

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, HUBBALLI**

**O.S.No.343/2025**

Plaintiff : Smt. Snehalata W/o. Ambasa Baddi.

**Versus**

Defendants : Smt. Sulochana Ramakrishna Magajikondi  
and others.

**ISSUES**

1. Whether plaintiff proves that the plaintiff and defendants are joint family members and suit property is joint family property and she is entitle for 1/7th share in the suit schedule properties?
2. Whether plaintiff proves that the partition deed dated 02.08.1992 with respect to suit properties between the family members of the plaintiffs is illegal and not binding on the share of plaintiff?
3. Whether plaintiff proves that the sale deeds dated 15.07.1995 executed by defendants No.1, 2, 3 and 6 in favour of defendant No.7 and 8 with respect to suit schedule property at serial No.1 is illegal and not binding on the share of plaintiff?
4. Whether the plaintiff proves that the sale deeds dated 29.09.2003 executed by defendants No.1 to 3, 5 and 6 in favour of defendants No.9 to 15 are illegal and not binding on the share of plaintiff?
5. Whether the plaintiff proves that the partition deed dated 17.03.2022 between defendants No.2 and 3 with respect

- to suit schedule property at serial No.5 is illegal and not binding on the share of plaintiff?
6. Whether the plaintiff is entitle for the reliefs sought for?
  7. Whether the defendants No.1, 5 and 6 proves that they are entitle for 1/5th share in the suit properties as claimed in the counter claim?
  8. Whether the defendants No.1, 5 and 6 proves that the sale deed dated 15.07.1995 is not binding on the share of defendant No.5?
  9. Whether the defendants No.1, 5 and 6 proves that the sale deeds dated 27.09.2003, 27.12.2001 and 11.02.2022 are illegal and not binding on these defendants?
  10. Whether the defendants No.1, 5 and 6 proves that the partition deed dated 17.03.2022 with respect to suit schedule property at serial No.5 is not binding on the 1/5th share of these defendants?
  11. Whether the defendants No.1, 5 and 6 proves that they are entitle for the relief sought in the counter claim?
  12. Whether the defendants No.2 and 3 proves that they have sold item No.4 to 7 fallen to their share for the legal necessity and welfare of the family?
  13. Whether the defendants No.9 to 11, 14 and 15 proves that they are bonafide purchasers for valuable consideration?
  14. What order or decree?

Place: Hubballi  
Dt: 03-07-2026

(Yamanappa Karehanumantappa)  
Prl. Senior Civil Judge, Hubballi.