

IN THE COURT OF SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AT NALGONDA

Present: - *Sri. M. Venkateswara Rao*,
Senior Civil Judge,
Nalgonda.

Tuesday, on this 02nd day of November, 20p21

ORIGINAL SUIT No.98 of 2011

Between: -

Komatireddy Vasantha, W/o.Narasimha Reddy, Age:44 years,
Occ:Household, R/o.Kothagudem Village of Narayanapuram Mandal,
Nalgonda District, presently residing at H.No.3-16-108/4/43/D,
Kamakashipuram, Ramanthapur, Hyderabad.

..... Plaintiff

And

1. Donuri Radhamma, W/o.Late Anantha Reddy, Age:65 years,
Occ:Household, R/o.Kothagudem Village of Narayanapuram Mandal,
Nalgonda District (*Died per L.Rs D.2 to D.4*).
2. Donuri Satyanarayana Reddy, S/o.Late Anantha Reddy, Age:48 years,
Occ:Agriculture, R/o.Kothagudem Village of Narayanapuram Mandal,
Nalgonda District, presently residing at Flat No.507, BLC No.31, Mahada
Complex Marg, Link Road, Khandavelli West, Mumbai.
3. Donuri Kondal Reddy, S/o.Late Anantha Reddy, Age:42 years,
Occ:Agriculture, R/o.Kothagudem Village of Narayanapuram Mandal,
Nalgonda District, presently residing at H.No.3-16-108/10/303, Street
No.10, Kamakshipuram, Ramanthapur, Hyderabad.
4. Donuri Hanumantha Reddy, S/o.Late Anantha Reddy, Age:40 years,
Occ:Agriculture, R/o.H.No.1-265, Ward No.2, Beside Mangali Sathaiah
house, Venkateshwara Colony, Chityal Village and Mandal, Nalgonda
District.
5. Devireddy Vijaya, W/o.Ram Reddy, Age:64 years, Occ:Household,
R/o.Brahmanavellemla Village of Narketpally Mandal, Nalgonda District.
(D.5 is impleaded as per the orders in I.A No.878/2017, dt.03.10.2017).

... Defendants

This suit is coming before me for final hearing and for disposal in the presence of *Sri. G.Venkata Ramana Reddy*, Learned Counsel for the plaintiff; and *Sri T.Kiran Kumar*, Learned Counsel for the Defendants No.1 to 4; and defendant No.5 remained *exparte*; and upon hearing the both the counsel ; and on perusal of the material on record and the matter having stood over for consideration till this day, the court delivered the following:

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

1. This is a suit filed by the Plaintiff for seeking relief of partition and separate possession of the Suit Schedule property.

2. ***The brief facts of Plaint are as under:***

i. That the plaintiff and defendants No.2 to 4 are the children of defendant No.1 and Late Donuri Anantha Reddy and they constitute Hindu Joint Family Governed by Mithakashara School of Hindu Law.

ii. Originally Donuri Masaiah @ Masi Reddy, who was the paternal grandfather of plaintiff and defendants No.2 to 4 and that the said Donuri Masaiah and his two brothers orally partitioned their joint family lands by metes and bounds and in that partition said Donuri Masaiah acquired the land admeasuring Ac.0.23 gts in Sy.No.209, the land admeasuring Ac.0.37 gts in Sy.No.210/A, the land admeasuring Ac.3.15 gts in Sy.No.211/A, the land admeasuring Ac.0.18 gts in Sy.No.213/A and the land admeasuring Ac.1.37 gts in Sy.No.214, totally to an extent of Ac.7.10 gts, situated at Kothagudem Village and the land admeasuring Ac.16.24 gts in Sy.No.778 and Ac.19.01 gts in Sy.No.851 totally to an extent of Ac.35.25 gts situated at Sarvail Village. Thus, total extent of lands Ac.42.35 gts situated in both the villages.

iii. During the life time of said Donuri Masaiah, he is in actual possession and enjoyment over the joint family lands fell to his share

and that said Masaiah has got two sons by names Donuri Anantha Reddy, who was the father of plaintiff and defendants No.2 to 4 and husband of defendant No.1 and Donuri Rama Krishna Reddy, who succeeded the properties of their father late Donuri Masaiah and both of them also separated their half share each i.e., Ac.21.18 gts in the lands mentioned above as the legal heirs of their father and accordingly patta was also mutated on their names in all the revenue records separately.

iv. Said Donuri Anantha Reddy died intestate on 19.09.2003 leaving behind the plaintiff, the defendants No.1 to 4 as his legal heirs and that said joint family became the coparcenary properties and that plaintiff being the only daughter of deceased Anantha Reddy and defendant No.1, she is entitled to equal share along with the defendants on the properties left by the deceased Anantha Reddy.

v. Further, the plaintiff contended that said Donuri Anantha Reddy performed her marriage on 10.05.1984 and at that time her father promised to give certain lands to her with the consent of defendants and accordingly, during his life time the father of plaintiff and defendants continued to give her share in the profits derived by the cultivation of the suit lands every year to the knowledge of villagers.

vi. While so, on 17.03.2011 the plaintiff demanded the defendants to divide the suit lands and allot to her $\frac{1}{5}^{\text{th}}$ share by metes and bounds, but the defendants denied for partition of the suit land and that the defendants got mutated their names in the revenue records in respect of the suit lands behind the back of plaintiff. Therefore, the said mutation proceedings are void and liable to be cancelled. Hence, the present suit is filed.

3. The defendant No.3 filed written statement. The Defendants No.1, 2 and 4 filed memo adopting the written statement of Defendant No.3. The brief facts of said written statement are as under:

The contention of defendants is that the father of plaintiff and defendants No.2 to 4 and the defendant No.1 by name Anantha Reddy acquired the agricultural lands from his father and said agricultural lands not partitioned in between his brother Donuri Ramakrishna Reddy as such Donuri Ramakrishna Reddy is also necessary party to the present suit. It is further stated that Late Anantha Reddy has got first wife by name Jagannadhamma and through her late Anantha Reddy has got one daughter by name Devireddy Vijaya and after death of Anantha Reddy being his class-I legal heir said Devireddy Vijaya and as such she is also necessary party to the suit and therefore the suit is liable to be dismissed since non joinder of necessary parties who are also having their undivided interest and share in the suit schedule properties.

4. During the life time of Donuri Anantha Reddy, the defendant No.2 used to look after the welfare of their family and that the defendant No.2 performed the marriages of plaintiff, defendant No.3 and 4 by spending huge amounts out of his own income. At the time of marriage of plaintiff, the defendant No.2 spent an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- towards marriage expenses and presentations and also presented 8 tulas of gold ornaments to the daughter of plaintiff by name Saritha on the occasion of her marriage and that defendant No.2 repaid the bank loan amount of Rs.30,000/- of plaintiff. After the marriage of daughter of plaintiff, she relinquished her 1/5th share in the joint family properties in favour of all

defendants and subsequently due to recent hike of prices and in order to extract more money from the defendants, the plaintiff filed the present suit.

5. In spite of publication of summons against Defendant No.5, he failed to appear before the court, as such Defendant No.5 was set *ex parte* on 16.04.2018. The Defendant No.5 remained *ex parte*.

6. Basing on the pleadings, the following issues are framed:

i. “Whether the plaintiff is entitled for partition and separate possession of the suit schedule property?

ii. To what relief?

7. During trial, the plaintiff herself was examined as P.W.1 and got marked *Ex.A1 to Ex.A7*. Further, one D.Kamamma examined as P.W.2 and one Rachakonda Buchaiah examined as P.W.3. On behalf of defendants No.1 to 4, defendant No.2 himself was examined as D.W.1 and got marked *Ex.B1 to Ex.B13*. Further, one Devireddy Ram Reddy and one Gude Mallesh were examined as D.W.2 and D.W.3.

8. Heard the learned Counsel for the Plaintiff and counsel for the contesting defendants.

9. Perused the material available on record.

10. **Issue No.1:**

The contention of plaintiff is that she is the daughter of Donuri Anantha Reddy and that D.2 to D.4 are her brothers and that D.1 is her mother. Further, the D.5 is said to daughter of said Anantha Reddy through his 1st wife Jagannadamma.

11. Further contention of plaintiff is that Donuri Anantha Reddy got the suit schedule property towards his share in the partition with his

brother Ramakrishna Reddy and that the said D.Anantha Reddy died intestate on 19.09.2003 leaving behind the plaintiff, Defendant No.1 to Defendant No.4 as his legal heirs and therefore the plaintiff is entitled to 1/5th share in the suit schedule property.

12. On the other hand, defendants No.1 to 4 did not deny that the suit schedule property is acquired by said Anantha Reddy. However, the contention of defendants is that, D.2 who is brother of plaintiff managed their family and performed the marriages of plaintiff by giving Rs.5,00,000/- and also used to send amounts to the plaintiff and therefore the plaintiff had relinquished her right over the suit schedule property orally and therefore she is not entitled for partition.

13. The D.5 remained exparte. However, husband of D.5 was examined as D.2 on behalf of D.1 to D.4.

14. In support of contention of plaintiff, the plaintiff herself was examined as P.W.1 and she reiterated the contents of her plaint in chief examination. The evidence of P.W.1 in brief is that her grandfather Donuri Masaiah @ Masi Reddy and his two brothers namely Laxmi Narsaiah and Agaiah got partitioned their joint family lands with metes and bounds and in that partition said Donuri Masaiah acquired the land measuring Ac.0.23 gts in Sy.No.209, the land admeasuring Ac.0.37 gts in Sy.No.210/A, the land admeasuring Ac.3.15 gts in Sy.No.211/A, the land admeasuring Ac.0.18 gts in Sy.No.213/A and the land admeasuring Ac.1.37 gts in Sy.No.214, totally admeasuring Ac.7.10 gts, situated at Kothagudem Village and the land admeasuring Ac.16.24 gts in Sy.No.778 and Ac.19.01 gts in Sy.No.851 totally admeasuring Ac.35.25 gts situated

at Sarvail Village. Thus, total extent of lands Ac.42.35 gts situated in both the villages.

15. Further, P.W.1 deposed that Said Masaiah got two sons by name Donuri Anantha Reddy, who was the father of plaintiff and defendants No.2 to 4 and husband of defendant No.1 and Donuri Rama Krishna Reddy, who succeed the properties of their father late Donuri Masaiah @ Masi Reddy and both of them also separated their half share each i.e., Ac.21.18 gts in the lands mentioned above as the legal heirs of their father and their names also mutated in the revenue records.

16. Further, P.W.1 deposed that said Donuri Anantha Reddy died intestate on 19.09.2003 leaving behind the plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 4 as his legal heirs and they constitute a Hindu Joint Family and the said joint family became the coparcenary property and that she being the only daughter of deceased Anantha Reddy and defendant No.1, she is entitled to equal share along with the defendants on the properties left by the deceased Anantha Reddy.

17. P.W.1 further deposed that said Donuri Anantha Reddy performed her marriage on 10.05.1984 agreed and promised to give her certain lands with the consent of defendants and accordingly, during his life time the father of plaintiff and defendants continued to give her share in the profits derived by the cultivation of the suit lands every year to the knowledge of villagers. P.W.1 further deposed that even after the death of father of plaintiff, the defendants used to continue to give the share of plaintiff by cultivation of the suit lands and that the plaintiff demanded the defendants on 17.03.2011 to divide the suit lands and allot to her 1/5th share by metes and bounds, since they denied to pay the value of profits

derived through cultivation of the suit lands and that the defendants No.2 to 4 denied for partition of the suit land and that the defendants got mutated their names in the revenue records in respect of the suit lands behind the back of plaintiff and therefore the said mutation proceedings are void and liable to be cancelled.

18. The P.W.1 further deposed that the facts mentioned by defendants in their written statement are false and that D.2 did not spent Rs.5,00,000/- for her marriage and he did not give any amount to the plaintiff. The learned counsel for defendants cross examined P.W.1 and it was suggested to P.W.1 that after death of father of plaintiff, the D.2 to D.4 partitioned the property. Except that nothing was elicited to show that the plaintiff has relinquished her share in the suit schedule property.

19. Further, the evidence of P.W.1 is corroborated by Ex.A1 to Ex.A7.

20. Ex.A1 is (5) True copies of Chessal pahanies for the years 1955-56 to 1957-58, showing that the land in Sy.No.209 to an extent of Ac.0.23 gts, the land in Sy.No.210 to an extent of Ac.0.37 gts, the land in Sy.No.211 to an extent of Ac.3.15 gts, the land in Sy.No.213 to an extent of Ac.0.18 gts was recorded in the name of Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah.

21. Ex.A2 is (6) copies of Pahanies for the years 1961-62, 1965-66 and 1986-87 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011.

22. Pahani for the year 1961-62 is showing as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
209	0.23	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
210	0.37	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
211	3.15	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
213	0.18	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
214	1.37	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah

Pahani for the year 1965-66 is showing as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
209	0.23	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
210	0.37	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
211	3.15	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
213	0.18	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
214	1.37	Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah

Pahani for the years 1986-87 is showing as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
209	0.23	Donuri Anantha Reddy and Donuri Ramakrishna Reddy S/o.Masi Reddy
210	0.37	-do-
211	3.15	-do-
213	0.18	-do-
214	1.37	-do-

23.Ex.A3 is (2) copies pahanies for the years 1995-96, 2009-2010 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011.

Pahani for the year 1995-96 is showing as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
209	0.12	D.Anantha Reddy
209	0.11	D.2
210	0.19	D.Anantha Reddy
210	0.18	D.2
211	1.27	D.Anantha Reddy
211	1.28	D.2
213	0.09	D.Anantha Reddy
213	0.09	D.2
214	0.39	D.Anantha Reddy
214	0.38	D.2

Pahani for the year 2009-10 is shown as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
209	0.12	D.1
209	0.11	D.2
210	0.19	D.1
210	0.18	D.2
211	0.22	D.2
211	0.22	D.3
211	0.23	D.4
211	1.28	D.2
213	0.03	D.2
213	0.03	D.3
213	0.03	D.4
213	0.09	D.2
214	0.13	D.2
214	0.13	D.3
214	0.12	D.4
214	0.39	D.2

24.Ex.A4 is True copy of pahani for the year 2007-2008 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011, and it shows as under :

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar	Possessor
209	0.12	D.Anantha Reddy	D.1 D.2 D.3 D.4
210	0.19	-do-	-do-
211	1.27	-do-	-do-
213	0.09	-do-	-do-
214	0.38	-do-	-do-

25.Ex.A5 is (6) copies of pahanies for the year 1955-56, 1964-65, 1974-75, 1985-86 and 1996-97 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.11.04.2011.

The Chesal pahani for the years 1955-56, 1956-57, 1957-58 is shows as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar
778	16.24	Donuri Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah
851	19.01	Donuri Masaiah S/o.Lachaiah

Further, pahani for the year 1964-65 is shows as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
778	16.24	D.Anantha Reddy and D.Ramakrishna Reddy
851	19.01	-do-

Further, pahani for the year 1974-75 is shows as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
778	16.24	D.Anantha Reddy and D.Ramakrishna Reddy
851	19.01	-do-

Further, pahani for the year 1985-86 is shows as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
778	16.24	D.Anantha Reddy and D.Ramakrishna Reddy
851	19.01	-do-

Further, pahani for the year 1996-97 is shows as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
778	8.12	D.Anantha Reddy S/o.Masaiah
851	9.21	D.Anantha Reddy S/o.Masaiah

26.Ex.A6 is (2) copies of pahanies for the year 2008-09 and 2009-2010 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur Dt.1.04.2011 and VRO Sarvail.

The Pahani for the year 2008-09 is shows as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
778	8.12	D.Anantha Reddy S/o.Masaiah
851	9.21	D.Anantha Reddy S/o.Masaiah

The Pahani for the year 2009-10 is shows as under:

Sy. No.	Extent Ac. Gts	Pattedar and Possessor
778	2.31	D.2
778	2.31	D.3
778	2.30	D.4
851	3.07	D.2
851	3.07	D.3
851	3.07	D.4

27.Ex.A7 is Copy of amendment register given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011.

28. Further evidence of P.W.1 is corroborated by P.Ws.2 and 3 and that they also deposed in the same lines of P.W.1.

29.Further, on behalf of defendants, D.2 himself was examined as D.W.1 and his evidence in brief is that his father byname Anantha Reddy

acquired the agricultural lands from his father and said agriculture lands not partitioned in between his brother Donuri Ramakrishna Reddy and his father and as such said Donuri Ramakrishna Reddy is also necessary party to the suit.

30. Further D.W.1 deposed that he used to look after their family and he performed the marriage of plaintiff by spending Rs.5,00,000/- and marriages of D.3 and D.4 by spending huge amounts out of his income and he also used to send the amounts to plaintiff and that he also repaid the loan amount of Rs.30,000/- of plaintiff and therefore considering said amounts, the plaintiff orally relinquished her share in the joint family properties in favour of defendants and therefore prayed to dismiss the suit.

31. During cross examination, D.W.1 admitted that said Maisaiah, Laxminarsaiah and Agaiah partitioned their ancestors properties and in said partition said Maisaiah got Ac.42.35 gts of land in Survail Village and Kothagudem Village of Narayanapur Mandal. It was suggested to D.W.1 that prior to marriage with his mother his father had marriage with one Jagannadamma and they blessed with one daughter by name Vijaya i.e D.5 herein and that after death of said Jagannadamma his father married D.1. Above suggestion admitted by D.W.1 that D.5 is the daughter of said Anantha Reddy and his 1st wife Jagannadamma.

32. The D.W.1 further admitted during cross examination that brother of his father by name D.Ramakrishna Reddy got Ac.21.18 gts of land towards his share in said partition between him and his father and that out of said Ac.21.18 gts of land of said Ramakrishna Reddy, D.2/D.W.1 purchased Ac.3.00 gts and odd of land at Kothagudem Village.

33. The D.W.1 further admitted during cross examination that his father died on 19.09.2003 and as on the date of death of his father, the suit schedule properties are in name of his father in revenue records as pattedar and possessor and that during life time of his father, the marriage of his sister was performed.

34. The D.W.1 further admitted during cross examination that he used to pay chit amounts through the account of husband of plaintiff and the husband of plaintiff used to pay his chit amounts out of amount sent by him. Further, D.W.2 and D.W.3 are also deposed in the same lines of D.W.1.

35. In support of contention of D.W.1, he exhibited Ex.B1 to Ex.B13.

36. Ex.B1 to Ex.B3 are the original receipts issued by P.A.C.S Narayanapur, showing that certain amounts paid in the name of D.Anantha Reddy to PACS, Narayanapur.

37. Ex.B4 is the Original Cash deposit counter slip, dt.13.06.2005, showing that an amount of Rs.11,440/- paid in the name of D.Anantha Reddy. Ex.B5 to Ex.B7 are the Original Cash Pay-in-Slips, showing that certain amounts paid in the name of K.Narsimha Reddy. Ex.B8 to Ex.B13 are the letters alleged to send to D.2 asking him to pay money.

38. After considering the above evidence on record, the following facts are not in dispute:

1. The father of plaintiff got suit schedule property towards his share in partition between his brother Ramakrishna Reddy and himself and that originally the suit schedule property is belongs to one Maisaiah who is grandfather of plaintiff and D.2 to D.4.

2. Further, it is admitted fact that D.5 is daughter of said Anantha Reddy and his 1st wife Jagannadamma.

3. It is further admitted fact that said Anantha Reddy died intestate leaving behind plaintiff and defendants as legal heirs.

4. Further, it is admitted fact that after death of said Anantha Reddy the names of D.2 to D.4 were mutated in revenue records in respect of suit schedule property.

39. The above documents on record and evidence of P.W.1 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A7 proving that the suit schedule property was acquired by father of plaintiff and D.2 to D.5 towards his share and he died intestate.

40. The learned counsel for plaintiff argued that since the said Anantha Reddy died intestate, the plaintiff being Class-I legal heir is entitled to a share in the suit schedule property and that mere mutation of names of D.2 to D.4 in revenue records will not affect the right of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property.

41. On the other hand, the counsel for defendants vehemently argued that the D.2 paid huge amounts for the marriage of plaintiff and that he also used to send money to the plaintiff and that he used to manage the family and that D.2 cleared off the debts of family, as such the plaintiff relinquished her right over the suit schedule property orally.

42. The learned counsel for plaintiff argued that there is no such relinquishment and that any oral relinquishment is not valid without any proper registered document.

43. After considering the material on record and after considering the submissions of both side counsels, this Court perused the entire material

on record. It is settled principle of law that Law does not permit the oral relinquishment of share in the property. Further, mere payment of amounts at the time of marriage or any amounts sent to the plaintiff itself is not ground to discard the legitimate share of plaintiff, unless there is a registered document relinquishing the share of plaintiff.

44. Further, as per Sec.8 of Hindu Succession Act, after death of Hindu male, all his Class-I legal heirs are entitled to succeed his property and merely because some amounts were paid, it will not affect the legitimate right of share of plaintiff.

45. Therefore, after considering the entire evidence of P.Ws.1 to 3, Ex.A1 to Ex.A7, D.W.1 to D.W.3 and Ex.B1 to Ex.B13, this Court holds that plaintiff is able to prove her claim that she is entitled her share in the suit schedule property.

46. The learned counsel for plaintiff argued that at the time of marriage of D.5, the said Anantha Reddy had given dowry as such D.5 is not entitled to any share. But there is no force in such contention.

47. As already discussed mere payment of any money at the time of marriage by way of gifts or by giving any money to the daughter itself is not a ground to discard her share in the property unless, there is any registered document relinquishing her share. Soon after the death of said Anantha Reddy, Class-I legal heirs will get share in the property and that her share cannot be denied on any ground.

48. Therefore, in view of the above discussion and for the reasons stated above and after considering entire evidence on record, it can be safely held that the suit schedule property is liable to be partitioned among plaintiff and Defendants No.1 to 5 equally and that plaintiff, D.1 to

D.5 are entitled for 1/6th share each in the suit schedule property. As D.1 died, the share of D.1 has to be devolved on D.2 to D.4 equally unless there is testamentary disposition or prior alienation of her undivided share. Issue No.1 is answered accordingly.

49. Issue No.2: To what relief?

In view of finding on Issue No.1, the suit of plaintiff is to be decreed in part with costs. Issue No.2 is answered accordingly.

In the result, suit of the plaintiff is preliminarily decreed in part with costs and that suit schedule property shall be divided into six equal shares; and plaintiff, Defendant No.1 to Defendant No.5 shall be allotted 1/6th share each with separate possession in suit schedule property. As D.1 died, 1/6th share of D.1 shall be allotted to D.2 to D.4 equally unless there is any testamentary disposition or prior alienation by D.1.

Typed to my dictation by Steno Gr-II, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 02nd day of November, 2021.

Sd/-

SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE
NALGONDA

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF:

P.W.1/11-08-2017: K.Vasantha
P.W.2/24-01-2019: D.Kamamma
P.W.3/01-08-2019: R.Buchaiah @ Pedda Buchaiah

WITNESSES EXAMINED ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS No.1 to 4:

D.W.1/13-11-2019: D.Satyanarayana
D.W.2/02-12-2019: D.Ram Reddy
D.W.3/17-12-2019: G.Mallesh

EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF :

Ex.A1: (5) True copies of Chessal pahanies given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011.

Ex.A2: (6) copies of Pahanies for the years 1961-62, 1965-66 and 1986-87 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011.

Ex.A3: (2) copies pahanies for the year 1995-96, 2009-2010 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011.

Ex.A4: True copy of pahani for the year 2007-2008 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011.

Ex.A5: (6) copies of pahanies for the year 1955-56, 1964-65, 1974-75, 1985-86 and 1996-97 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.11.04.2011.

Ex.A6: (2) copies of pahanies for the year 2008-09 and 2009-2010 given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur Dt.1.04.2011 and VRO Sarvail.

Ex.A7: Copy of amendment register given by Deputy Tahsildar, Narayanapur dt.23.04.2011.

EXHIBITS MARKED ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS No.1 to 4:

Ex.B1: Original Receipt issued by P.A.C.S Narayanapur, dt.30.05.2006.

Ex.B2: Original Receipt issued by P.A.C.S Narayanapur, dt.30.05.2006.

Ex.B3: Original Receipt issued by P.A.C.S Narayanapur, dt.20.03.2004.

Ex.B4: Original Cash deposit counter slip, dt.13.06.2005.

Ex.B5: Original Cash Pay-in-Slip, dt.24.11.2003.

Ex.B6: Original Cash Pay-in-Slip, dt.27.01.2004.

Ex.B7: Original Cash Pay-in-Slip, dt.01.10.2004, 16.03.2004, 13.04.2004, 19.05.2004.

Ex.B8: Original inland letter card, dt.04.06.1995.

Ex.B9: Original inland letter card, dt.14.11.1994.

Ex.B10: Original inland letter card, dt.15.03.1995.

Ex.B11: Original inland letter card, dt.27.08.1995.

Ex.B12: Original inland letter card, dt.17.11.1994.

Ex.B13: Original inland letter card, dt.22.12.1994.

Sd/-
SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE
NALGONDA