



IN THE COURT OF PRL CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC.,
SAKALESH PURA

:Present:

SRI LAKSHMI NARASIMHA R.V., B.A.L., L.L.B.,

Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC., Sakaleshpura.

Dated this the 06th day of August, 2026

O.S. No.188/2015

Plaintiff

:

Sri. N. Srinivas

S/o Late Nanjundashetty,

Aged about 61 years,

R/at Mallikarjuna Nagara Badavane,

3rd Cross, Sakaleshpura Town,

Sakaleshpura Taluk.

[Rep. by Sri. S.G., Advocate]

V/s-

Defendants

:

1. Sri. Nanda

S/o Venkataramanagowda,

Aged about 48 years,

R/at Halasulige village,

Kasaba Hobli,

Sakaleshpura Taluk.

2. Sri. Mangal Kumar

S/o Amruth Lal,

Aged about 29 years,

R/at B.M. Road,

Sakaleshpura Town,

[Rep. by Sri. R.N.K., Advocate]



Date of Institution of Suit	16.12.2015
Nature of the Suit	Permanent injunction
Date of Commencement of Evidence	06.07.2018
Date of pronouncement of Judgment	06.08.2026
Total Duration	Years Months Days
	10 07 21

J U D G M E N T

The plaintiff has filed the present suit for the relief of permanent injunction, restraining the defendants, their agents, servants or anybody claiming through them from interfering with the possession and enjoyment and destroying the boundary stone towards eastern side of the suit schedule property.

2. Description of the suit schedule property:

The property bearing Khata No.6220/01, measuring 1) 174+173X48+47 Mtr, 2) 22.00X33.00+13.00+16.00X33.04+41 Mtr 3) 35X15 Mtr, situated at B.M. Road, Sakaleshpura Town, carved out of Sy No.286, measuring 2 Acres 17 guntas of Malali village, Kasaba Hobli, Sakaleshpura Taluk and bounded on :-



East by : Site in Sy No.301
West by : Sy No. 287 (Property of Harish and Suresh)
North by : Property bearing Sy No.292, 293, 294 belonging to plaintiff (property of son of plaintiff S.S. Pradeep)
South by : B.M. Road

3. The brief facts of the plaintiff case are as under:

The suit schedule property was originally belonging to one S.J.Manjegowda and his siblings. One S.S.Pradeep purchased the suit schedule property through a registered Sale deed dated 23.10.1998 from the said S.J. Manjegowda and his family members. Thus, he became absolute owner in possession of the suit schedule property. Thereafter, he got converted the suit schedule property for commercial purpose in the year 2009. The said S.S. Pradeep executed a registered Gift deed dated 10.07.2012 in favour of his father i.e., the plaintiff. Thus, the plaintiff became absolute owner in possession of the suit schedule property. Thereafter, initially he filed requisition



before the competent authority for conversion of the suit schedule property for residential purpose and during the pendency of proceedings, on 04.09.2012 he again got converted the same for commercial purpose. Thus, the suit schedule property is situated within the limits of the Town Municipality, Sakaleshpura. The plaintiff has constructed a conventional hall and commercial complex towards eastern side of the conventional hall by obtaining license from the Town Municipality. He has also constructed a shed after the commercial complex. Thus, the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property.

4. The plaintiff has further contended that, the defendants having no any right, title or interest over the suit schedule property, have tried to encroach towards eastern side the suit schedule property and tried to destroy the boundary stone. They have also tried to interfere with the possession and causing obstructions to the construction work. In spite of request not to cause obstructions, went in vain. Hence the



plaintiff constrained to file the present suit for the relief of permanent injunction.

5. Upon the service of summons, the defendants have appeared before the court through their counsel and filed written statement. It is the contention of defendant No.1 that the plaintiff has not produced any approved plan issued by the Town Planning Authority. The plaintiff is the owner only to an extent of the property reserved for commercial purpose and not to the entire extent. As per the conversion order, the property to an extent of 7456 Sq. Mtr is the area for commercial purpose. The property to an extent of 1150 Sq. Mtr is reserved for park, the property to an extent of 652 Sq. Mtr. is reserved for the road and the property to an extent of 525 Sq. Mtr is reserved for the vehicle parking. Hence, the plaintiff is not the owner of said park, road and parking area. The plaintiff has not stated anything as to which side he has left the vacant area for the said purposes. Whereas, the plaintiff has mentioned 3 measurements under the same khata number



without specifying the proper boundaries and approved plan.

6. Defendant No.1 has further contended that the plaintiff is constructing the convention hall in violation of the license issued by the Town Municipality. The son of plaintiff Sri.Pradeep got converted the property for commercial purpose in the year 2010 and inspite of the same, he has obtained license from Malali Village Panchayath on 17.05.2012 to construct the house by mentioning Sy No.286, by suppressing the factum of conversion. As such, the plaintiff has no any right to obtain license from the Village Panchayath as the property got converted for commercial purpose and situated within the limits of Town Municipality.

7. Defendant No.1 has further contented that the land bearing Sy No.286 of Malali village is situated towards Northern side of B.M. Road and it is situated at the Low-lying area deep about 20 feet from the road. The plaintiff and his children have filled soil for about 12 to 15 feet height and



covered the boundary stone with soil. Now, the suit schedule property is situated at the depth of 5 to 8 feet from B.M.Road. As such, the defendants have not destroyed any boundary stone towards eastern side of the suit schedule property as alleged by the plaintiff. The vacant site and shed of wife of defendant No.1 by name Smt.Krupa Nandan is situated towards eastern side of the suit schedule property and wired fence is also installed around the property of the defendant No.1. The plaintiff has shown wrong boundaries by stating that Sy No.301 is situated towards eastern side of the suit schedule property. The land bearing Sy No.301 is not in existence towards northern side of the suit schedule property. The plaintiff has given wrong boundaries only with intention to grab the property of defendant No.1. The plaintiff by colluding with the Municipality officials, got created the E khata by including the entire property inspite he is not the owner of entire extent. The plaintiff has not described the specific boundaries of park, road and vehicle parking and filed present suit only with intention to



grab the suit schedule property. Accordingly, prayed to dismiss the suit.

8. It is the contention of defendant No.2 that the plaintiff is constructing the convention hall in violation of the license issued by the Town Municipality. Hence, he is not the absolute owner of the suit schedule property. The mother of defendant No.2 by name Smt. Mohini Devi purchased the property bearing Khata No.679/A/615 (old khata No.3199P, 675/615P), measuring East-West 15.3 mtrs and North-South 30 mtrs totally measuring 459.0 Sq. Mtrs through a registered sale deed dated 17.10.2011. The said property is bounded on East by site No.2 of Suresh Alva and Raju H.N. and site No.3 belonging to Sadiq Suhil and M.Suhil Pasha, West by site No.1/P belonging to Krupa Nandan, North by property bearing Sy No.295 and South by B.M. Road. The property of Krupa Nandan is situated towards western side of the said purchased property and thereafter a convention hall is being constructed towards western side of site of Smt. Krupa Nandan.



9. He has further contended that the plaintiff has constructed the convention hall in violation the approved plan and he is trying to grab the property of wife of defendant No.1. The plaintiff has obtained license by stating that he is proposed to construct a AC Sheet shed, whereas he is constructing a convention hall. Now, he has filed the present suit with intention to grab the property of defendant No.1. The plaintiff has tried to interfere with the possession of property of mother of defendant No.2. As such, she has filed a suit vide O.S.No.5/2016 against the plaintiff and the same is pending for consideration. The mother of defendant No.2 is in possession of her purchased property by putting up the fence around. The plaintiff is trying to encroach the property of Smt.Krupa Nandan and the property of defendant No.2. The plaintiff has filed the suit only with intention to cause harassment to the defendants and grab their property. Accordingly, prayed to dismiss the suit.



10. Based on the pleadings, my predecessor in office has framed the following issues;

Issue No.1:- Whether the plaintiff proves that he is in lawful possession and enjoyment of suit schedule property ?

Issue No.2:- Whether the plaintiff proves the alleged interference by the defendants as stated in para 5 of the plaint ?

Issue No.3:- Whether plaintiff is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction as sought in the plaint ?

Issue No.4:- What order or decree?

11. In order to prove the contentions, the plaintiff got examined himself as PW.1 and got marked documents at Ex.P1 to 59. On the other hand, defendant No.1 got examined himself as DW-1 and got marked documents at Ex.D1 to 15. One witnesses by name Thajamul @ Syed Aliuddin got examined as DW.2. The Court Commissioner Sri. Harshith Kumar R. got examined as CW-1 and got marked the documents at Ex.C.1 to 6.



12. Heard arguments on behalf of both the parties. The learned counsel for the plaintiff and defendants have also filed written arguments. The learned counsel for defendants has relied upon the following decisions.

- a) AIR 2008 SC 2033
- b) Civil Appeal No.8241/2009 dated 09.10.2018 of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

13. My answer to the aforesaid issues is as under:-

Issue No.1: In the *Negative*.

Issue No.2: In the *Negative*.

Issue No.3: In the *Negative*.

Issue No.4: As per the final order for the following;

::REASONS::

14. **Issue No.1:-** The main contention of the plaintiff is that he is in possession of the suit schedule property by virtue of the registered Gift deed dated 10.07.2012. In order to substantiate his contentions, the plaintiff got examined himself as PW.1 by filing affidavit in lieu of examination in chief by reiterating the averments of the plaint got marked documents



at Ex.P.1 to 59. Ex.P.1 is the certified copy of the Tax Demand extract, Ex.P.2 is the Tax paid receipt, Ex.P.3 is the RTC Extract in respect of Sy No.286, Ex.P.4 is the certified copy of Mutation extract, Ex.P.5 and 6 are the Building Construction License, Ex.P.7 is the certified copy of the E-Khata, Ex.P.8 is the certified copy of approved sketch, Ex.P.9 is the certified copy of Conversion order passed by Deputy Commissioner, Hassan, Ex.P.10 is the certified copy of order of approval of Sketch issued by Town Planning Authority, Sakaleshpura, Ex.P.11 and 12 are the certified copy of the official memorandums issued by Deputy Commissioner, Hassan, Ex.P.13 is the certified copy of the sale deed dated 23.10.1998, Ex.P.14 is the certified copy of the Gift deed dated 10.07.2012, Ex.P.15 is the certified copy of the Tax Assessment extract, Ex.P.16 is the certified copy of the Commencement certificate, Ex.P.17 and 18 are the certified copy of tax paid receipts, Ex.P.19 is the Building Construction License, Ex.P.20 is the endorsement issued by Town Planning Authority, Ex.P.21 to 53 are the certified copy of Tax



Assessment extracts, Ex.P.54 is the certified copy of the village Map, Ex.P.55 is the endorsement issued by Town Planning Authority, Ex.P.56 is the certified copy of the letter dated 29.02.2016 issued to ADLR, Sakaleshpura, Ex.P.57 is the certified copy of the sketch, Ex.P.58 is the certified copy of the deposition in O.S.No.11/2016, Ex.P.59 the Acknowledgment issued by Sakaleshpura Town Police.

15. On perusal of the Sale deed at Ex.P.13, it appears that, one Pradeep S.S purchased the property bearing Sy No.286, measuring 2 acres 17 guntas of Malali village, Sakaleshpura and other properties from one S.J. Manjegowda and others. The said property is bounded on East by Sy No.301, West by Sy No.283, North by Sy No.292, 293, 294 and South by B.M. Road. It can be seen from Ex.P.9 to 12 that the said property was got converted for commercial purpose and measured as 9161.00 Sq.Mts. PW.1 has produced E-Khata at Ex.P.7 in respect of suit schedule property. On perusal of the same, it discloses that the suit schedule property is bounded on



East by Property No.26-4-125, West by Private property, North by Private property and South by B.M. Road. Whereas, inspite of conversion of Sy No.289 and it is coming within the limits of Town Municipality, the plaintiff has mentioned the boundaries of unconverted revenue land as per the sale deed. Hence, it appears that the boundaries mentioned in the plaint is not in consonance with the boundaries mentioned in the E-Khata.

16. It is pertinent to note here that on perusal of the certified copy of the Modified Conversion Order dated 01.10.2023 passed by Deputy Commissioner, Hassan, it discloses that the property to an extent of 7486 Sq. Mtr is the area for commercial purpose, the property to an extent of 1150 Sq. Mtr is reserved for park, the property to an extent of 652 Sq. Mtr. is reserved for the road and the property to an extent of 525 Sq. Mtr is reserved for the vehicle parking. PW.1 in his cross examination has deposed that “**2010** ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಅಲಿನೇಷನ್ ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಿಗದಿಪಡಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ನಿವೇಶನಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಿತ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹಸ್ತಾಂತರಿಸಿ ನೋಂದಣಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು



ಎಂದು ಷರತ್ತು ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ - - ಉದ್ಯಾನವನಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ರಸ್ತೆಗಾಗಿ, ವಾಹನ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಿಗದಿಪಡಿಸಿದ ಜಾಗವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರಿಗೆ ನೊಂದಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಉದ್ಯಾನವನಕ್ಕಾಗಿ, ರಸ್ತೆಗಾಗಿ, ವಾಹನ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಿಗದಿಪಡಿಸಿದ ಜಾಗ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಜಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯವರು ಹೋಗಿ ಬರಬಹುದು ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ.” He has further deposed that “ಕ್ರಮ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 2 ಮತ್ತು 3 ರಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿರುವ ಜಾಗ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕೆ ಮೀಸಲು ಇಟ್ಟ ಜಾಗ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನನಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ನಿಪಿ.7 ರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಪಿ.1 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಮ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 2 ಮತ್ತು 3 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲು ಇಟ್ಟ ಜಾಗದ ಅಳತೆ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣವನ್ನು ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. -- ಶೇಕಡಾ 45 ಭಾಗದಷ್ಟು ಜಾಗ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಮೀಸಲು ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಅದನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ ದಾವಾ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆಂದರೆ ಸರಿ”. Thus, he has categorically admitted that as per the condition of the conversion order, the plaintiff is required to hand over the property in favour of Town Municipality meant for public usage. Whereas, he has not handed over the same. Further he has categorically admitted that the area reserved for Park, Road and vehicle parking is in the possession of the Town Municipality.



17. PW.1 in his cross examination has categorically admitted the after conversion of the land, Sy No.286 ceases to exist. As per the documents produced by the plaintiff himself it is clear that, the suit schedule property is identified as Khata Number, but not survey number, Whereas, inspite of the same, the plaintiff has filed this suit on basis of Sy No.286 and given the then existed boundaries. From the supra deposition, it is clear that Park, Road and Vehicle parking area is in the possession of the Town Municipality. He has also deposed that he has no any exclusive right over the said area reserved for the usage of the public at large.

18. Further, on perusal of the certified copy of Tax Demand extract at Ex.P.1, it discloses that the separate measurements have been shown in respect of Commercial area, Park area and Vehicle parking area. PW.1 in his cross examination has categorically admitted that 45% of converted land is belonging to the government as per the condition of conversion order and the said area is in the possession of the



Town Municipality and he is not the absolute owner of the said area. Whereas, the E-Khata at Ex.P.7 has been issued in favour of the plaintiff including the said Park area, road property and Vehicle parking area, wherein the plaintiff has no any exclusive rights over the said properties. PW.1 in his cross examination has deposed that inspite of having the knowledge of the same, he has included the entire extent and filed the present suit.

19. Further, PW.1 in his cross examination has admitted that there is a fence in existence besides Adarsh Agency building. DW.1 has also produced the photographs of the said fence at Ex.D.9 and 10. Thus, it can be seen that the said fence separates the property. As such, it raises doubt as to existence of the suit schedule property within the boundaries of the plaint schedule. Hence, in the absence of the clarification and material evidence as to the specific boundaries of the suit schedule property, the contentions of the plaintiff cannot be considered. As such, this court is of the opinion that plaintiff has failed to prove to the satisfaction of the court that he is in lawful



possession the suit schedule property to the entire extent within the boundaries mentioned in the plaint. Accordingly, issue No.1 is answered in the *Negative*.

20. Issue No.2:- The plaintiff has contended that the defendants are trying to destroy the boundary stones towards eastern side and causing obstructions to the possession of the suit schedule property. On the other hand, the defendants have contended that the land bearing Sy No.286 of Malali village is situated at the Low-lying area, deep about 20 feet from the road. The plaintiff and his children have filled soil for about 12 to 15 feet height and covered the boundary stone with soil. Now, the suit schedule property is situated at the Low-lying area of 5 to 8 feet from B.M. Road.

21. During the pendency of the suit, the court commissioner was came to be appointed as both the parties disputed about the boundaries. CW.1 was appointed as court commissioner and he has submitted the report before the court.



On perusal of the Report at Ex.C.4 and 5, CW.1 has mentioned that, the plaintiff has filled the soil for about 12 feet and the boundary stones are covered under the soil. As such, the boundary stones are invisible and impossible to locate the same. PW.1 in his cross examination has also categorically deposed that he has filled the soil for about 5 feet as the property was in Low-lying area from the road. CW.1 in his cross examination has deposed that due to filling of the soil in Sy No.289, the boundary stones have been destroyed. He has also deposed that on 22.04.2025, he found the boundary stone. When the boundary stones have been covered with the soil and already building has been constructed, how they have been found has not been explained by CW.1. Further, when CW.1 had fixed the date of survey as 10.12.2025 and prior to it, the defendants have issued a letter requesting to conduct the survey on some other day, as they are unavailable on the said day, inspite of the same, CW.1 has proceeded to conduct survey and submitted the report. As stated supra, when the boundary stones have been



destroyed, what method has been adopted to find the boundary stones and conducted the survey has not been explained by the surveyor.

22. Further, CW.1 has mentioned in the Report that the plaintiff has left the area for Park, Road and Vehicle parking. Whereas, he has not mentioned as to the extent of the area left for the said purpose with specific boundaries. As such, this court is of the opinion that, the report submitted by the surveyor in so far as method of survey is not proper. Hence, this court declines to accept the Court Commissioner Report to that extent. From the admission of PW.1 and report of CW.1, it clearly discloses that the boundary stones have been covered under the soil at the time of filling the soil. As such, this court is of the opinion that the defendants have not destroyed any boundary stone towards eastern side of the suit schedule property as alleged by the plaintiff.



23. Further, it can be seen from documentary as well as oral evidence that there is a cloud as existence and exclusive ownership of the suit schedule property within the boundaries mentioned in the plaint. At the time of arguments, the learned counsel for the defendants has relied upon a decision reported in *(2008) 4 SCC 594, Anatula Sudhakar V/s P Buchi Reddy and others*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that ***“When a plaintiff is in lawful or peaceful possession of a property and such possession is disturbed or threatened by the defendant, a suit for injunction simpliciter will lie. A person has a right to protect his possession against any person who does not prove a better title by seeking a prohibitory injunction. But a person in wrongful possession is not entitled to an injunction against the rightful owner. Where the title of the plaintiff is not disputed, but he is not in possession his remedy is to file a suit for possession and seek in addition, if necessary an injunction. A person out of his possession cannot seek the***



relief of injunction simpliciter, without claiming the relief for possession. Where the plaintiff is in possession but his title to the property is dispute, or under a cloud, or where the defendant asserts title thereto and there is also thereat of dispossession from the defendant, the plaintiff will have to sue for declaration of title and consequential relief of injunction. Where the title of the plaintiffs is under cloud or in dispute and he is not in possession or not able to establish possession, necessarily the plaintiff will have to file a suit for declaration, possession and injunction. In the case on hand, the defendants have denied the very existence of the suit schedule property within the boundaries mentioned in the plaint. When, the plaintiff is not in lawful possession of the suit schedule property within the boundaries of the suit schedule property, mere suit for bare injunction does not suffice and the question of alleged interference by the defendants does not arise at all.



24. At the time of the arguments, the learned counsel for the plaintiff has relied upon the complaint lodged before jurisdictional police against the defendants to show the alleged interference by the defendants. Whereas, at the cost of repetition, it is stated that the plaintiff has initially failed to prove his lawful possession of the suit schedule property within the boundaries mentioned in the plaint. Hence, this court is of the opinion that the plaintiff has failed to prove the alleged interference by the defendants. Accordingly, Issue No.2 is answered in the ***Negative***.

25. **Issue No.3:-** As discussed supra for above issues, the plaintiff has failed to prove his lawful possession over the suit schedule property within the boundaries and also alleged interference by the defendants. It can be seen that the plaintiff has included the government property and filed the suit. PW.1 himself has admitted that he has no any exclusive rights in respect of 45% government property and the same has been handed over to Town Municipality. In view of the above facts



and discussions, this court is of the opinion that the plaintiff is not entitled to any reliefs as sought for. Accordingly, Issue No.3 is answered in the *Negative*.

26. Issue No.4 : In view of the findings on Issue No.1 to 3 and for the reasons stated above, this court proceeds to pass the following;

::ORDER::

The suit of the plaintiff is hereby
dismissed with costs.

Draw decree accordingly.

[Dictated to the stenographer directly on computer and then corrected by me and thereafter pronounced in the open court on this the 6th day of August, 2026]

[Lakshmi Narasimha R.V.]
Prl. Civil Judge and JMFC,
Sakaleshpura.

::ANNEXURE::

List of witnesses examined for the plaintiff:

PW.1 : Sri. Srinivasa

List of documents exhibited for the plaintiff:

Ex.P.1 : Certified copy of the Tax Demand extract



- Ex.P.2 : Tax paid receipt
- Ex.P.3 : RTC Extract in respect of Sy No.286
- Ex.P.4 : Certified copy of Mutation extract
- Ex.P.5 and 6 : Building Construction License
- Ex.P.7 : Certified copy of the E-Khata
- Ex.P.8 : Certified copy of approved sketch
- Ex.P.9 : Certified copy of Conversion order passed
by Deputy Commissioner, Hassan
- Ex.P.10 : Certified copy of order of approval of
Sketch issued by Town Planning
Authority, Sakaleshpura
- Ex.P.11 and 12 : Certified copy of the official
memorandums issued by Deputy
Commissioner, Hassan
- Ex.P.13 : Certified copy of the sale deed dated
23.10.1998
- Ex.P.14 : Certified copy of the Gift deed dated
10.07.2012
- Ex.P.15 : Certified copy of the Tax Assessment
extract
- Ex.P.16 : Certified copy of the Commencement
certificate
- Ex.P.17 and 18 : Certified copy of tax paid receipts
- Ex.P.19 : Building Construction License



- Ex.P.20 : Endorsement issued by Town Planning Authority
- Ex.P.21 to 53 : Certified copy of Tax Assessment extracts
- Ex.P.54 : Certified copy of the village Map
- Ex.P.55 : Endorsement issued by Town Planning Authority
- Ex.P.56 : Certified copy of the letter dated 29.02.2016 issued to ADLR, Sakaleshpura
- Ex.P.57 : Certified copy of the sketch
- Ex.P.58 : Certified copy of the deposition in O.S.No.11/2016
- Ex.P.59 : Acknowledgment issued by Sakaleshpura Town Police

List of witnesses examined by the Defendants:

- DW.1 : Sri. M.V. Nandan
- DW.2 : Sri. Thajamul @ Syed Aliuddin

List of documents exhibited by the Defendants:

- Ex.D.1 : Caveat petition
- Ex.D.2 : Certified copy of the order sheet in OS No.11/2016
- Ex.D.3 : Certified copy of the plaint in OS No.11/2016
- Ex.D.4 : Certified copy of the General Power of Attorney



- Ex.D.5 : Certified copy of the Tax paid receipt
- Ex.D.6 : Certified copy of Tax Demand Extract
- Ex.D.7 : Certified copy of the sale deed dated 04.05.2011
- Ex.D.8 to 12 : Photographs
- Ex.D.13 : CD
- Ex.D.14 : Vijayavani Daily News Paper dated 14.02.2022
- Ex.D.15 : Letter dated 03.12.2025 issued to ADLR

List of witnesses examined by the Court Commissioner :

- CW.1 : Sri. Harshith Kumar.R

List of documents exhibited by the Court Commissioner :

- Ex.C.1 : Notice
- Ex.C.2 : Mahazar
- Ex.C.3 & 4 : Commissioner Report
- Ex.C.5 : Certified copy of the Sketch
- Ex.C.5 : Certified copy of the Tax paid receipt
- Ex.C.6 : Memo dated 26.03.2025 filed before the Court.

[Lakshmi Narasimha R.V.]
Prl. Civil Judge and JMFC,
Sakaleshpura.