/2009	Pw.1
Ex.A.5	Certified copy of orders in W.P.No.16430/2008	Pw.1
Ex.A.6	Certified copy of orders in W.P.No.28349/2013	Pw.1

Ex.A.7	Certified copy of orders in W.P.No.9870/2013	Pw.1
Ex.A.8	Certified copy of orders in I.A.635/2013	Pw.1
Ex.A.9	Certified copy of decree orders in I.A.912/2013	Pw.1
Ex.A.10	Certified copy of memorandum of association of the Society of Trustees of Inginenous.	Pw.1
Ex.A.11	Appointment letter of Br. John Subbareddy dt. 22.3.2001	Pw.1
Ex.A.12	Appointment letter of plaintiff dt.30.1.2004	Pw.1
Ex.A.13	Certified copy of deed of trust dt.24.3.2004	Pw.1
Ex.A.14	Certified copy of rectification deed dt.22.2.2005	Pw.1
Ex.A.15	Certified copy of supplementary trust deed dt. 24.3.2004	Pw.1
Ex.A.16	Authorisation letter given by trust to the Indian bank dt. 17.2.2008	Pw.1
Ex.A.17	Copy of account	Pw.1
Ex.A.18	Original deed of cancellation of registered General Power of Attorney	Pw.1
Ex.A.19	Certified copy of common orders in W.P.No. 7639, 24352 of 2004	Pw.1
Ex.A.20	Orders of District Registrar dt. 2.7.2014	Pw.1
Ex.A.21	Bunch of electricity payment receipt	Pw.1
Ex.A.22	Bunch of payment receipt of telephone	Pw.1
Ex.A.23	Certified copy of SROP No.3/2014	Pw.1
Ex.A.24	Certified copy of paper publication	Pw.1
Ex.A.25	Certified copy of letter of authorisation dt.	Pw.1

	30.9.2014	
Ex.A.26	Certified copy of paper publication	Pw.1
Ex.A.27	Certified copy of letter addressed by Chairman of Trust dt. 27.9.2014	Pw.1
Ex.A.28	Certified copy of letter addressed by Trust to Munnangi Koteswara Rao dt.21.10.2014	Pw.1
Ex.A.29	Certified copy of letter addressed by Trust to plaintiff dt.2.1.2014	Pw.1
Ex.A.30	Certified copy of resolution dt.11.5.2009	Pw.1
Ex.A.31	Certified copy of affidavit in SROP No.3/2014	Pw.1
Ex.A.32	Certified copy of affidavit of Swarna Ezekie vide OS..478/2008	Pw.1
Ex.A.33	Certified copy of counter in I.A.166/2008 filed by trust	Pw.1
Ex.A.34	Certified copy of counter filed by 3 rd respondent/plaintiff in I.A.166/2008	Pw.1
Ex.A.35	Certified copy of written statement filed by trust in vide O.S.478/2008	Pw.1
Ex.A.36	Certified copy of written statement by plaintiff in O.S.478/08	Pw.1
Ex.A.37	Certified copy of Affidavit given by Swarn Ezekie in O.S.478/08	Pw.1
Ex.A.38	Certified copy of plaint in O.S.478/08	Pw.1
Ex.A.39	Certified copy of decree in O.S.478/08	Pw.1
Ex.A.40	Certified copy of orders in I.A.932/2015 in O.S.280/15	Pw.1
Ex.A.41	Certified copy of orders in CRP 2692/2016	Pw.1

Ex.A.42	Certified copy of memorandum of association	Through Dw.1
Ex.A.43	Certified copies of petition affidavit, petition and docket orders in O.S.280/2015	Through Dw.1

For Defendants :

Exhibit number	Description of document	Proved by/attested
Ex.B.1	Certified copy of registered sale deed dt.15.6.1966	Through Pw.1

Sd/- xxx

PCJ (SD)