

C.R.P.27

Govt. of Karnataka

Form No.9 (Civil) Title Sheet for Judgement in Suits (R.P.91)
--

TITLE SHEET FOR JUDGMENTS IN SUITS
IN THE COURT OF SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC.,
AT CHINTAMANI

OS NO.85/2008 CLUBBED WITH OS NO.80/2002

Dated this the 2nd day of November 2019

:: PRESENT ::

Sri.K.M.Rajendra Kumar, *L.L.M, M.Phil*
Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Chintamani.

O.S. NO. 80/2002

Plaintiff/s:

1. M.S.Shivanna,
aged about 25 years,
2. M.S.Byrareddy,
aged about 23 years,
both are Hindu majors
and sons of N.Sriramareddy
R/at.Marinayakanahalli,
Murugamalla hobli,
Chintamani taluk.

(Sri.B.R.S. Advocate for plaintiffs)

- V/s -

Defendant/s:

1. N.Sreeramareddy,
aged about 52 years,
Since dead represented by his legal heirs
- 1a) Smt.Saraswathamma,
W/o.N.Srirama Reddy,
aged about 60 years,
- 1b) S.Shobha
D/o.N.Srirama Reddy,
W/o.Rangareddy,
- 1c) Prameela.S
D/o.N.Srirama Reddy,
W/o.Ashwathanarayana
The above legal heirs 1a to 1c are
R/at.Marinayakanahalli village,
Murugamalla hobli,
Chintamani taluk.
2. M.N.Lakshmanareddy,
aged about 46 years,
drill teacher, Govt High school,
Chintamani.
Since dead represented by his legal heirs
- 2a) Smt.Vanajamma,
W/o.M.N.Lakshmana Reddy,
aged about 42 years,

2b) Supriya,
D/o.M.N.Lakshmana Reddy
aged about 21 years,

2c) Sushma,
D/o.M.N.Lakshmana Reddy,
aged about 19 years,

The defendant no.2a to 2c are
R/at.Marinayakanahalli village,
Murugamalla hobli,
Chintamani taluk.

3. Appireddy,
aged about 42 years,
Since dead represented by his legal heirs

3a) Smt.Suchitra
W/o.Appireddy,
aged about 38 years,

3b) Charan,
S/o.Appireddy,
aged about 17 years,
Since minor represented by his mother defendant no.3a

3c) Bharath,
S/o.Appi Reddy,
aged about 13 years,
Since minor represented by his mother defendant no.3a

The above legal heirs are
R/at.Marinayakanahalli village,

Murugamalla hobli,
Chintamani taluk.

Presently R/at.Opposite to Ex MLA
Late Krishnareddy house, Tank
bund road, Chintamani town-563125.

4. M.N.Aswathareddy,
aged abpit 38 years,
5. Krishnareddy,
aged about 50 years,
**Since dead represented by his
legal heirs**
- 5a. Nagarathnamma,
W/o.Late Krishnareddy,
aged about 56 years.
- 5b. Ashwathanarayanareddy,
S/o.Late Krishnareddy,
aged about 28 years,
- 5c. Smt.Bharathi,
D/o.Late Krishnareddy,
aged about 32 years,
- 5d. Smt.Ambika,
D/o.Late Krishnareddy,
aged about 30 years,
The defendants no.5a to 5d
are R/at.Marinayakanahalli village,
Nandhiganahahalli hobli,
Chintamani taluk.

6. Narayanaswamy,
aged 44 years,
defendant no.1 to 6 are sons
of Late Nareppa,
Defendant no.1, 3 to 6 are
R/at.Marinayakanahalli village,
Murugamalla hobli,
Chintamani taluk.
7. Lakshmiddevamma,
W/o.Shivanna,
aged about 46 years,
R/at.Anoor village,
Kasaba Hobli,
Sidlaghatta taluk.
8. Nagarathnamma,
W/o.Venkatashamireddy,
aged about 42 years,
R/at.Oolavadi village and post,
Kasaba Hobli,
Chintamani taluk.
9. M.N.Venkateshreddy,
S/o.Late Chikkanallappa,
aged about 60 years,
R/at.Marinayakanahalli
Nandhiganahalli post,
Chintamani taluk.
10. Ananda,
S/o.Nareppa,
aged about 45 years,
R/at.Marinayakanahalli village,
Nandhiganahalli hobli,
Chintamani taluk.

**(Sri.G.B.V Advocate for D1. D5(a to c)),
(Sri.SHR Advocate for D1(a to c)
(Sri.K.R.S.H Advocate for D2 to 6)
(Sri.SRB/PSB Advocate for D7)
(Sri.RN Advocate for D8 & 10)
(Sri.DNK Advocate for D9)
(D2(a to c) & D3(a to c) Exparte)**

Date of institution of the suit : **13.09.2002**

Nature of the suit : **Partition & Separate Possession**

Date of Commencement of
Recording of evidence : **14.06.2011**

Date on which the judgment
was pronounced : **02.11.2019**

	Year/s	Month/s	Day/s
Total Duration	17	01	19

**(RAJENDRA KUMAR K.M)
Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Chintamani.**

O.S. NO. 85/2008

Plaintiff/s:

S.Shobha,
aged about 29 years,
D/o.N.Sriramareddy,
W/o.Ranga Reddy,

R/at.Gandraganahalli
Murugamalla hobli,
Chintamani taluk.

(Sri.S.R. Advocate for plaintiff)

- V/s -

Defendant/s:

1. Smt.Venkatamma,
W/o.Late Nareppa
aged about 75 years,
R/at.Marinayakanahalli
Murugamalla hoibli,
Chintamani taluk.
2. N.Srirama Reddy,
aged about 58 years,
3. N.Krishna Reddy,
aged abpit 55 years,
4. M.N.Lakshamana Reddy,
aged about 53 years,
5. Narayanaswamy,
aged about 50 years,
6. Appireddy,
aged abaout 48 years,
7. Lakshmiddevamma
aged about 47 years,
8. Ashwatha Reddy,
aged about 46 years,

9. Nagarathnamma,
aged about 45 years,
Defendant no.2 to 8 are children
of the Late Nareppa,
R/at.Marinayakanahalli
Murugamalla hoibli,
Chintamani taluk.

10. M.S.Shivanna,
aged about 32 years,

11. M.S.Byre Reddy,
aged about 30 years,

The defendant no.10 and 11 are
the sons of N.Srirama Reddy,
Marinayakanahalli village,
Murugamalla hobli,
Chintamani taluk.

12. S.Prameela,
aged about 27 years,
D/o.N.Srirama Reddy,
W/o.Ashwatha Narayana Babu
Oolavadi, Kasaba Hobli,
Chintamani taluk.

13. M.Venkata Reddy,
aged about 45 years,
S/o.Muniyappa,
Maniganahalli
Ronur hobli,
Srinivasapura taluk.

(Sri.P.S.B. Advocate for D7)

(Sri.KP Advocate for D1, 3 to 6, 8 and 9)

(D2, 10 to 12 Exparte)

Date of institution of the suit : **24.10.2008**

Nature of the suit : **Partition & Separate Possession**

Date of Commencement of
Recording of evidence : **14.06.2011**

Date on which the judgment
was pronounced : **02.11.2019**

	Year/s	Month/s	Day/s
Total Duration	11	00	08

(RAJENDRA KUMAR K.M)
Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Chintamani.

JUDGMENT IN OS NO.80/2002

This is a suit filed by plaintiffs against the defendants seeking for the relief of partition and to allot 1/12th share each of the plaintiffs and put them in possession of their separate share in all suit schedule properties by metes and bounds and to grant such other reliefs as this court deems fit under the circumstances of the case with costs of this suit.

JUDGMENT IN OS NO.85/2008

2. This is a suit filed by plaintiff against the defendants seeking for the relief of partition and to allot 1/4th share out of 1/6th share and put her in separate possession and declare that the alleged release deed dated 11.02.1977 document no.2491/76-77 executed in favour of defendant no.3 and subsequent sale deed dated 21.07.2008 bearing document no.1191/08-09 executed in favour of defendant no.13 is not binding on the plaintiff.

3. Further, to order for enquiry into mesne profits against the defendant no.1 to 6 and 8 in respect of schedule properties from the date of suit till its realisation of their separate share under Order 20 rule 12 of CPC and to pass such other orders as this court deems fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

Brief facts of the plaintiff's case in OS 80/2002 are as follows:

4. That the defendants are the children of one Nareppa. The defendant no.2 to 4 and the plaintiffs

constitute a joint Hindu family and they are in joint possession and enjoyment of all the suit schedule properties as coparceners. The plaintiffs are the children of first defendant. The suit item no.1 to 5 are the ancestral properties and remaining properties are acquired out of joint family nucleus. The joint family was getting sufficient income from nucleus of the ancestral properties and out of the said income, items 6 to 10 have been purchased in the name of defendants father Nareppa. Likewise the suit item no.11 to 13 were acquired in the name of 3rd defendant Appireddy out of joint family yielding nucleus i.e produce from mango gardens and other agricultural produce. There was yielding nucleus to the joint family from 30 acres of Mango garden and all other properties were acquired out of the said nucleus along with tractor i.e suit item no.14.

5. That, the plaintiffs father Sreeramareddy, the first defendant has put forth his effort and labour raised loans from PLD Bank, Chintamani and other financial institutions along with his father. In the year 1976 some of the properties were acquired out of joint

family funds in the name of defendants father Nareppa and first defendant was virutally the manager of the joint family who put forth his efforts to cultivate the lands and to acquire properties out of the sufficient yielding nucleus. That the plaintiffs father has been very much concerned towards his brothers and not insisting for equitable partition of joint family properties though the plaintiffs and their father jointly entitled to $\frac{1}{4}$ share in all the suit schedule properties.

6. That, the 6th defendant Narayanaswamy got himself released from the joint family under registered release deed dated 23.09.1988 and he was allotted valuable properties namely Sy.No.81/1 measuring 1-16 guntas out of 2-31guntas which consists of sumersible pumpset and Sy.No.77 measuring 1-38 guntas consisting of well and coconut garden with site of Marinayakanahalli village and the properties given to him are not included in this suit. Likewise the 5th defendant Krishnareddy also got himself released from joint family under registered release deed dated 11.02.1977 taking to his share Sy.No.16/2 measuring 1-15guntas, 16/3 measuring 0-22 guntas, 16/4

measuring 0-24 guntas and Sy.No.18/1 measuring 0-13 guntas, Sy.No.44/3 measuring 1-07 guntas, Sy.No.18/3 measuring 0-12 guntas and also a house situated at Marinayakanahalli, as such the above properties are not included in this suit. Sy.No.44/1 of Chikkakarakamakalahalli was purchased in the name of 5th defendant out of joint family funds and the same was relinquished in his favour as said above.

7. It is further case of the plaintiffs that for the last 2-3 years, the defendant no.2 to 4 have been trying to secret the joint family earnings and making wrongful gains out of it. The defendants further proclaiming that the first defendant has relinquished his right in the joint family properties in the year 1971 by taking Rs.500/-. That the first defendant was entitled to 1/6th share to the extent of more than 15 acres in the year 1971 itself and right of his share was not less than Rs.2 lakhs as such he is not competent to batter the interest of plaintiffs in the joint family properties by taking Rs.500/-. However even after the alleged release deed in the year 1971, the first defendant continued in the joint family and raised loans for joint

family by executing mortgage in favour of many financial institutions along with his father apart from the fact that he has been shown as joint family member in the voter list from the year 1971 and also residing with his father.

8. That the release deed purported to be executed by the first defendant was not at all acted apart from the fact that there was no equitable partition of joint family properties and allotment of legitimate share to the first defendant. The said alleged release deed is not binding the interests of these plaintiffs in suit properties. However the first defendant continued himself in the joint family as a coparcener put forth his efforts and improved and developed joint family estate. The alleged deed is nominal and inequitable and not enforceable in law. Further the plaintiffs do not admit the alleged execution of release deed by their father and even if such deed has come into existence the same might have been obtained by playing fraud and undue influence.

9. That the plaintiffs notified their intention three months back for partition and separate possession of their share and demanded the defendants to come for an amicable partition. The defendants 2 to 4 though convened a panchayath, later not cooperated for equitable partition. Though there was no legal necessities the item no.17 and 18 schedule properties have been disposed off by the defendants and money was wasted for their personal enjoyments and bad vices. The money was not utilized for fulfillment of family welfare. The properties were valuable when compared to other properties. The interest of plaintiffs in the said properties are illegally bartered for fictitious value. By contending so the plaintiffs prays to decree the suit.

10. Upon service of summons, the defendant's have appeared through their counsels in OS 80/2002 and have filed their separate written statements.

11. The defendant no.2, 3 and 4 have filed their written statement by denying the entire case of plaintiffs. It is contended that the plaintiffs are not entitled for any of the reliefs as prayed for by them in

the plaintiff and plaintiffs were not at all born at the time of when the first defendant got released from the then joint family on 30.06.1971 by executing a duly registered release deed in favour of his father and other members of the then joint family and as the plaintiffs father the first defendant was not married at the time when the first defendant got himself released from the then joint family by executing the registered release deed dated 30.06.1971 and as the plaintiffs have absolutely no manner of right, title, interest or possession whatsoever to the suit schedule properties and have no right to be in possession of the suit schedule properties and as the first defendant is residing separately from 30.06.1971 and as the plaintiffs and the first defendant after execution of registered release deed by the first defendant were never residing in the family of these defendants and were never in possession of the suit schedule properties at any time.

12. The defendant submits that as the plaintiffs were never in possession of the suit schedule properties within 12 years before institution of the suit

on the file of this court and hence the suit is barred by law of limitation and as such the suit of the plaintiffs is liable to be dismissed by this court as not maintainable in law.

13. It is contended that as the plaintiffs and their predecessors in interest if any were never in possession of the suit schedule properties at any time and as the defendants are in absolute possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule properties and enjoying the same in their own right, title, interest and possession adversely, uninterruptedly, hostilely, to the knowledge of the plaintiffs and the first defendant for more than 12 years prior to the institution of the suit on the file this court, hence the defendants have perfected their title to the suit schedule properties by law of adverse possession and as such the suit filed by the plaintiffs is liable to be dismissed by this court as not maintainable in law.

14. That the father of plaintiffs as stated above has already separated long back as on 30.06.1971 by executing a registered release deed in favour of his father Nareppa and as the first defendant was residing

separately from 30.06.1971 the defendants humbly submits that the first defendant was outset from the then joint family on 30.06.1971 itself and as such the first defendant has absolutely no manner of right, title, interest or possession whatsoever to the suit schedule properties and when the first defendant himself has no right or possession whatsoever to the suit schedule properties the plaintiffs being the sons of first defendant have no right, title interest or possession whatsoever to the suit schedule properties and as such the suit filed by the plaintiffs for partition and for alleged share and separate possession in the suit schedule properties is not maintainable in law, and as such the suit of the plaintiffs is liable to be dismissed by this court as not maintainable in law.

15. That the first defendant and defendant no.5 and 6 have separated from the family by executing the registered release deeds as stated by the defendants in the abovesaid paras of this written statement and in respect of the registered release deeds from the date of respective registered release deeds executed by the defendant no.1, 5 and 6 the defendants are enjoying the suit schedule properties in their own right title,

interest and possession by paying kandyam due thereon and raising crops therein the defendants humbly submit that the plaintiffs and the defendants 1, 5 and 6 have absolutely no manner of right, title, interest or possession whatsoever to the suit schedule properties and as such the suit filed by the plaintiffs is liable to be dismissed by this court.

16. It is contended that the first defendant has absolutely no manner of right, title, interest or possession whatsoever to the suit schedule properties has instituted the revenue proceedings on the file of Tahasildar, Chintamani taluk and also on the file of learned Assistant commissioner, Chikkaballapur Sub division, Chikkaballapur and the revenue proceedings instituted by the first defendant was later on dismissed by the Tahasildar, Chintamani taluk directing the first defendant to establish his right if any in a competent court of civil jurisdiction the defendants are also herewith producing the certified copy of the orders passed by the Tahasildar, Chintamani taluk for kind consideration of this court and first defendant having failed in his attempt to succeed before the revenue authorities has got filed this suit through the plaintiffs

in order to harass the defendants and as such the suit of the plaintiffs is liable to be dismissed by this court as not maintainable in law. All other allegations made by the plaintiffs in their plaint filed on the file of this court contrary too and inconsistent with the allegations in this written statement are hereby denied and other allegations which are not herein specifically traversed are all absolutely false. By contending so these defendants prays to dismiss the suit with exemplary costs.

17. In OS 80/2002 the defendant no.7 in her written statement contended that one Late Sri.Nareppa had six children namely, N.Sriramreddy (defendant no.1), Krishnareddy (defendant no.2), Lakshmanareddy (defendant no.3), Narayanaswamy (defendant no.4), Appireddy (defendant no.5), Lakshmidevamma (the above defendant) Ashwathareddy (defendant no.6) and Nagarathnamma (defendant no.8). The said Nareppa died intestate leaving behind the above children. All the suit schedule properties are joint Hindu undivided family properties and the first defendant herein is entitled to her legitimate share in the suit schedule properties.

18. That, the defendant no.1 N.Sriramareddy got released himself on 30.06.1971 vide document bearing Reg.No.15/71-72 without taking any property to his share for some understanding in the family and showing in the release deed that he is releasing his rights over all his family properties by receiving just Rs.500/-. Even after execution of the said release deed, the defendant no.1 continued to live together with said joint Hindu undivided family and raised loans jointly with his father and acquired several properties for the sake of family. Later after several years he was addicted to alcohol and to avoid his burden he was kept aside without any share in family properties. Even though he was living separately his children i.e the plaintiffs lived with joint family and jointly are in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule properties. Hence the release deed is fraudulent and illegal.

19. That, the 5th defendant Krishnareddy also got himself released from joint family under registered release deed dated 11.02.1977 taking to his share Sy.no.16/2 measuring 1-15 guntas, 16/3 measuring 0-22 guntas, 16/4 measuring 0-24 guntas and

Sy.no.89/II block measuring 2-00 acres and Sy.no.3/2 measuring 0-02 guntas and Sy.no.44/1 measuring 2-01 guntas of Chikkakarakamakalahalli and Sy.no.18/1 measuring 0-13 guntas, Sy.no.44/3 measuring 1-07 guntas, Sy.no.18/3 measuring 0-12 guntas and also a house bearing V.P.katha no.43 measuring east to west 10feet and north to south 11 feet situated at Marinayakanahalli. As such the above properties are not included in this suit. Sy.No.44/1 of Chikkakarakamakalahalli village was purchased directly in the name of 5th defendant out of joint family funds and the same was relinquished in his favour as said above.

20. That fifth defendant also although he entered into release deed he continued to live jointly with family members and all the family members are in joint possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule properties. Very recently the fifth defendant is living separately. The said properties mentioned in the above release deed of 5th defendant are more valuable and are not subjected to partition rather entered into release deed fraudulently and is not binding on the above defendant.

21. It is contended that the 6th defendant Narayanaswamy got himself released from the joint family under registered release deed dated 23.09.1988 and he was allotted valuable properties namely Sy.no.81/1 measuring 1-16 guntas out of 2-32 guntas which consists of submercible pumpset and sy.no.77 measuring 1-38 guntas consisting of well and coconut garden and a site bearing no.9 measuring 30x40feet wherein all the above properties are situated at Marinayakanahalli village and the properties given to him are not included in this suit. Although the 6th defendant is released from the said family he is still living with the joint family in the house built in Sy.no.81/3. Further he has also got a land granted to his name fraudulently in old sy.no.19 measuring to an extent of 0-38 gutnas which was cultivated by all the joint family members since ancient times. Further he also got another 0-30 guntas land in old sy.no.89, new sy.no.180 granted to his wife Padmammas name fraudulently which has been cultivated by joint family members since ancient times.

22. That all the above release deeds were executed for one or the other purpose and not as partition in

between the joint family members and joint family properties. The said release deeds were executed without the consent of all family members and however the above defendant Laxmidevamma is not considered for said release and she has also not consented for the same. Hence the properties allotted to 5th and 6th defendant cannot be exempted from partition. That there is no partition in the said joint undivided Hindu family and the above defendant is entitled for her legitimate share in all family properties including the properties allotted to 5th and 6th defendant under release deeds.

23. It is further contended that the 5th defendant Krishnareddy by taking undue advantage of the release deed and khata mutation and RTC in his name has fraudulently sold the land in sy.no.16/2 measuring 1-15 guntas to one Sri.Venkatareddy son of Muniyappa vide sale deed registration no.CMN-1-01191-2008-2009 dated 21.07.2008. Thereafter he has also sold the sy.no.16/3 measuring 0-22 guntas and 16/4 measuring 0-24 guntas to one Narayanappa vide sale deed registration no.2069/2010 dated 13.09.2010.

24. That apart from the above properties and properties of the plaint, the joint family have acquired some more properties out of joint family funds in sy.no.16/7 measuring 0-38 guntas situated at Kodigevarahalli, Murugamalla hobli, Chintamani taluk and registered in the name of defendant no.3 Appireddy and the same are not mentioned in the schedule of the plaint. The land in sy.no.3/7 measuring one gunta and sy.no.5/5 measuring 2guntas of land of Marinayakanahalli which are purchased and exists in the name of defendant no.3 are also a joint family property. Further the joint family has acquired several sites mentioned in the schedule below at Marinayakanahalli village and the above defendant is entitled to her legitimate share in the same. The above defendant suspects there are few more properties which have been raised out of joint family nucleus and the details of same is not available at the present and hence the defendant reserves liberty to bring them on record after she obtains documents of same.

25. That the plaintiffs has not joined the persons mentioned above who are necessary parties to this suit

as they are purchasers of the joint family properties belonging to the joint family of the plaintiff and defendants. That the plaintiffs has not included the properties mentioned in the written statement to this counter claim, which also properties belonging to the joint family properties. By contending so this defendant prays to decree the suit.

26. In OS 80/2002 the defendant no.8 in her written statement contended that the plaintiffs have filed false and frivolous suit against the defendant including this defendant and the plaintiffs have absolutely no manner of right, title, interest or possession what so ever to the suit schedule properties and they are not entitled for any share in the suit schedule properties and muchless to 1/12th share of each of the plaintiffs and as such the plaintiffs are not at all entitled for any of the relief stated by them in the plaint and as such the plaintiffs suit is liable to dismissed by this court as not maintainable in law. That, the plaintiffs at the instigation of their father i.e first defendant have filed this false suit even though the plaintiffs have no right, title, interest or possession whatsoever to the suit schedule properties and even

though the plaintiffs have no share in the suit schedule properties. Hence, the suit filed by the plaintiffs against this defendant is liable to be dismissed.

27. That, the defendant no.2, 3 and 4 have already filed a detailed written statement in the suit and this defendant adopts the written statement already filed by the defendant no.2, 3 and 4 in the suit. That this defendant has married about 25 years ago and from the date of marriage is residing in her husbands house and as such this defendant also has absolutely no manner of right, title, interest or possession whatsoever to the suit schedule properties. As there was division in the family long ago the details of which has already been stated by defendant no.2, 3 and 4 and as the plaintiffs father prior to the birth of plaintiffs has released from the family by taking properties and has executed a duly registered release deed that the plaintiffs and first defendant have no share at all in the suit schedule properties. All other allegations made by the plaintiffs in their plaint filed including the amended plaint on the file of this court contrary too and inconsistent with this written statement are denied as false. The allegations in this

plaint which are not specifically traverssed are all denied as false. By contending so this defendant prays to dismiss the suit with exemplary costs.

28. The defendant no.10 has filed written statement contending that the suit of the plaintiff is not maintainable either in law or on facts and the same is liable to be dismissed and denied all the allegations in the plaint. That the defendant no.2 to 4 along with one Venkatareddy son of Late Venkataswami were the absolute owners and they are in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the landed property bearing Sy.No.31, measuring 15 guntas of land, situated at Marinayakanahalli village, Chintamani taluk. The defendant no.2 to 4 and Venkatareddy approached this defendant that they were intending to sell the said schedule property for their family legal necessities and in turn all of them requested this defendant to purchase the same, for which this defendant has agreed to purchase the said schedule proeprty for sale consideration of Rs.8000/-. Accordingly this defendant paid the sum of Rs.8000/-. In turn the defendant no.2 to 4 and Venkatareddy have executed the registered sale deed in favour of this defendant on 06.01.1999.

29. That, this defendant was in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the said property for eight years. After that this defendant has inturn sold this property in favour of one N.Narayanaswamy for valuable consideration and since the date of purchase he is in possession and enjoyment of the same. After the sale this defendant is unconcerned with this property and he has got no right, interest over the said property. The claim of the plaintiff is most unrighteous and unwarranted under law. The plaintiff has not approached the court with clean hands and he has suppressed the truth and mis represented the fact to make unlawful gain. Further all the other allegations made in the plaint, which are contrary to and inconsistent with this written statement are all denied as false and the plaintiff is put to strict proof of the same. By contending so this defendant prays to dismiss the suit with costs.

30. The defendant no.2 to 4 and Lrs of defendant no.5 have also filed their separate additional written statements. The Lrs of defendant no.5 has contended that the plaintiffs have filed this false suit to make unlawful gain. The plaintiffs have not made the

purchasers of the said properties as parties to the suit as such the suit of the plaintiffs is bad for non joinder of necessary parties. Further, the plaintiffs have not included the suit properties as such the suit is bad for partial partition, as such the suit of the plaintiff is not maintainable and is to be dismissed. The plaintiffs has filed 4-5 amended applications and trying to improve the case. The claim of the plaintiff is most unrighteous and unwarranted under law. The plaintiff has not approached the court with clean hands and he has suppressed the truth and misrepresented the facts to make unlawful gain.

31. The defendant no.2 to 4 in their additional written statement contended that the boundaries given by the plaintiffs to the suit schedule properties are all false boundaries and are all concocted by the plaintiffs in order to harass the defendants and to put them to substantial loss, injury and hardship and the plaintiffs are not entitled for any of the reliefs they have prayed in the plaint. By contending so the defendant no.2 to 6 and Lrs of defendant no.5 prays to dismiss the suit with costs.

32. *Brief facts of the plaintiff's case in OS 85/2008 are as follows:*

That one Sri.Late Nareppa and first defendant have eight children namely (1)N.Sriramareddy, (2) N.Krishnareddy, (3) M.N.Lakshmanareddy (4) Narayanaswamy (5) Appireddy (6) Lakshmiddevamma (7) Ashwathareddy and (8)Nagarathnamma who are the defendant no.1 to 8 herein. That the defendant no.1 has four children namely (1)M.S.Shivanna (2) M.S.Byrereddy, (3) S.Shobha (Plaintiff herein) and (4) S.Prameela.

33. That, all the plaintiffs and defendants constitute Hindu undivided joint family and they are governed by the Hindu law and also the rules of Hindu Mithakshara school, in respect of joint family estate. Whereas the defendant no.13 is the stranger to the joint family of plaintiffs and defendants no.1 to 12 and his presence is required in the suit since he is alleged to have purchased the item no.1 of suit schedule properties. That this undivided joint family is having several immovable properties which are ancestral properties and some acquired from the joint family

nucleus. That the plaintiff is the daughter of the 2nd defendant and grand daughter of late Nareppa and first defendant and the defendants no.3 to 6 and 8 are the full blood brothers of the 2nd defendant and paternal uncle of the plaintiffs and defendant no.7 and 9 are the sisters of 2nd defendant and paternal aunts of plaintiff. All of them together constitute a Hindu undivided joint family and all of them are the coparceners of the said Hindu undivided joint family including female members since amendment brought under section 6 of Hindu Succession Act.

34. It is the case of the plaintiffs that one Late Sri.Nareppa was the absolute owner and in possession of lands bearing Sy.No.16/2 measuring 1acre 15 guntas, 16/3 measuring to an extent of 22guntas and 16/4 measuring to an extent of 24 guntas situated at Marinayakanahalli village, Murugamalla hobli, Chintamani taluk which are described in the schedule to this plaint. These properties are the ancestral properties and which are in joint possession of the joint family consisting of plaintiffs and defendant no.1 to 12. That there is no partition in the joint undivided Hindu

family till today except the father of the plaintiff i.e the defendant no.2 is living separately due to the differences in the family with his self acquired property.

35. That very recently on 30.09.2008 the defendant no.13 entered into the item no.1 of the schedule properties and was cultivating the land and knowing the same the plaintiff went to the said land and questioned him about his rights over the schedule property and the said defendant replied that he had purchased the said land measuring 1acre 15guntas in sy.no.16/2 vide sale deed dated 21.07.2008 bearing document no.1191/08-09 from the defendant no.3 alleged to be a sole absolute owner. That on verification, very recently the plaintiff came to know that the defendant no.3 has been released from the joint family vide release deed dated 11.02.1977 document no.2491/76-77. As per this deed the said Late Nareppa was the owner and in possession of the suit schedule properties and he along with other defendants no.4, 5, 6 and 8 some of them being minors

and represented by the said Nareppa their father has entered into the said release deed.

36. That, the defendant no.3 alleged to have sole and absolute proprietary rights over the suit schedule properties have allegedly sold the item no.1 of the suit schedule properties which is illegal and arbitrary. The plaintiff approached the defendants and asked for her legitimate share since they have been doing such illegal acts, but the defendants refused to part any of the properties with the plaintiff, saying that the suit schedule properties are his self acquired properties although they are not so and rather ancestral properties as stated supra. Taking undue advantage of the fraudulent release deed and subsequent katha and mutation in his name, colluded with other defendants and has sold the suit item no.1 of suit schedule properties to the defendant no.13 is illegal and arbitrary and contrary to the existing law.

37. It is further case of the plaintiffs that the said release deed is a fraudulent document executed before the marriage of the defendant no.3 for the best reasons

known to them. The defendant no.3 never lived separate from the Hindu joint undivided family. The alleged release of the defendant no.3 is a documentary release and not enacted physically. It is also pertinent to note that the defendant no.1, 2 and female members defendant no.8 and 9 has not consented and attested their signatures for the release deed and hence their shares and interest is vested in the said schedule properties. That the 2nd defendant though he is father of plaintiff, he is taking more interest in the welfare of the defendant no.3 to 9 and he has become a puppet in the hands of his brothers and as such the said illegal acts done by the defendant no.3 to 6 and 7 and 13 are not at all binding on the plaintiff and her separate share in the suit schedule properties and cannot be affected as she have got independent and separate share over the suit schedule properties.

38. That, the plaintiff is always kept away from any information regarding any transaction and also the said illegal transactions were not within the plaintiffs knowledge. The plaintiff suspects that there are some other ancestral properties and the details of which are not immediately available to the plaintiff and nobody in

the family are disclosing the same and accordingly the plaintiff reserve her right to include such other properties of joint family as and when she get the details of the same in the course of the suit against the defendant with leave of this court.

39. That under the above said facts and circumstances the plaintiff left with no other alternative remedy have filed the present suit for partition and declaration and for such other relief against the defendants. It is also necessary to state that the plaintiff has made her best efforts to seek the partition of the suit schedule properties with the defendants on 05.10.2008, after learning about the aforesaid illegal acts and which the defendants no.1 to 6 and 8 have refused to effect partition.

40. That the aforesaid illegal acts of the defendants are contrary, arbitrary, vexatious, tainted with ill motives and malafide object. In this connection it is stated that defendant no.13 is not a bonafide purchaser of the suit schedule property and he has colluded with other defendants and as such he does

not derive any right, title and interest or possession over the schedule properties and further cannot claim any joint possession with the plaintiff and other defendant since he is a stranger to the family of plaintiff and defendants. That apart he cannot trespass over the suit schedule property forcibly as he has not acquired any right, title or interest over the schedule property. By contending so the plaintiff prays to decree the suit.

41. Upon service of summons, the defendant's no.1, 3 to 9, 13 have appeared through their counsels and have filed their separate written statements and defendant no.2, 10 to 12 were not appeared before the court and they were placed exparte.

42. The learned counsel for the defendant no.1, 4, 5, 8 and 9 have filed memo on 01.04.2009 and adopt the written statement filed by the defendant no.3 and 6.

43. The defendant no.1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 have filed their written statement by denying the entire case of plaintiff. That the defendant no.10 to 12 are the

children of 2nd defendant. The 2nd defendant released the family of his father Nareppa and his minor son Krishnareddy, Lakshmana Reddy, Narayanareddy, Appireddy and Ashwatha reddy under registered release deed dated 30.06.1971. At the time of registered release deed the above said Krishnareddy, Lakshmanareddy, Narayana swamy, Appireddy and Ashwatha reddy are minors. On behalf of minor sons, Nareppa entered into registered release deed with 2nd defendant.

44. That, the 2nd defendant received cash of Rs.500/- by reliniquishing his right over the family properties and thereafter the 2nd defendant residing separately and he was working as a village accountant for certain period and subsequently he was suspended. Some of the properties acquired by him from his self acquisition bearing sy.no.52/5 measuring 19 guntas and sy.no.112 measuring 2acres and some other properties. In view of the said registered release deed, the 2nd defendant lost his right, title over the family properties. He was an ouster from the family of Nareppa and so also his properties. At the time of regisitered release deed the plaintiff and defendants 10

to 12 are not born. The 10th defendant is an elder son of 2nd defendant who is born on 19.01.1976 is very much prior to his birth his father is released from the family. When the 2nd defendant have no right, title over the properties, plaintiff and defendants 10 to 12 have no share in any of the alleged suit schedule properties.

45. It is contended that the 2nd defendant and 11th defendant have entered into registered partition deed with respect to their family properties on 01.07.1999 under 'A' and 'B' schedules. The 'A' schedule properties allotted to 2nd defendant with respect to sy.no.52/5 measuring 19 guntas and 'B' schedule properties allotted to 11th defendant with respect to s.no.112 measuring 2acres (two bit of land one acre each). The said registered partition deed is very clear the 2nd defendant is not the joint family member of this defendant and regsiteed release deed dated 30.06.1971 is acted upon. The 10th and 11th defendant have filed a alleged suit for partition against the defendant no.2 to 6 and 8 other than the properties in OS No.80/02. The said suit was also pending for final adjudication. If at all the plaintiff have any grievance

she can work out her remedy in OS 80/2002 and not to file this frivolous suit.

46. It is further contended that the 3rd defendant was released from the family of his father Nareppa and other brothers by executing a registered release deed on 11.02.1977 by receiving certain properties. In view of the registered release deed, the 3rd defendant is not the joint family members of first defendant, 4th defendant, 6th defendant and 8th defendant and what are the properties acquired by 3rd defendant under registered release deed, he has every right to dispose off his properties if necessity arises. Accordingly, the suit item no.1 disposed off by him in favour of defendant no.13 and he is in possession of the property. That the 5th defendant was executed a registered release deed to his father Nareppa and so also his sons 4th defendant, 6th defendant, 5th defendant by executing registered release deed dated 23.08.1988. In view of the registered release deed the 5th defendant is not the joint family member of 1st defendant, 4th defendant, 6th defendant and 8th defendant and what are the properties acquired by 5th defendant under registered release deed he is in possession.

47. That, the plaintiff filed this frivolous suit with collusion of 2nd defendant, defendant no.10 to 12 by knowing the fact the 2nd defendant released from the family on 30.06.1971 and 3rd defendant released from from the family on 11.02.1977 and 5th defendant released the family on 13.09.1988 and registered partition deed between 2nd defendant and 11th defendant on 01.07.1999 and civil suit filed by the defendant no.11 and 12 in OS 80/2002. Hence, the suit filed by the plaintiff is not maintainable. That the plaintiff is the utter stranger to the suit schedule properties and she is not coparcener of the property at any point of time, in particular on the date of suit prior to 12 years. In this score itself the suit of the plaintiff is liable to be dismissed. All other allegations are not specifically traversed in the written statement and inconsistent of the plaint averments are denied as false. By contending so the defendant no.1, 3 to 6, 8 and 9 prays to dismiss the suit with exemplary costs.

48. The defendant no.13 has filed written statement by denying the entire case of plaintiff. It is contended that on 21.07.2008 he has purchased the suit item no.1 bearing sy.no.16/2 measuring 1.15acres

dry land bounded on the east by vendors property, west by land of A.Krishnappa, north by vendors land, south by Govt. Kaluve and road situated at Marinayakanahalli, Muragamalla hobli, Chintamani taluk from the earlier owner Krishnareddy, S/o.Nareppa and his daughter Bharathi, Ambika and son Ashwatha Narayanareddy under the regstiered sale deed for valuable consideration of Rs.69,000/- and the vendor has delivered his possession to the defendant no.13 on the date of sale. Hence he is in exclusive possession over the suit item no.1 since from the sale deed till today. The vendor had acquired the suit item no.1 under the registered release deed dated 11.02.1977 executed by family members of the Late Nareppa. Hence it was self acquired property to the vendor of the defendant no13. He was the independent RTC holder, mutation holder, kathedar and tax payer with respect to suit item no.1.

49. The defendant no.13 has enquired the mode of acquisition of the some land by vendor, perused his revenue documents and seeing his exclusive possession has purchased the same and now in

possession and enjoyment over the said land. The concerned RTC, mutation register and other relevant revenue documents are also incorporated in the name of the defendant no.13 he has been paying land revenue to the government up to date.

50. It is further contended that his vendor Krishnareddy son of Nareppa has acquired several properties under the release deed dated 11.02.1977 including suit item no.1, but the plaintiff has chosen to file this suit with respect to sy.no.16/2 measuring 1acre 16 guntas, sy.no.16/3 measuring 0.22 guntas, sy.no.16/4 measuring 0.24 guntas. Buy she has left sy.no.3/2 measuring 0.02 guntas and V.P. Katha no.43 measuring 10x11 yards Gramatana property without including in this suit. Moreover the father of the defendants vendor Nareppa has executed registered release deed on behalf of himself as well as on behalf of his all minors children. At that time female members or the concept was not recognized by law. And the kartha had a right to do whatever good to the family. So members cannot question it after 30 years. Excepting the suit item no.1 the defendant no.13 is not concerned to other lands. By contending so the

defendant no.13 prays to dismiss the suit with respect to item no.1 is concerned.

51. On the basis of the rival contentions, pleadings, material proposition of fact and law and the documents this court has framed the following:

ISSUES IN OS 80/2002

- 1. Whether the plaintiffs prove that suit schedule properties are joint family properties in between them and defendant no.2 to 4 and they are in joint possession?**
- 2. Whether plaintiffs prove that item no.6 to 10 properties are purchased in the name of first defendant father Nareppa and item no.11 to 13 acquired in the name of 3rd defendant out of joint family yielding nucleus and so also item no.14 property was purchased out of joint family funds?**
- 3. Whether plaintiffs prove that defendant no.1 after execution of the release deed on 30.06.1971 continued in joint family and the said release deed is not acted upon?**

4. Whether defendants prove that court fee paid by the plaintiffs is incorrect?
5. Whether defendants prove that they perfected their title to the suit schedule property by way of adverse possession?
6. Whether defendants prove that suit of the plaintiffs is barred by limitation?
7. Whether plaintiffs are entitle for 1/12th share in the suit schedule properties by metes and bounds?
8. What order ord decree?

ADDITIONAL ISSUES DATED 06.06.2011

1. Whether the 7th defendnat proves that the partial partition suit of the plaintiff is not maintainable?
2. Whether the 7th defendant proves that he is entitle for 1/8th share in the suit schedule properties?
3. Whether the 7th defendant proves that the release deed dated 30.06.1971, 11.02.1977, 23.09.1988 and sale deed dated 21.07.2008 and 30.09.2010 are not binding upon her share?

52. As per the orders passed on IA No.4 dated 04.11.2011 the suit OS No.85/2008 is clubbed with OS No.80/2002.

53. To substantiate the case of the plaintiff in OS No.80/2002 the 2nd plaintiff examined himself as PW.1 and got examined first plaintiff as PW2 and got examined two more witnesses as PW3 and PW4 and got marked the documents as per Ex.P1 to Ex.P51.

54. After closure of plaintiff's side evidence, the defendant no.3 got examined himself as DW1 and 7th defendant got examined himself as DW4 and got examined two witnesses as DW2 and DW3 and got marked documents at ExD1 to ExD179 and closed their side.

55. Heard arguments on both sides. During the course of arguments the plaintiff counsel and defendant counsel have submitted that both the parties have already settled the dispute amicably. Hence, prays to pass judgment in considering the partition deed dated 26.07.2016 and compromise petition dated 17.07.2018.

56. My answer to the above framed issues are as follows:

**Issue No.1 to 7 and Additional issue no.1 to 3:
Does not survive for consideration.**

**Issue No.8 : As per final order for the
following:-**

REASONS

**ISSUE NO.1 TO 7 AND ADDITIONAL ISSUE NO.1
TO 3 :**

57. On perusal of order sheet dated 04.01.2019 in OS No.85/2008 it appears Sri.SR Advocate has filed vakalath along with SPA copy and IA No.5 under Order 3 rule 2 of CPC praying this court to permit the plaintiff to represent the suit through her power of attorney holder i.e her mother. As the said IA is not opposed by other parties. The IA is allowed.

58. It is pertinent here to mention that the plaintiff in OS No.85/2008 through her power of attorney holder has filed a memo dated 04.01.2019 praying this court to permit her to withdraw the suit as not pressed. After filing this memo, court notice was

issued to the plaintiff, however even in spite of service of notice the plaintiff did not keep herself present before the court, hence memo is allowed. The suit filed by the plaintiff in OS No.85/2008 is dismissed as not pressed.

59. Further it is also pertinent here to mention that the plaintiffs and defendants in OS No.80/2002 have strongly contested this suit for many years by examining many witnesses and by producing many documents earlier. However, on 26.07.2016 i.e as per Exp51 all the parties to the suit have amicably settled their disputes amongst themselves excluding the property which is already alienated to the 3rd parties. In this suit even though some of the original defendants have affixed their signatures to Exp51 partition deed they could not affix their signatures to the compromise petition under Order 23 rule 3 of CPC which is filed before this court dated 17.07.2018 as some of them were dead. But, even in spite of sufficient opportunity given to the Lrs of the defendants (the original defendants have affixed their signature on Exp51 partition deed) the Lrs did not affix their

signature to the compromise petition filed before this court.

60. The learned counsel for the plaintiffs and defendants during the course of arguments submitted that in view of long pending of the suit and to keep their relationship intact among the parties the plaintiffs are taking only a nominal share out of the suit schedule properties to which all the original defendants conceded and affixed their signature on 26.07.2016.

61. In considering the submission of one of the senior most counsel appearing for the plaintiff at bar, I am of the opinion that this court has to accord both the parties to amicably settled their dispute amongst themselves.

62. In view of the compromise entered in between the plaintiffs and original defendants as per partition deed dated 26.07.2016 and subsequent compromise petition filed by the plaintiff, I am of the opinion that there is no need to answer the above issues no.1 to 7

and additional issue no.1 to 3 in detail. The plaintiffs and defendants have amicably settled their dispute amongst themselves as per the terms and conditions enunciated in the partition deed and compromise petition.

63. I have carefully perused the contents of compromise petition wherein it appears the property which is already alienated in favour of 3rd party purchaser are not included in the compromise petition.

64. The compromise petition U/O 23 rule 3 of CPC is filed stating that the parties have entered in to compromise as per agreement dated 26.07.2016. It is further stated that the defendants had lot of differences as such prior to 20.05.2016 and all the defendants approached them along with one Ramappa and M.N.Manjunath for settlement of dispute. That, the first plaintiff is a MBA graduate and 2nd plaintiff is practicing Advocate at Bangalore and the defendants are educated and they do not want to quarrel for ever for the sake of partition of suit properties. The suit properties are totally measuring 25 acres and out of that the plaintiff have got meagre share.

65. That in view of the suggestions of defendants and after negotiations held in presence of the witnesses, the plaintiff have agreed to take meagre share suggested by the defendants and volutnary offer made by them, and have agreed to take the following properties situated at Marinayakanahalli, Murugamalla hobli, Chintamani taluk.

1. Sy.No.89/15, new 150 2.07 guntas out of 5.07 guntas
2. Sy.no.3/7 measuring 0.01 guntas
3. Site no.87/63/D measuring 40x60feet.
4. Sy.No.5/5 measuring 0.02 guntas including tamarind trees, peeple tree, vacant space.
5. Sy.no.180 measuring 0.02 guntas out of 0.30guntas.

66. The said allotment is very meagre when compared to the potential value retained by the defendants. **In fact the plaintiffs are in actual physical possession of the properties allotted to them as co-parceners, the defendants appreciating the state of affairs, have agreed to take and**

voluntarily offered to them as their share and they are ready to compromise the suit.

67. That in view of the compromise, the defendants have prepared the compromise agreement dated 26.07.2016 which is virtually a partition deed evidencing the shares allotted to them adjusted by lawful agreement in writing signed by parties in respect of the suit properties. All the defendants have affixed their LTMs/signatures to the compromise agreement dated 26.07.2016 after understanding the contents. In fact they themselves have got the document prepared. Due to death of defendant no.1 to 3 the compromise could not be reported all these days. The plaintiffs are parties to the compromise agreement dated 26.07.2016 and presenting the same today which is in accordance with law. That the first defendant died on 08.07.2017 and the plaintiff are his Lrs. The 2nd defendant died on 01.06.2016 and his Lrs have signed the compromise agreement. The 3rd defendant died on 23.03.2017 and he had signed the compromise agreement while he was alive.

68. The 4th defendant has also signed the compromise agreement. The 5th defendant died during the year 2015 and he filed written statement admitting his relinquishment in the joint family properties. The 6th defendant had not at all contested the suit. The 7th defendant had signed the compromise agreement. The 8th defendnat filed memo stating that she do not claim any share in the suit properties. **The defendant no.9 and 10 are purchasers of the suit items and the said properties are not subject matter of the compromise agreement and present compromise and the parties concede the sale transactions in their favour.** The Lrs of defnedant no.3 were aware of the fact that the 3rd defendant had signed the compromise agreement. It is necessary in the interest of justice to allow the compromise petition and allot their properties mentioned in the compromise agreement dated 26.07.2016.

69. The terms and conditions of the compromise petition was read over and explained. Both the parties admitted its due execution. The parties identified their counsels' and vice versa the counsels' identified their

parties. The parties have admitted that they have compromised the matter out of their own free will without any force, nor undue influence nor coercion, without any fear.

70. Heard and perused.

71. The said compromise is not opposed to any law for time being in force. Hence there is no hesitation to accept the compromise petition. Accordingly the compromise petition is accepted.

72. The suit filed by the plaintiff is hereby decreed in terms of the partition deed dated 26.07.2016 and compromise petition dated 17.07.2018.

73. The partition deed (suit agreement) and compromise petition shall form part and parcel of the decree. **It is further made it clear that if in case any one of the defendants or Lrs of defendants are aggrieved by the compromise petition or by the orders of this court, they are at liberty to file necessary application to recall the orders passed by**

this court today and are at liberty to restore this case to its original number and proceed with the case on merits.

74. In view of the above discussion and reasonings, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The OS No.85/2008 stands dismissed as not pressed in view of the memo dated 04.01.2019 filed by the plaintiff through her GPA holder.

The suit filed by the plaintiff in OS No.80/2002 is hereby decreed in part as per the compromise petition dated 17.07.2018 and agreement dated 26.07.2016.

It is made it clear that the properties which are standing in the name of 3rd party purchasers i.e defendant no.9 and 10 are not part and parcel of this compromise decree.

In considering the relationship amongst the parties and long pending of the suit, both the parties are directed to bear their own costs.

Draw decree accordingly as per the compromise petition and suit agreement dated 26.07.2016.

True copy of this judgment shall be kept in OS No.85/2008.

(Dictated to the stenographer on computer, Corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court on this the 2nd day of November 2019)

(Rajendra Kumr. K.M)
Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Chintamani.

ANNEXURE

1. List of witnesses examined for plaintiffs:

Pw.1	:	Sri.Byraredddy
Pw.2	:	Sri.M.S.Shivanna
Pw.3	:	Sri.Venkataswamy
Pw.4	:	Sri.S.Ramappa

1. List of documents got marked for plaintiffs:

Ex.P1	:	Genealogical tree
Ex.P2 to 12	:	RTC extracts.

Ex.P13 : Demand register extracts
Ex.P14 & 15 : Election voter lists.
Ex.P16 to 18 : Cash receipts.
Ex.P19 to 21 : EC bills.
Ex.P22 to 45 : RTC extracts.
Ex.P46 : Voter list.
Ex.P47 : AC orders
Ex.P48 : Tahsildar orders
Ex.P49 & 50 : Certified copy of mortgage
deeds.
Ex.P51 : Partition deed dated
26.07.2016.

2. List of witnesses examined for defendants:

DW1 : Sri.Appireddy
DW2 : Smt.Venkatamma
DW3 : Sri.Kariyappa
DW4 : Smt.Lakshmiddevamma.

3. List of documents got marked for defendants:

ExD1 to 3 : Partition deeds
ExD4 to 23: RTC extracts.
ExD24 & 25: Genealogical trees.
ExD26 & 27: Election voter list
ExD28 : Tahsildar order copy
ExD29 : AC order copy
ExD30 : Tahsildar order copy
ExD31 : Ration card.
ExD32 & 33: Admission extracts.
ExD34 : Certified copy of partition deed
ExD35 : RTC extract.
ExD36 : Demand register extracts.
ExD37 to 40: RTC extracts.
ExD41 & 42: Mutation register extracts.
ExD43 : RTC extract.

ExD44	:	Mutation register extract
ExD45	:	RTC extract.
ExD46	:	Mutation register extract
ExD47	:	Certified copy of lease deed.
ExD48	:	RTC extract.
ExD49	:	Kathe badalavane nakalu
ExD50	:	RTC extract.
ExD51	:	Mutation register extract
ExD52	:	RTC extracts
ExD53	:	Mortgage deed
ExD54	:	Certified copy of judgment and decree in OS 49/1996.
ExD55	:	Notice.
ExD56	:	Jugment in LAC 01/2010.
ExD57	:	Mortgage deed.
ExD58	:	Certified copy.
ExD59 to 61:		Notice letters.
ExD62	:	Endorsement
ExD63 to 70:		RTC extracts.
ExD71	:	Mutation register extract.
ExD72	:	RTC extract.
ExD73 to 77:		Mutation register extracts.
ExD78 to 80:		RTC extracts.
ExD81	:	Certified copy of sale deed.
ExD82	:	Demand register extracts.
ExD83	:	Kathe badalavane.
ExD84	:	Mutation regsiteer extract.
ExD85	:	Receipt
ExD86 to 89:		RTC extracts.
ExD90	:	Receipt.
ExD91	:	Letter issued by Nandiganahalli Co-operative society.
ExD92 to 97:		RTC extracts.
ExD98	:	Certified copy of Tahsildar orders.
ExD99	:	Survey sketch.

ExD100 : Notice.
ExD101 : Mahazar.
ExD102 : Mutation register extract
ExD103 : RTC extract
ExD104 : Certified copy of sale deed.
ExD105 : RTC extract.
ExD106 & 107: Kandaya Receipts.
ExD108 : Mortgage release letter.
ExD109 : Sale deed.
ExD110 : Mutation register extract.
ExD111 : Certified copy of sale deed
ExD112 : Mutation register extract.
ExD113 & 114: RTC extracts.
ExD115 : Certified copy of sale deed
ExD116 : Thiluvaike pathra
ExD117 : Certified copy of the KET
judgment.
ExD118 : Certified copy of orders passed
by the Tribunal .
ExD119 : Paying in slip
ExD120 & 121: Receipts
ExD122 : Auction letter.
ExD123 : Nondayitha anche
ExD124 : Tahsildar notice
ExD125 : Aakairu notice.
ExD126 to 131: Receipts.
ExD132 : Certified copy of the appeal in RA
25/2011.
ExD133 : Certified copy of memo in RA
15/03-04.
ExD134 : Certified copy of appeal
ExD135 : Certified copy of the interim
applications.
ExD136 to 173: RTC extracts.
ExD174 to 176: Mutation register extracts.

- ExD177 : RTC extract for the year 2004-05
ExD178 : Certified copy of sale ded dated
06.07.1998.
ExD179 : Certified copy of the sale deed
dated 06.01.1999.

(Rajendra Kumr. K.M)
Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Chintamani.

