



IN THE COURT OF THE IV ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE & J.M.F.C
AT BALLARI.

:PRESENT:

SMT. LAXMI BHAVANI SHANKRAPPA.,BBA.LLB(Hon's), LL.M.,

IV ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC, BALLARI.

Dated this the 13th day of July, 2026

O.S.No.707/2019

Plaintiffs:

- 1.** Smt.Lakshmi
W/o Ramalinga,
D/o Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
Aged about 25 years,
R/at.Taluru Village,
Siruguppa Taluk,
Ballari District.
- 2.** Smt.Parvathamma
W/o Obalesh
D/o Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
Aged about 21 years,
R/at.Yallamma Gudi camp,
Kampli Muddapur
Village, Kampli Taluk,
Ballari District.

(By Sri.K.S.,Advocate)

V/s

Defendants:

- 1.** Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
S/o Late.T.Pennappa @ Giddappa,
Aged about 60 years,

2. Takkalakote Nagamma
W/o Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
Aged about 35 years,
3. Manjunatha
S/o Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
Aged about 37 years,

Since dead Rept by his LRs

- 3(a). Smt.Rajeshwari Chanal
W/o Late.T.Manjunatha,
Aged about 28 years,
- 3(b). Minor Nireesha T
D/o Late.T.Manjunatha,
Aged about 5 years,
- 3(c). Minor Koushik T
S/o Late.T.Manjunatha,
Aged about 3 years,

Def No.3(b) and (c) since
minors Represented by their
natural mother guardian,

Def.No.3(a) Smt.Rajeshwri
Chanal W/o Late.T.Manjunatha,
Aged about 28 years,
R/at.ward No.4, Hanuman Nagar,
Badanahatti Village,
Kurugodu Taluk and Ballari District.

4. Raghavendra
S/o Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
Aged about 35 years,

Defendant No.1 to 4 are
R/at ward No.4, Hanuman Nagar,
Badanahatti Village,
Kurugodu Taluk, Ballari District.

5. Sridevi
W/o Rudra
D/o Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
aged about 40 years,
R/at.Somasamudra Village,
Kurugodu Taluk,
Ballari District.
6. Jayamma
W/o Gurushantha,
D/o Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
Aged about 30 years,
ward No.4, Hanuman Nagar,
Badanahatti Village,
Kurugodu Taluk, Ballari District.
7. Bangaramma
W/o Basava
D/o Takkalakote Doddabasappa,
Aged about 25 years,
R/at.Kanive Thimmalapura
Village, Kampli Taluk,
Ballari District.
**(Deft.No.1 & 2: By Sri. A.K.G,
Advocate)**
**(Deft.No.4 to 7 and Deft.No.3 (a to c)
L.N.Advocate)**

Date of Institution of Suit	:05-12-2019
Nature of the suit (suit on pronote,Suit for injunction etc.	:Partition
Date of the commencement of recording of the evidence	: 19-01-2024
Date on which the Judgment was pronounced	: 13-07-2026

Total Duration	Years	Months	Days
	06	07	8

Sd/-

**(LAXMI BHAVANI SHANKRAPPA).,
IV ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC,
BALLARI.**

JUDGMENT

The Plaintiffs have filed the present suit against the defendants for the relief of partition and separate possession.

2. The description of the suit schedule properties is as under:

ITEM NO.1

Sy.No.280/4 extent 1.28 cents, situated at Badanahatti village, within the kurugodu Sub-Registration, Ballari District, with the following boundaries:

East	:	land of Nagappa
West	:	land of pompapathi
North	:	Land of Sy.No 270, land of Goudara Hampamma
South	:	Canal.

ITEM NO.2

Sy.No.280/6 extent 0.32 cents, situated at Badanahatti village, within the kurugodu Sub-Registration, Ballari District, with the following boundaries:

East : land of Nagappa
West : land of pompapathi
North : Canal
South : Land of Manjunatha

ITEM NO.3

Sy.No.280/6 extent 0.82 cents, situated at Badanahatti village, within the kurugodu Sub-Registration, Ballari District, with the following boundaries:

East : land of Nagappa
West : land of pompapathi
North : land of Raghavendra
South : Remaining land of Sy.No.281

ITEM NO.4

Sy.No.280/4 extent 0.76 cents, situated at Badanahatti village, within the kurugodu Sub-Registration, Ballari District, with the following boundaries:

East : land of Nagappa

West : land of pompapathi
North : land of Raghavendra
South : Remaining land of Sy.No.281

ITEM NO.5

Sy.No.527/c/1 extent 1.05 cents, situated at Badanahatti village, within the kurugodu Sub-Registration, Ballari District, with the following boundaries:

East : land of Malli @ Mallikarjuna
West : land of Goravara karegouda
North : land of D.T. Siddayya
South : Takkalakote Maremma

3. The averments of the plaint in brief are as follows:

It is averred that, the defendant Nos.1 and 2 are their father and mother and the defendant No.3 to 7 are the children of defendant No.1 through his first wife. The suit schedule properties originally belonged to the plaintiffs' grandfather, T.Pennappa @ Giddappa. He had three sons, namely T.Dodda Basappa, T.Nagappa and T.Kariyappa. T.Dodda Basappa, the father of the plaintiffs, initially married Shivamma and, after her death, married

T.Nagamma. defendant No.3 to 7 are stated to be the children born through Shivamma, whereas the plaintiffs are the daughters born through T.Nagamma.

4. The suit schedule properties were granted in favour of T.Pennappa @ Giddappa by the Special Tahsildar, Ballari, in LRM Case No.476/1974-75, by an order dated 18.11.1981, conferring occupancy rights in Form No.10. According to the plaintiffs, their grandfather remained in possession and enjoyment of the properties during his lifetime. After his death, the properties continued to be the ancestral and joint family properties of the plaintiffs and defendants. Presently, defendant No.3 and 4 are stated to be in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule properties. The plaintiffs further allege that defendant Nos.1 to 4, by producing false and fabricated documents before the Sub-Registrar, Kurugodu, got a registered partition deed executed in December 2017. Under the said partition deed, only the shares of defendant Nos.1 to 4 were shown, while the shares of the plaintiffs and the other

defendants were excluded. The plaintiffs contend that the said partition was effected without their knowledge or consent and is therefore illegal and not binding upon them.

5. It is also alleged that defendant No.3 and 4, on the basis of the said documents, got the revenue entries and mutations changed in their names. According to the plaintiffs, such mutation entries are illegal and do not confer any exclusive right, title or interest upon defendant No.3 and 4. The plaintiffs maintain that the suit schedule properties, consisting of Item Nos.1 to 5 situated at Badanahatti Village, Kurugodu Taluk, Ballari District, continue to be the ancestral properties of the Hindu Undivided Joint Family. The plaintiffs claim that they are each entitled to a 1/9th share in the suit schedule properties. They assert that all the plaintiffs and defendant Nos.1 to 7 are in joint possession and enjoyment of the properties.

6. The plaintiffs repeatedly demanded partition and separate possession of their legitimate shares, including a demand made on 20.07.2019. However, the defendants allegedly postponed the partition on one pretext or another and ultimately refused to allot the plaintiffs shares. The plaintiffs state that they convened a panchayat on 20.09.2019 and made further requests for partition. They thereafter issued legal notices to defendant Nos.3 and 4. Though the notices were served, defendant Nos.3 and 4 neither replied nor complied with the demand for partition. Hence, the plaintiffs have filed the present suit seeking partition and separate possession of their respective 1/9th shares in the suit schedule properties. **Hence, Plaintiffs have filed this suit.**

7. After service of suit summons, the defendant No.1 to 7 appeared through their counsel and defendant No.1 to 3 only filed written statement.

8. The averments of Written statement of defendants No.1 and 2 in brief are as follows:

The defendant No.1 and 2 have substantially admitted the plaintiffs' case. defendant No.1 is the father and defendant No.2 is the mother of the plaintiffs, defendant No.3 to 7 are the children of defendant No.1 through his first wife, Shivamma. The plaintiffs are the daughters of defendant No.1 through his second wife, T.Nagamma. The suit schedule properties originally belonged to T.Pennappa @ Giddappa, the grandfather of the plaintiffs, who had three sons, namely T.Dodda Basappa, T.Nagappa and T.Kariyappa.

9. The suit properties were granted in favour of T.Pennappa@Giddappa by the Special Tahsildar, Ballari, in LRM Case No.476/1974-75, and occupancy rights in Form No.10 were granted on 18.11.1981. During his lifetime, T.Pennappa was in possession and enjoyment of the properties, and presently defendant No.3 and 4 are stated to be enjoying them.

10. The defendant No.1 and 2 contend that the properties are ancestral and joint family properties in which the plaintiffs and defendants have equal rights. The defendant No.3 and 4, by producing false and fabricated documents, got a registered partition deed dated 06.12.2017 executed in respect of the suit properties. Under the said deed, shares were allotted only to defendant No.1 to 4, without recognising the shares of the plaintiffs and the remaining defendants. The partition deed was executed without the knowledge or consent of the plaintiffs and is therefore illegal and not binding upon them.

11. The defendant No.3 and 4 also allegedly secured mutation of the properties in their names based on the said documents. The plaintiffs and defendants entitled to a 1/9th share in the suit schedule properties. Therefore, Defendant No.1 and 2 support the plaintiffs' claim for partition and separate possession of their respective shares in the suit schedule properties. **Hence, defendant No.1 and 2 prays to decree the suit of the Plaintiffs.**

12. The averments of Written statement of defendant No.3 in brief are as follows;

The defendant No.3 contends that the defendant No.1 and defendant No.2 never contracted a valid legal marriage, and therefore the plaintiffs, being children born out of such relationship, are neither members of the joint Hindu family nor coparceners entitled to claim partition in the suit schedule properties. The defendant No.2 has instigated the present proceedings and other litigations only to harass defendant No.3. The defendant No.3 further states that defendant No.1, along with his father and brothers, had borrowed a loan of Rs.4,00,000/- from Smt.Neelamma by executing an unregistered sale agreement dated 20.03.2012 in respect of Item No.5 of the suit schedule property. After discharging the entire loan with interest, defendant No.3 purchased Item No.5 under a registered sale deed dated 31.07.2018, executed by defendant No.1, his brothers, and defendant No.2 for valuable consideration. Consequently, Item No.5 became the

absolute self-acquired property of Defendant No.3, over which neither the plaintiffs nor any other person has any right, title, or interest.

13. It is further pleaded that all the legal heirs had already effected a registered family partition deed dated 06.12.2017, under which the suit properties were divided and the properties allotted to defendant No.3 and 4 became their exclusive properties. By virtue of the said registered partition, the properties lost their ancestral and joint family character, and therefore the plaintiffs cannot seek partition of those properties. The defendant No.3 also asserts that he repaid another loan of Rs.70,000/-, borrowed by defendant No.1 from Hosamane Mahesh Gouda under a promissory note dated 05.03.2016, and claims that all the family members are liable to reimburse their respective shares of the said amount.

14. The defendant No.3 further contends that even after the registered partition, defendant No.1 and 2 continue to

enjoy income from Item No.1 of the suit schedule property standing in the name of defendant No.4. It is also pleaded that the plaintiffs themselves have admitted that they are not in possession of the suit properties and have not pleaded constructive possession. Therefore, the suit ought to have been valued on the market value of the properties and not on a fixed court fee, rendering the court fee paid insufficient. On these grounds, defendant No.3 prays that the suit be dismissed with costs. **Hence, defendant No.3 prays to dismiss the suit of the Plaintiffs.**

15. On the basis of above said pleadings my Learned Predecessor in office has framed the following:

ISSUES

1) Whether the Plaintiffs prove that the suit schedule properties are the ancestral properties of plaintiffs and defendants?

2) Whether the Plaintiffs further prove that they have 1/9th share in the suit schedule properties?

3) Whether the defendant No.3 proves that suit schedule item No.5 property is the self acquired property of himself?

4) Whether the defendant No.3 proves that he has paid loan borrowed by the defendant No.1 under the promissory note dated 05-03-2016 to the amount of Rs.70,000/- along with interest, Hence the plaintiffs and other defendants are all liable for the loan paid by the himself?

5) Whether the defendant No.3 proves that the registered partition deed dated 06-12-2017 was executed between all legal heirs and necessary parties?

6) Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to the reliefs as sought for?

7) What order or decree?

16. In order to prove the case of the Plaintiffs, the plaintiff No.2 got examined as PW1 and got marked as many as 13 documents as Ex.P1 to Ex.P13. Though the defendant No.1 examined as DW1 no documents has been marked.

17. Heard the arguments of learned counsel for plaintiff and defendants and perused the materials on record.

18. The findings of this Court on the above said Issues are as under:

Issue No.1 :	In the Partly in Affirmative
Issue No.2 :	In the Negative
Issue No.3 :	In the Negative
Issue No.4 :	In the Negative
Issue No.5 :	In the Negative
Issue No.6 :	In the Negative
Issue No.7 :	As per the final order for the following

REASONS

19. ISSUE NO.1, 3 TO 5:- As these issues are interlinked with each other, hence they are taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid repetition of facts and evidence.

20. It is the specific contention of the plaintiffs and defendant No.1 and 2 that, the suit schedule properties are ancestral joint family properties originally granted to their grandfather, T.Pennappa @ Giddappa, and that they are entitled to a 1/9th share each. They allege that defendants

No.1 to 4 fraudulently executed a registered partition deed in December 2017 by excluding the plaintiffs and subsequently mutated the revenue records in favour of defendants No.3 and 4. Despite repeated demands, a panchayat, and legal notices seeking partition, the defendants failed to allot the plaintiffs legitimate shares. Therefore, the plaintiffs have instituted the present suit seeking partition and separate possession. The defendant No.1 and 2 supported case of the plaintiffs. Hence the plaintiffs have filed this present suit.

21. It is specific case of the defendant No.3 that, the suit is false and not maintainable, asserting that Defendant No.1 and 2 never had a valid marriage and, therefore, the plaintiffs are not entitled to claim partition. He claims to have lawfully purchased Item No.5 of the suit schedule property through a registered sale deed after discharging the loan secured over the property, making it his absolute self-acquired property. It is further contended that a registered family partition dated 06.12.2017 had already

divided the family properties, thereby extinguishing their joint family character. The plaintiffs are not in possession of the suit properties and have failed to seek the relief of possession. Hence defendant No.3 prays to dismiss the suit of the plaintiff.

22. In order to prove the case of the plaintiffs, the plaintiff No.2 has filed affidavit in lieu of oral examination in chief and got examined as PW1 by reiterating the plaint averment and marked as many as 13 documents as Ex.P1 to Ex.P13. In order to disprove the case of the plaintiffs, learned counsel for the defendants has not cross-examined the PW1. Though the defendant No.1 examined as DW1 not marked any documents the plaintiff counsel submits no cross-examination.

23. Ex.P.1 is the genealogical tree. It discloses T.Pennappa@Giddappa as the propositus and shows his three sons, namely T.Doddabasappa, T.Nagappa and T.Kariyappa. defendant No.1 is T.Doddabasappa. defendant

No.2 is shown as Nagamma and the plaintiffs are shown as the daughters of defendant No.1 through her. The defendant No.3 to 7 are shown as the children of defendant No.1 through Shivamma 1st wife of defendant No.1.

24. The revenue records produced by the plaintiffs show that the properties in Sy.No.280/A and Sy.No.527/C stood in the name of the predecessor of the parties. The entries disclose the grant and enjoyment of the lands through the common ancestor. Ex.P.13, the registered partition deed dated 06.12.2017, also proceeds on the footing that the properties had come to the family through the common ancestors and thereafter came to be divided among some of the family members.

25. Revenue entries by themselves do not create or extinguish title. Nevertheless, when they are read with the recitals of Ex.P.13 and the admitted genealogy, they constitute relevant evidence regarding the source and character of the properties. There is no reliable evidence

showing that the suit schedule properties, as a whole, were separately acquired by any individual defendant. Therefore, the plaintiffs have established that the suit schedule properties originated from the common ancestor and possessed the character of ancestral or joint family properties. Since the plaintiffs born through 2nd wife of defendant No.1 suit schedule properties are not ancestral properties of plaintiffs but suit schedule properties ancestral properties of defendants.

26. The defendant No.3 claims that Item No.5 is his self-acquired property by virtue of a registered sale deed dated 31.07.2018. However, the alleged sale deed has not been produced or proved. The plea that the property was acquired after discharge of a family loan is also unsupported by documentary evidence. A bare entry in the revenue record referring to a sale cannot substitute proof of the conveyance. Consequently, defendant No.3 has failed to discharge the burden cast upon him under Issue No.3.

27. Likewise, no promissory note, receipt, account, acknowledgment or other acceptable material has been produced to prove that defendant No.1 borrowed Rs.70,000/- or that defendant No.3 discharged the said debt. The claim for reimbursement is therefore not proved.

28. Ex.P.13 is a registered instrument and carries the ordinary presumption attached to a formally executed registered document. The defendant No.1 and 2 are parties to it. However, the document itself shows that all the persons now described as legal heirs were not executants. The defendant No.5 to 7 were not parties to the said deed. Therefore, the broad plea that the deed was executed by all legal heirs and necessary parties has not been proved.

29. The failure of defendant No.3 to prove Issues No.3 to 5 does not, by itself, entitle the plaintiffs to a decree. A plaintiff must succeed on the strength of his or her own legal entitlement and not merely on the weakness of the defence. **Hence issue No.1 answered in partly in**

affirmative and Issue No.3 to 5 are answered in the Negative.

30. ISSUE No.2 AND 6:- As these two issues are interlinked with each other, hence they are taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid repetition of facts and evidence.

31. The crucial question is whether the plaintiffs possess a present and independent right to demand partition and a 1/9th share during the lifetime of defendant No.1. The admitted position is that defendant No.1 is alive and is a party to the suit. The plaintiffs claim through defendant No.1 and defendant No.2. The plaintiffs contend that defendant No.2 married defendant No.1 after the death of his first wife. However, no marriage certificate, invitation, photograph, independent witness or other cogent evidence has been produced to establish the date and validity of such marriage. The mere support extended by defendant

No.1 and 2 cannot dispense with proof where the status of the marriage has been specifically disputed.

32. Sections 5 and 11 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 provide that a marriage solemnised while either party has a spouse living is void. Section 16 confers legitimacy upon children of void and voidable marriages, but sub-section (3) expressly limits their proprietary rights to the property of their parents and does not confer rights in the property of any other person.

33. The question is, can illegitimate daughters who satisfies the conditions of section 6A(d) of Hindu Succession (Karnataka Amendment) Act, 1990 or under section 6(1) of Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act, 2005 claim her right over ancestral property as a coparcener?. Section 16 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 speaks of legitimacy of children of void and voidable marriages. As per section 16(3) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, such children, though illegitimate are to be treated as legitimate,

notwithstanding that marriage was void or voidable. But the said provision confined their right of succession or inheritance only to the properties of their parents and not the properties of any other persons. After considering all these aspects, it is very clear that the illegitimate children cannot claim the status of coparceners with respect to ancestral property and it is only legitimate children who can claim the status of coparceners with respect to ancestral property.

34. Another question that arises for discussion is that after the death of their father, can such illegitimate children claim right over the share of their father in ancestral property as class I legal heir or their right is restricted only with respect to the self-acquired properties of their father?. **The Hon'ble Apex court of India between Jinia keotin V/s Kumar Sitaram Manjhi, reported in (2003) 1 SCC 730, between Neelamma V/s Sarojamma, reported in (2006) 9 SCC 612 and between Bharatha Matha V/s R.Vijaya Renganathan, reported in (2010) 11**

SCC 483 while discussing the rights of illegitimate children rights has held that illegitimate children would only be entitled to a share of the self-acquired property of the parents and not to the ancestral property.

35. The Hon'ble Apex Court between Revansasiddappa v.Mallikarjun, (2011) 11 SCC 1 at page 9 para 27 though referred the matter to larger bench but not accepted the interpretation of section 16(3) given in **Jinia keotin (2003) 1 SCC 730, Neelamma (2006) 9 SCC 612 and Bharatha Matha (2010) 11 SCC 483:(2010) 4 SCC (civ) 498. at para 28**, it is held that the legislature has used the word “property” in section 16(3) and is silent on whether such property is meant to be ancestral or self-acquired. Section 16 contains an express mandate that such children are only entitled to the property of their parents, and not of any other relation. At para 29 it is held that when such illegitimate children are considered as legitimate as per section 16(3) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, then they cannot be discriminated against and they will be on par

with other legitimate children, and be entitled to all the rights in the property of their parents, both self-acquired and ancestral.

36. The Hon'ble Apex court at para No.38, has further held that in the case of joint family property such children will be entitled only to a share in their parents property but they cannot claim it on their own right. Further held that logically, on the partition of an ancestral property, the property falling in the share of the parents of such children is regarded as their self-acquired and absolute property. Further held that the only limitation even after the amendment seems to be that during the lifetime of their parents such children cannot ask for partition but they can exercise this right only after the death of their parents.

37. The Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka between Kenchegowda v. K.B. Krishnappa, ILR 2008 Kar 3453 page 3483, while discussing the status of illegitimate children has clearly held that such illegitimate children are

not coparceners and they have no right to maintain a suit for partition with respect to ancestral property during the life time of their father. Further it is held that such illegitimate children have to wait till the death of their father and only after his death, they can maintain a suit for partition.

38. Therefore, on ration laid down by Hon'ble Supreme court of India and Hon'ble High Court it is crystal clear that illegitimate children cannot claim the status of coparceners with respect to ancestral property and they have no independent right over the said property. Hence an illegitimate daughter though satisfies the conditions under Section 6A(d) of Hindu Succession (Karnataka Amendment) Act, 1990 or under Section 6(1) of Hindu Succession (Amendment) Act, 2005 cannot claim the status of coparcener and she cannot maintain suit for partition with respect to ancestral property. It can be concluded that the illegitimate children will not get share in the ancestral property in their independent right as coparceners, but

they will get share in the property fallen to the share of their father as Class I legal heirs as per notional partition principle along with legitimate children subject to a condition that their father died intestate. If their father during his life time bequeathed his undivided share in the ancestral property to somebody else, then neither legitimate nor illegitimate children can claim such share of their father as per Section 8 to 10 of Hindu Succession Act, 1956. But in the self-acquired or separate property of a male Hindu, both legitimate and illegitimate children will get equal share as per the rules contained under Section 8 to 10 of Hindu Succession Act, 1956 provided the father died intestate. Hence suit of the plaintiff is not maintainable and plaintiff are not entitled for the relief as sought.

39. In **Revanasiddappa case**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court clarified that a child whose legitimacy is protected by Section 16 of the Hindu Marriage Act is entitled to rights in the property of his or her parents. In relation to Mitakshara

joint family property, such a child does not become a coparcener by birth and cannot claim a share in the joint family property in his or her own independent right. The entitlement is confined to the share of the parent, to be worked out in accordance with the Hindu Succession Act when succession opens.

40. Thus, even assuming in favour of the plaintiffs that they are children of a marriage to which Section 16 applies, their legitimacy is protected, but they do not, on that account, acquire coparcenary status in the larger ancestral estate of T.Pennappa@Giddappa. Their right is only in the property of their parent, defendant No.1, and not directly in the property of the grandfather or the other coparceners. As defendant No.1 is alive, succession to his estate has not opened. The plaintiffs cannot presently seek partition of the entire joint family estate by claiming an independent 1/9th share as coparceners. **Hence, in touchstone of reasons assigned above, this Court has answer Issue No.2 and 6 in the Negative.**

41. ISSUE No.7: In view of the aforesaid reasons and discussions on Issue No.1 to 6, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

**The suit of the Plaintiffs is hereby
dismissed with costs.**

Office to draw Decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer and transcribed by her, revised, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 13th day of July 2026.)

Sd/-

**(LAXMI BHAVANI SHANKRAPPA.)
IV Addl.Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Ballari.**

ANNEXURE

The witnesses examined on behalf of Plaintiffs:

PW1 : Smt.Parvathamma

The documents marked on behalf of Plaintiffs:

Ex.P1 : G-tree

Ex.P2 to 9 : RTCs

Ex.P10 to 12: Mutations

Ex.P13 : C/copy of partition deed.

The witnesses examined on behalf of Defendants:

DW1 : Takkalakote Doddabasappa

The documents marked on behalf of Defendants:

Nil

Sd/-

**IV Addl.Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Ballari.**