

IN THE COURT OF SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AT MADIKERI

: O.S.No. 25/2019 :


Plaintiff :- Smt.Bhavaniamma and others
-v/s-

Defendant :- Sri.A.T.Ponnappa and others

:: ISSUES ::

1. Whether the plaintiffs prove that the suit properties are joint family properties of them and defendants No.1 to 10 ?
2. Whether the defendant No.15 proves that the defendants No.11 to 29 also having right over the suit properties ?
3. Whether the defendant No.15 further prove that there was earlier partition between the members of Aiyettira Family?
4. Whether the defendant No.15 further proves that the plaintiff No.1 husband sold his share and purchased the properties at Masagodu village and without including this property suit is bad for partial partition?
5. Whether the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties?
6. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for partition?
6. What Order or Decree?

(Issues framed and pronounced in open court on 17th November 2020)


(Vijay Kumar)
Senior Civil Judge,
Madikeri.

:Additional Issues:

1. Whether the defendants no.1 and 2 prove that they are entitle for 1/4th share?
2. Whether the defendants no.1 to 3 prove that they are entitle for 1/4th share jointly?


Dated 09th November 2021.



(Roopa K.)
Senior Civil Judge,
Madikeri.

Additional issues framed on 27.01.2023

3. Whether the defendant No. 12 proves that Item No. 1 to 3, 6 and 10 of the suit schedule property among other properties were allotted to the share of Aiyettira Somappa by virtue of oral partition entered in the Aiyettira family prior to 1979 as averred in the written statement?
4. the Defendant No. 12 further proves that by virtue of oral partition among A. Somappa and his children, 2.50 acres of land out of Item No. 1 to 3 of the suit schedule property along with Item No. 6 to 10 of the suit schedule property was allotted to the share of Defendant No.11 as avail in the written statement?



Senior Civil Judge & CJM,
Kodagu-Madikeri.

Additional Issues framed on 21.10.2024

1. Whether the defendant No.29 proves that, he is is the bonafide purchaser of item No.9 as averred in para 3 of the written statement?
2. Whether the defendants No.29 further proves that, the suit is bad for non-inclusion of all the joint family properties, as averred in para-4 of the written statement?


(N.B. Jayalakshmi)
Senior Civil Judge and CJM, 21/10/2024
Kodagu-Madikeri.