

KAKP310001052014



IN THE COURT OF THE CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC

AT: YELBURGA

: PRESENT :

Sri Sanjukumar Pachhapure

Civil Judge & JMFC Yelburga

Dated this 6th day of July-2026

OS No. 26/2014

Between:

1. Sri. Asarfalisab S/o S/oYamanoorsab Karakunti, (Deleted), by his legal heirs.

- 1(a). Sri Rahimsab S/o AshraAli Jarakunti Age: 44 years, Occ:Agriculture/ Business R/o: Yelburga Tq: Yelburga Dist: Koppal.

- 1(b). Sri Nabisab S/o AshraAli Jarakunti Age: 26 years, Occ: Agriculture/Business R/o: Yelburga Tq: Yelburga, Dist: Koppal.

...plaintiff/s

(R/by Sri S.A.Ningoji Advocate)

-Versus-

1. Sri Gundangouda S/o Siddramgouda
Balangoudar @ Bannimarad (Deleted)
by his legal heirs,
- 1(a). Smt Savitri W/o Sharanappa Arakeri
Age: 58 years, Occ: Agriculture R/o:
Yelburga village Tq: Yelburga and Dist:
Koppal.
- 1(b) Sri. Siddramagouda @ Siddappa S/o
Gundanagouda Balanagoudar @
Bannimarad, Age:51 years Occ
Agriculture, R/o Yelburga Tq: Yelburga,
Dist:Koppal.
- 1(c) Smt. Sridevi W/o Ayyanagouda Age 26
years Occ Agriculture R/o Navalagunda
Dist:Dharwad.
- 1(d) Smt.Renuka W/o Sharanappagouda
Karigoudar, Age: 24 years Occ:
Agriculture, R/o: Tondihal Tq: Yelburga
Dist: Koppal.
- 1(e) Sri.Mallanagouda S/o Gundanagouda
Balanagoudar @ Bannimarad, Age:22
years Occ Agriculture, R/o Yelburga Tq
Yelburga Dist Koppal.

2. Siddappa S/o Gundanagouda
 Balanagoudar, Age: 25 years Occ-
 Agriculture, R/o Ganji oni Yelburga,
 Dist: Koppal.

...defendant/s

(D-1 and 2 R/by Sri B.M. Shirur Advocate)
 (D-1(a) to (d) placed exparte) (D-1(b) & (c)
 R/by Sri U.S. Menasageri Advocate)

Date of suit	:	28-01-2014		
Nature of the suit	:	Suit for permanent injunction		
Date of evidence	:	17-11-2025		
Date of judgment	:	06-07-2026		
Total duration	:	Year/s	Month/s	Day/s
		12	05	09

(Sanjukumar Pachhapure)
 Civil Judge & JMFC Yelburga

-:: J U D G M E N T ::-

The plaintiff has filed the present suit against the defendant for the relief of permanent injunction with respect to the suit schedule property along with cost of the suit.

2. **The brief facts of the case of the plaintiff is as under:-**

It is averred that the suit schedule property is bearing RS.No.337 measuring 5 gunta situated at Yelburga town and boundaries is towards east NGO quarters, towards west Yelburga road, towards north TAPCMS Yelburga petrol bunk, towards south vetti shop and remaining land.

3. It is averred that, the plaintiff is the absolute owner and in possession of the suit schedule property and it was purchased by the plaintiff from the defendant for a valid consideration amount of Rs.40,000/- as per the registered sale deed dated 02.02.1992 and at the time of registration the survey number 669/1/338-A is mentioned instead of 699/4-337. Hence, the amended registered sale deed is executed by the defendant no.1 on 16.12.1998. Hence, the plaintiff is the absolute owner and person in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. It is averred that, after purchase of the suit property, the plaintiff became the absolute

owner and possessor of the property without obstruction from anybody. The defendant without having any sort of right or interest over the property is trying to interfere in the possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff by putting up the tin shed in the suit property without any valid reason. The defendants have interfered into the possession of the plaintiff by erecting the tin shed by threatening the plaintiff. The plaintiff is the innocent person and defendants are very influential persons. It is averred that, the defendant taking undue advantage of innocence of the plaintiff, they are hurry up to put up tin shed and due to this illegal act of the defendant, the plaintiff will be put to heavy loss.

4. It is averred that, under such circumstances, the plaintiff is entitle to get permanent injunction against the defendant. The defendants who are powerful persons and they are backed with rowdy elements and they are persisting in their illegal activities. And it became very difficult for the plaintiff to manage and resist their obstruction, for which the plaintiff, without

any alternative has approached the court, requesting the court to grant the temporary injunction order against the defendant. Hence, the plaintiff has approached the court. The cause of action was arose to file the present suit in the second week of January 2014 and other subsequent dates, when the defendant has interfered with the possession of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property. Therefore, the plaintiff has prayed for judgment and decree.

5. After registration of the suit the summons was issued to the defendant and summons is served and thereafter defendant has appeared before the court through their counsel and defendant has filed the detail written statement.

6. **The brief facts of the case of the defendant is as under:**

The defendant has denied the entire case and claim of the plaintiff in his written statement. It is contented that, the land bearing survey number 337-338-A and a old survey number 659-1 is measuring 1 acre 4 gunta situated

at Yelburga town and it was owned and possessed by one Sri Sutharamgouda, son of Sri.Gundanagouda, Balannagaudar, resident of Yelburga and who is the father of defendant no.1 and grandfather of defendant no.2. And thereafter, out of survey number 337/338/ಃ, old survey number 659/1 is measuring 1 acre 4 gunta and to the extent of 16 gunta is acquired by the Assistant Commissioner, Koppal by order dated LA/2/161/65-66 dated 22.01.1968 to the extent of 1 acre of 25 gunta is sold to Sri.Shantavirappa S/o Andappa Manashetty and also 5 gunta land has gone for road formation along back. Therefore in all 3 items is come in total is land 25 gunta and 22, 25 annas. The 22 gunta and 25 annas it would be deducted in total 1 acre 4 gunta it will come the remaining land will be 21 gunta 75 annas is in the name of defendant no.1. And in the above said total land, the plaintiff has purchased 5 gunta in survey number 337-338/a and old survey number 659-1 and the said 5 gunta would be deducted, then the remaining land in 16 gunta is in the name of defendant no.1 and accordingly mutation has taken place on all transaction wise. And it is contented that,

without admitting that, the alleged rectification of registered sale deed is executed on 13.12.1998 by the defendant no. 1, the defendant no.2 has not given consent of both alleged registered sale deed. The consent of the defendant no.2 is necessary as it is an ancestral property. And in view of this, the defendant no.1 is not party to the alleged sale deeds. Hence, the sale deeds are not at all binding upon the defendant no.2.

7. It is contented that, as this defendant has already stated above the land No.337-338/A, old No.659/1 of Yelburga is one and the same. The said survey number never separated one and same is continued till today. It is contented that, there is no any cause of action to file the present suit and shown in the plaint is imaginary and on other various grounds stated in the written statement the defendant has prayed for dismissal of the suit.

8. **The brief facts of the case of the defendant 1-B is as under:**

The defendant no.1-B has denied the case and claim of the plaintiff in the written statement. It is contented that the plaintiff has shown the wrong boundary and has not shown the boundary as per the sale deed and he is not in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. The plaintiff has filed the present suit against the defendant for a relief of permanent injunction and without the relief of deterioration the suit itself is not maintainable in the eyes of law. Hence, the suit is liable to be dismissed.

9. It is contented that, the defendants have submitted the hand sketch map along with the written statement wherein it is shown that, the suit schedule property is shown as A, B, C, D, the property shown as C, D, E, F and E, F, G, H belongs to the defendants. The plaintiff has encroached upon the property of the defendants and recently have got encroached upon the property and have erected the shed. It is contented that, the plaintiff has got created the document colluding with the revenue official and now he is taking undue

advantage of the same is trying to interfere with the possession of the defendants over the suit schedule property. Therefore, the suit is liable to be dismissed with costs.

10. It is contented that, the suit was filed in OS No.74/1999 against the father of the defendants one Sri. Gundanaguda Dhamappa S/o Maharudappa Badigeer for the possession of the suit schedule property and in the said suit the parties have got compromised on 08.07.2002 and in the said suit the boundaries of the suit schedule property have been shown and compared to the said boundaries the defendant the plaintiff has shown the wrong boundary in the present suit. Therefore, on other various grounds stated in the written statement the defendant no.1(C) prayed for dismissal of this suit.

11. On the bases of said pleadings, documents and on perusal of the material on record the following issues were framed :

-:: I S S U E S ::-

1. Whether the plaintiff proves that, he was in lawful possession of the suit property as on the date of filing of suit?
2. Whether the plaintiff further proves the alleged interference made by the defendants?
3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relieves as sought for?
4. What order or decree?

12. In order to substantiate his case the plaintiff has examined himself as PW.1 and the PW.1 got marked the documents as Ex.P1 to P7 and closed his side of evidence. And on the other hand, the defendant No.1(b) has got examined himself as DW.1 and he produced and got marked 25 documents as Ex.D1 to D25 and closed his side of evidence.

13. Heard the arguments of both sides at length in great detail and perused the material on record by way of pleadings, by oral and documentary evidence and

upon going the same the answers to the above said issues.

Issue No.1	:Partly In the affirmative.
Issue No.2	: In the Negative.
Issue No.3	: In the Negative.
Issue No.4	: As per the final order;

14. The above said answers are supported with the following:

-:: R E A S O N S ::-

15. **Issue No.1** : The burden of proof of the present issue is on the plaintiff that, whether he was in lawful possession of the suit property as on the date of the filing of the suit.

The case of the plaintiff and defendant is already stated above in detail. It is the main contention taken by the plaintiff is that, the plaintiff is the absolute owner and person in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property through the registered sale deed. And from the date of the sale deed is in possession and enjoyment of the property and the defendant without

having any right or interest in possession over the property is trying to interfere with the possession therefore the plaintiff has approached the court. And on the other hand, the defendant has denied the case of the plaintiff and has contented that the defendants never interfered with the possession of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property, the false suit is filed against him. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the suit.

16. That during the pendency of the suit the original plaintiff was died and the LRs were brought on record. The plaintiff no.1-B in order to prove his case and also to disprove the case of the defendant got examined as PW1. The PW1 has filed the evidence affidavit in lieu of examination in chief wherein he has reiterated the contents of the plaint averments as already stated above in detail. The PW1 in support of his oral contention, he got marked the documents as Ex.P1 to Ex.P7. Ex.P1 is the RTC extract with respect to property bearing No.337/* measuring 5 guntas standing in the name of plaintiff. Ex.P2 is the notice issued in MA

No.10/2015. Ex.P3 is the official memorandum issued by the Assistant Commissioner of Koppal dated 29.07.2002 wherein it shows that the suit schedule property is converted for non-agricultural purpose. Ex.P4 is the map with respect to suit schedule property. Ex.P5 is the statement dated 23-8-2012. Ex.P6 is the statement. Ex.P7 is the map with respect to suit schedule property.

17. The PW1 has been subjected for cross-examination wherein he deposed in accordance with his case. The PW1 has deposed that, the measurement of the suit schedule property is 5 gunta and survey number is 699/4-337 and deposed the boundaries. The PW1 has denied the sale deed dated 27.02.1997 executed in the name of his father and also sale deed dated 01.01.1999. The PW1 has admitted that at the time of purchase of the suit schedule property, the road was single. The PW1 has deposed that the one shop is situated in the suit schedule property. The PW1 has admitted that the Sai Associates the advocate office is situated in the suit schedule property and adjoining with

the same the advocate office of Sri Hadapada and Aaraballi is also situated. The PW1 has admitted that thereafter the co-operative bank is situated and thereafter Nidagundi Saavaji Khanavali is situated and thereafter, Karnataka one shop is situated. The PW1 has admitted the Ex.P4 and also the sketch shown in Ex.P4. And other suggestions were denied by the witness.

18. The original defendant during the pendency of the suit was died and he is legal heirs were brought on record as D-1(a to e). And on the other hand in order to disprove the case of the plaintiff and also to prove their case the defendant no.1-B got examined as DW1. The DW1 has filed the evidence affidavit in lieu of examination in chief, wherein he has reiterated the contents of the plaint averments as already stated above in detail. The DW1 in support of his oral contention, he got marked the documents as Ex.D1 to Ex.D25. Ex.D1 is the certified copy of order sheet filed in OS No.74/1999. Ex.D2 is the plaint filed in OS.No.74/1999. Ex.D3 is the written settlement filed in

OS.No.74/1999. Ex.D4 is the compromise petition. Ex.D5 is the certified copy of issues. Ex.D6 is the compromise decree. Ex.D7 and D8 are the depositions. Ex.D9 and Ex. D10 are the certified copy of RTC extract with respect to suit schedule property of the year 1998 to 1999. Ex.D11 to 20 are the photos and CD. Ex.D21 is the receipt, Ex.D.22 is the certificate. Ex.D23 is the certified copy of ME No.45. Ex.D24 is the certified copy of sale deed dated 20.02.1997 executed in favour of the plaintiff by the defendant. Ex.D25 is the certified copy of sale deed dated 16.12.1998 executed by the defendant in favour of the plaintiff.

19. The DW1 has been subjected for cross-examination wherein he deposed that the suit survey number is 337-338 in total measuring 2 acre 8 guntas. And earlier it was standing in the name of his grandfather. And out of it, 16 gunta has been acquired by his father. And out of it, 16 gunta has been acquired by the government for establishing the post office. The DW1 has deposed that, he has produced the RTC

extract. The DW1 has deposed that, he has produced the RTC extract from the year 1965 to 2000. The DW1 has deposed that the RTC is standing in his name at the time of filing of the suit and he has produced the said document. The DW1 has admitted that his father has sold 5 gunta of land in favour of the plaintiff in the year 1997 and boundary is towards east: PWD quarters towards west: Road, towards South petrol bunk, towards North remaining land belongs to the defendant. The DW1 has deposed that, he do not know the boundary mentioned in the sale deed and the suit is filed as per the boundaries shown in the sale deed. The DW1 has admitted that he does not know the documents filed by the plaintiff in the present case. The DW1 has admitted that the plaintiff is in possession of the suit schedule property, but witness deposed that at the time of purchase of the suit schedule property the road was single and now the road has been widened. As such, 2 gunta has been acquired by the concerned authority for forming the road. The DW1 has admitted that the Ex. P24 and Ex.P25 are the sale deeds with respect to suit

schedule property executed in favour of the father of the plaintiff. The DW1 has admitted that in the Ex.P25 the server number is modified but not the boundary. The DW1 has admitted that his father has filed the suit as per Ex.D1 and he has admitted the boundaries shown in the said suit.

20. The DW1 has deposed that he do not know the english language. The DW1 has deposed that, he has produced the RTC extract with respect to suit schedule property of the year 2014 and the land is shown as 16 gunta. The DW1 has deposed that as per Ex.D19 and D20, he has prepared a video, but he do not know the date and time. The DW1 has admitted that survey number 337 and 338 are in Ex.D19 and D20. The DW1 has deposed that the property shown in Ex.P17 and Ex.P18 belongs to him and remaining shops were belongs to the plaintiff. And other suggestions denied by the witness.

21. It is well settled law that the following conditions are necessary for seeking the relief of

permanent injunction: The conditions that are the applicable for the grant of the permanent injunction are:

1. There must be legal rights express or implied in favour of the applicant.
2. Such right must be violated or there should be invasion.
3. Such right should be an existing one.
4. The case should be fit for the exercise for courts discretion.
5. It should not fall with in the spare of the restraining provisions contained in or referred to in section 41 of Specific Relief Act.

22. Therefore, on over all perusal of the oral and documentary evidence of the plaintiff and the defendants, wherein it clearly discloses that, the plaintiff is claiming his lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. The plaintiff has contended in his plaint that, he is the absolute owner and person in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as per the registered sale deed dated 02/02/1992 and also as per the rectified sale deed dated 16/12/1998, the

plaintiff has purchased the suit schedule property from the defendant. And on the other hand, the defendant has not disputed the possession and title of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property. The defendant has raised the objection regarding the boundaries shown in the plaint, the defendant has not disputed the case of the plaintiff. And on the other hand, the defendant has admitted that, he has sold the suit schedule property in favour of the plaintiff as per the registered sale deed and the defendant is in possession of the property in the remaining land.

23. The contention of the plaint averments shows that the boundary of the suit schedule property towards East the NGO quarters, towards West road, towards North T.A.P.C.M.S. Yelburga petrol bank and towards South Vetti shop and remaining land. The PW1 during his cross-examination, he has deposed the boundaries of the suit schedule property is towards East NGO quarters towards West Yelburga-Koppal road towards North T.A.P.C.M.S. land and towards South the shop. The

Ex-P3, the NA order passed by the Assistant Commissioner of Koppal, discloses the boundaries of the suit schedule property is towards East survey number 300, towards West road towards North the empty land towards South the Vetti shop. There is a lot of differentiation in the boundaries shown by the plaintiff himself in his plaint and also the documents produced by himself. The plaintiff is claiming that, he is the absolute owner and person in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as per registered sale deed and he has shown the boundaries as per registered sale deed, but he has not placed the same document, before this court to know that whether the plaintiff is the owner and person in possession and enjoyment of this suit schedule property as contended in the plaint. And on the contrary, the defendants have produced the documents as per Ex.D-24 and 25, that is certified copy of sale deed and also the rectified certified copy of sale deed executed by the defendant in favour of the plaintiff. The Ex.D-24 the registered sale deed clearly discloses the boundaries of the suit schedule property is

towards East NGO quarters, towards West Yelburga Koppal road, towards North T.A.P.C.M.S Yelburga petrol bunk and towards South the remaining land. And further, again there is a contrary in between the documents produced by the plaintiff and also relied by the plaintiff, wherein it clearly shows that the plaintiff has not proved the boundaries before this court by way of producing cogent, reliable and probable documentary evidence. And further the records shows that the plaintiff has purchased the suit schedule property and he has taken the order from the Assistant Commissioner as per the Ex-P3. And thereafter, whether the suit schedule property has been converted for non-agricultural purpose or commercial purpose has not been pleaded before the court and have not been placed any documents before this court. The Ex.P3 clearly discloses that, the said order is passed by the Assistant Commissioner on 29/7/2002. And further, the plaintiff has produced the Ex.P1, the RTC extract with respect to suit schedule property, it shows that the said land is an agricultural land.

24. And further, the defendant has admitted the Ex.P.4 the map issued by the surveyor and the Ex.P4 will not disclose the boundaries of the suit schedule property. And further Ex.P-5, 6, 7 are the statement, sketch with respect to suit schedule property, but nowhere it is properly shown the boundaries of the suit schedule property. And on the other hand, the defendants have disputed the boundary and have placed the documents before this court as per Ex-D1 to D25. The plaintiff in order to show his boundaries, he has produced the Ex.P-3 and except the said document, he has not placed other relevant documents like sale deed and boundary certificate or any other relevant documents regarding the exact boundaries of the suit schedule property.

25. The plaintiff himself has admitted the suit schedule property in Ex.D-11 to D14 photos and further admitted the property of the defendants in Ex.D-15, 16, 17, 18. The above said photos clearly establishes about the existence of the shops particularly the advocate

office by name Sri Amaresh's Hadapada and Mr.Aaraballi and also shows about the existence of SMK cold drinks and Sri Biralingeswar Enterprises and Sri Soubhagya Sahakari Pattina Sangha and Santosh Saavaji Khanavali, Karnataka one and other complexes in the suit schedule property. Ex.D-15 shows about the existence of Ganapati Steels and Gas Welding Works, Sreenidhi Bike Service Center, Sri New Annapurneshwari Khanavali and Manjunath Bike Garage and Meraj Steel Works and other complexes. The above said exhibits clearly establishes the fact that, the plaintiff and defendants have given their properties for commercial purpose and there they clearly establishes about the existence of the complexes and shops.

26. The actual existence of the properties is clearly reflected in Ex.D-11 to D-20, the photos and CD, but with respect to the said fact, there is no pleading by the plaintiff or the defendant. And further, the plaintiff or defendant have not disclosed the true facts before this court regarding the existence of the shops and

complexes and other related workshops in the suit schedule property and also in the property of the defendants. And further, the Ex.D-24 and 25 are the certified copy of sale deed and rectified sale deed and have not been disputed by the plaintiff or the defendants. And further, the oral evidence of PW1 and DW1 clearly establishes the fact about the earlier ownership of the defendant and thereafter he has sold the property in favour of plaintiff. And at the time of execution of the sale deed, the road shown in the plaint is in a single road and now it has been made as a double road. And further shows about the existence of the other facts with respect to suit schedule property.

27. The defendant has disputed the boundaries of the suit schedule property, then the burden is upon the plaintiff to establish the boundaries by way of producing the cogent, reliable and probable documentary evidence. And further, the plaintiff has not examined the witnesses regarding the adjoining owners of the suit schedule property and not produced or

collected any relevant documents to show the boundaries of the suit schedule property. Though, the documents before this court clearly shows about the boundaries, but there is no conclusive evidence to come to the conclusion that the boundaries shown in the plaint are true and correct. Therefore, the plaintiff has shown the possession over the suit schedule property and the plaintiff has utterly failed to show the boundaries as shown in the plaint. And further, when the plaintiff has failed to show the boundaries of the suit schedule property as contended in the plaint, then he has utterly failed to prove that, the defendant is trying to interfere with the possession of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property. Therefore, the plaintiff has proved his possession over the suit schedule property, but he has utterly failed to prove the boundaries of the suit schedule property and the interference made by the defendant over the suit schedule property by way of producing cogent, reliable and probable documentary evidence. Accordingly, point, issue No.1 is answered partly in the affirmative and issue No.2 in the negative.

28. **Issue No.3:** The burden proof of the present issue on the plaintiff that whether he is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction. In review of the findings on issue No.1 & 2, wherein this court has held that the plaintiff has utterly failed to prove the possession over the suit schedule property with correct boundaries and also the plaintiff has utterly failed to prove that the interference made by the defendant over the suit schedule property by way of producing cogent, reliable and probable documentary evidence. Therefore, the plaintiff is not entitled for relief of permanent injunction as claimed in the suit. Accordingly, issue No.3 is answered in the negative.

29. **Issue No.4:-** In view of the findings on issue No.1 to 3 and also considering the facts and circumstances of the case the court proceed to pass the following:

-:: O R D E R ::-

The suit filed by the plaintiffs is
hereby dismissed.

No order as to cost.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer Gr-III on computer typed and computerized by her, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open Court on this the 6th day of July 2026)

(Sanjukumar Pachhapure)
Civil Judge & JMFC Yelburga.

-:: ANNEXURE ::-

List of witnesses examined on behalf of plaintiff's

PW-1 : Sri. Nabisab S/o Asharafali Jarakunti

List of documents marked on behalf of plaintiff's. Exhs.

Ex.P-1 : RTC

Ex.P-2 : Mutation Register

Ex.P-3 : Official Memorandum.

Ex.P-4 : Map

Ex.P-5 & 6 : Statements

Ex.P-7 : Map

List of witnesses examined on behalf of defendants

DW-1: Sri. Siddramagouda @ Siddappa S/o
Gundanagouda Balanagoudar @
Bannimarad,

List of documents marked on behalf of defendants Exhs.

Ex.D-1 : C.C. of Order sheet

Ex.D-2 : C.C. of Complaint in O.S.No.74/1999

- Ex.D-3 : C.C. of W.S. in O.S.No.74/1999
- Ex.D-4 : C.C. of compromise petition in O.S.No.74/1999
- Ex.D-5 : C.C. of issues in O.S.No.74/1999
- Ex.D-6 : C.C. of compromise decree in O.S.No.74/1999
- Ex.D-7 & 8 : C.C. of depositions in O.S.No.74/1999
- Ex.D-9 & 10: RTC Extracts
- Ex.D-11 to 18: Photos
- Ex.D-19 & 20: CDs
- Ex.D-21 : Photo bill
- Ex.D-22 : Certificate
- Ex.D-23 : Mutation Register Extract.
- Ex.D-24 & 25: Sale deeds.

(Sanjukumar Pachhapure)
Civil Judge & JMFC Yelburga

(Judgment is pronounced in open court)
(Vide separate sheets)

-:: O R D E R ::-

The suit filed by the plaintiffs is
hereby dismissed.

No order as to cost.

Draw decree accordingly.

Civil Judge & JMFC Yelburga

