



Present: **Mahesh.B.T.,**
B.Com., LL.M.,
Senior Civil Judge & J.M.F.C.,
H.D.Kote.

Dated : On this the 31st July, 2026

Plaintiff/s : 1. Ningaraju
S/o. Late. Biliyaiath
Aged about 40 years
R/at. Machare Village
Antharasanthe Hobli
H.D.Kote Taluk.

2. Smt. Ningamani
W/o. Lakshmana.H
aged about 37 years
R/at.Hosamala Village
Antharasanthe Hobli
H.D.Kote Taluk.

3. Smt. Surendri
W/o. Mahesh
Aged about 35 years
R/at. Sogalli Village
Antharasanthe Hobli

H.D.Kote Taluk.

(By Sri. M.N.R.,Advocate)

-V/s-

Defendant/s : 1. Smt. Rathanamma
W/o. Late. Sannaswamaiah
Aged about 58 years

2. Sri. Ningaraju
S/o. Late. Sannaswamaiah
Aged about 35 years

3. Smt. Jayasheela
W/o Rudra
D/o. Late. Sannaswamaiah
Aged about 32 years

R/at. Matakere Village
Kasaba Hobli, H.D.Kote Taluk
Mysuru district.

4. Sri.Suresha
S/o. Late. Sannaswamaiah
Aged about 30 years

Defendant Nos.1, 2 and 4 are
residing at Hirehally 'A' Colony
Kasaba Hobli
H.D.Kote Taluk
Mysuru District.

(Rep By Sri.J.C.K., Advo.,)

Date of institution of the Suit	09.08.2023
Nature of the Suit	Declaration & Injunction

Date of commencement of recording of evidence	30.05.2024
Date on which the Judgment was pronounced	31.07.2026
Total duration	Years /s Month/s day/s 02 11 22

Sd/-
(Mahesh.B.T)
Senior Civil Judge & J.M.F.C
H.D.Kote

J U D G M E N T

The plaintiffs have filed the suit for the relief of declaration and permanent injunction in respect of suit schedule property against the defendants.

2. The brief case of the plaintiffs are as under:

The case of the plaintiffs are that, they are the children of Late. Biliyaiah S/o. Late. Ningaiah of Machare Village, Antharasanthe Hobali, H.D.Kote Taluk and are the only surviving legal heirs of Late. Biliyaiah. That they have been in absolute possession and enjoyment of land Sy.No.1/35 measuring 3.00 acres situated at Machare Village, Antharasanthe Hobali, H D Kote Taluk more fully described in the schedule. That the suit schedule property was granted to their father Late. Biliyaiah vide land grant No.LND No.1/1977-78 and he was in

possession and had been in absolute and enjoyment of the suit schedule land getting change of khatha to his name vide Khatha No.72.

3. Further it is stated that, Sannaswamaiah husband of defendant No.1 and father of the rest of the defendants in connivance with the revenue officials got change of khatha to an extent of 1.20 acres vide MR. dated 07.03.1992 without having any grounds or document to support and cause change of khatha without noticing Late. Biliyaiah, father of the plaintiffs. That Late. Biliyaiah challenged the said change of khatha vide his appeal bearing No. RA.215/2022 before the court of Assistant Commissioner, Hunsur and the said appeal was disposed directing the appellant to approach the civil court as the Revenue Courts are not authorized to consider appeal challenging change of khatha held more than 20 years ago. That said Biliyaiah died on 12.06.2022 and the issue could not be pursued.

4. Further it is stated that, the plaintiffs recently approached the revenue authorities to collect revenue documents to file a civil suit seeking justice and to their shock they came to know that the defendants got change of pouthy khatha to an extent of 1.20 acres to the name of defendant No.1 taking advantage of the previous

khatha in the name of Late. Sannaswamaiah which was under challenge and questioned vide RA.No.215/2022 before the court of Assistant Commissioner, Hunsur. That even the revenue authority without looking in to the history and questioning of khatha of the suit schedule land and without taking into the actual possession and enjoyment of suit schedule land by the plaintiff changed khatha to the name of defendant No.1 illegally.

5. Further it is stated that, the defendants taking advantage of khatha standing in the name of defendant No.1 which was obtained by creating fake records and falsifying facts, are trying to dispossess the plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs are apprehending that the defendants may stoop to any level to snatch the suit property from the hands of the plaintiffs. That the defendants are now deploying all their might and demanding the plaintiffs either to leave possession or to face life threats saying that the plaintiffs cannot do anything as they got khatha in the name of defendant No.1 and they will not allow the plaintiffs to get change of khatha to their names at any cost and also will not leave them to enjoy the suit property peacefully.

6. Further it is stated that, the defendants have been interrupting the absolute and continuous peaceful

possession of the plaintiffs of their property left by their father for their welfare which was his self acquired property by way of land grant to him. That it is very necessary to prevent them from their illegal interference to have peaceful and lawful possession of the suit property as the defendants are also not heeding to the advice of the village elders. That they continue to disturb and that on 02.08.2023 the defendants came near the suit property and showing some papers threatened them to vacate the possession of the suit property abusing and causing life threats. That it is very difficult to stop them as either the protest by the plaintiffs or the sane advice of the village elders did not yield result until getting justice from this court. Hence this suit praying declaration and consequential relief of permanent injunction.

7. After service of summons, the defendants have appeared before the court through their counsel and filed their written statement. Defendants in their written statement contended that, the plaintiffs father, the defendant's No.1 husband's father, Late Ningaiah had a total of 4 sons, the first being Late Chikkaningaiah, the second being Biliyaiah, i.e., the plaintiffs' father, the third being Sannaswamaiah i.e. the defendant's No.1 husband and the fourth being the father of the defendant No.4. The suit property is a land granted to

the entire family, and the plaintiffs' father, Late Biliyaiah, divided 1-20 guntas of the suit property to the east of the suit property on date 16.12.1996, the land surveyor measured it and drawn Mahazar, published it under the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, and on the basis of possession and on the basis of the partition letter, khatha was transferred in the name of the Late Sannaswamaiah, the husband of the defendant No.1 and the father of the defendants No.2 to 4, as per M.R.No.3/1991-92. Since the date of the khatha, the husband of the defendant No.1 and the father of the defendants No.2 to 4 have been in possession. Recently, i.e. on 09.09.2020, Sannaswamaiah passed away. After his death, the defendants have had possession of the scheduled property. They are in the continuous possession for about 31 years. After the death of the husband of the defendant No.1 and the father of the defendant No.2 to 4 Late. Sannaswamaiah, an application was filed before the office of the H.D.Kote Tahsildar to get an khata under the pauti. The father of the plaintiffs filed a suit in the H.D.Kote court seeking a declaration of ownership and a permanent injunction for 1-20 guntas of land out of the 3-00 acres of land sanctioned in O.S.No.426/2012, but when the defendants filed an application for pauti khata for the remaining 1-20 guntas of land, the father of the

plaintiffs filed a objection to the application. A case was registered in the court of H.D.Kote Tahsildar vide RRTC (Dispute) C.R.No.152/2020-210 and notices were sent to both the parties in connection with the said case, which was heard and a joint khatha was made in favor of the defendants. After the court of H.D.Kote Tahsildar ordered a joint khatha of 1-20 guntas of land in the name of the defendants, after death of plaintiff's father to cause trouble to the defendants, the plaintiff No.1 challenged the order of the Tahsildar and filed an appeal vide R.A. No. 215/2022 in the Honorable Sub-Divisional Officer's Court, Hunsur. Since, plaintiffs questioned the khata after a lapse of 30 years, the said court has dismissed the appeal.

8. Further it is contended that, Even before filing the said suit, the plaintiff's father Late Biliyaiah had already filed a suit against his brother Late Chikkaningaiah in the H.D.Kote Add., Civil Court in relation to the suit property, seeking the same relief sought in the said suit vide O.S.No.426/2012, seeking a declaration of ownership in respect of 1-20 gunte of the 3-00 acre land. When the plaintiff's father was alive, while filing the suit under O.S.No.426/2012, he stated in his pleadings that he had left 1-20 guntas of land to the east of the suit property to his younger brother, Late

Sannaswamaiah, i.e. the husband of the defendant No.1 and the father of the defendants No.2 to 4, Sannasomaiah. Accordingly, he has admitted that he had left the land to the husband of the defendant No.1 by way of partition at the time of contesting by the plaintiff's father in the suit under O.S.No.426/2012. The plaintiffs' father himself has given up the land through partition and accordingly, it is apparent that he has the right of possession. Even though the plaintiffs were aware of the said facts, they have created this false suit to trouble the defendants. In the schedule of the suit in O.S.No.426/2012, the plaintiffs' father has sought a declaration of ownership and a permanent injunction for only 1-20 guntas of the 3-00 acres of land. However, the plaintiffs have changed the said matters and have brought this false suit seeking a declaration of ownership and a permanent injunction for the 3-00 acres of land allotted to the plaintiffs' father by including the 1-20 guntas of land in the defendants' right of possession. The plaintiffs have been in possession of 1-20 guntas of the 3-00 acres of the suit property for about 30-31 years and after the death of the defendants' father, they have peaceful possession by making an khatha under the will. Since the plaintiffs' father is dead and the defendants' father is dead, the plaintiffs have brought this false suit against the

defendants to seize the 1-20 guntas of land in which the defendants are in possession. Hence prayed to dismiss the suit.

9. Based on the rival pleadings of the parties, this office has framed the following issues:

ISSUES

1. Whether plaintiffs prove that they are the absolute owners and in possession of suit schedule property?
2. Whether the plaintiffs further prove the interference caused by the defendants?
3. Whether the plaintiffs are entitle for the relief of declaration and permanent injunction as claimed by them?
4. What order or decree?

10. The plaintiffs in order to prove their case, plaintiff No.1 got examined as PW1 and produced documentary evidence as per the Ex.P1 to Ex.P10. To prove the case of the defendant No.2, himself examined as DW1 and marked Ex.D1 to D9 documents and one more witness was examined as DW2.

11. Heard the arguments of counsel for defendants and perused the written argument of the plaintiffs.

12. The findings of this court on aforesaid issues are as under:

Issue No.1	In the Negative
Issue No.2	In the Negative
Issue No.3	In the Negative
Issue No.4	As per final order for the following:

REASONS

13. ISSUE No.1 and 2:- Both the issues are interlinked with each other, hence they are taken together for common discussion to avoid the repetition.

14. This is the suit filed by the plaintiffs for the reliefs of the declaration and injunction. Before advertng into the case it is to be noted here that, on what circumstances instant suit came to be registered. The plaintiffs have filed the instant suit for the relief of the declaration and injunction. It is the case of the plaintiffs is that, plaintiff are the owners and in possession of the suit schedule property. The defendants without having any right over the suit schedule property mutated their

name in the portion of the suit schedule property trying to interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Further it is stated that, suit schedule property was granted in the name of his father Late. Biliyaiah from the Government. Thereafter, the father of the plaintiff was in possession and enjoyment of the same, after his death his legal heirs i.e., in the plaintiffs are in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property.

15. Per contra, defendants contended that, they are the owners of the portion of the suit schedule property for the extent of 1 acre 20 guntas towards the eastern side, Further it is stated suit schedule property was granted to the joint family and suit schedule property is the joint family property and as per the partition and in the family 1 acre 20 guntas of the property towards eastern side fallen to the share of the defendants. Further it is stated that, during the life time of the father of the plaintiffs have challenged the said property in O.S.No.426/2012 and same was dismissed and now once again they have come up with the false suit. Further it is to be noted that, the father of the plaintiffs already in O.S.No.426/2012 have filed the suit for the same relief and in the said case the father of the plaintiffs claimed right over the 1 acre 20 guntas in the suit schedule

property and same was decreed in their favour. Now, once again plaintiffs have filed the instant suit claiming the ownership over the suit schedule property.

16. To prove the case, plaintiff No.1 himself examined as PW1 and filed affidavit evidence in lieu of his examination-in-chief. In the affidavit PW.1 reiterated the plaint averments and in support of his case PW.1 has produced Ex.P1 to Ex.P10 documents, Ex.P1 is the certified copy of the grant certificate, Ex.P2 is the certified copy of the Revenue Inspector's report, Ex.P3 is the certified copy of the map, Ex.P4 is the certified copy of M.R.No.7-1991/92, Ex.P5 and 6 are the certified copy of two handwritten RTCs, Ex.P7 is the computerized RTC, Ex.P8 certified copy of the order of A.C.Hunsur dated 10.7.2023, Ex.9 is the Death Certificate of plaintiff father and Ex.P10 is the computerized copy of the RTC.

17. The defendants to substantiate their contention defendant No.2 got examined as DW1 and produced documentary evidence as per Ex.D1 to Ex.D9 documents and one more witness was examined as DW2. Ex.D1 is the RTC for the year 1990-91 to 1999-2000 and 2014-15, Ex.D2 is the MR Extract, Ex.D3 is the witness examination and cross-examination of Biliyaiah and Ningaraju in OS 426/2012, Ex.D4 is the copy of the

order of R.R.T.C.R.152/2020-21, Ex.D5 is the copy of the order in R.A.115/2022, Ex.D6 is the RTC with respect to Sy.No.1 of Mattare Village for the year 2022-23, Ex.D7 is the M.R. Extract No.5/2022-23, Ex.D8 is the RTC with respect Sy.No.1 of Mattare Village for the year 2023-24 and Ex,D9 is the copy of the judgment and decree in O.S.426/2012.

18. It is not in dispute that, suit schedule property bearing Sy.No.1/35, measuring to an extent of 3 acres situated at Macchare Village, granted to the father of the plaintiffs by the Government vide No.LND1A 1/77-78. As per the case of the plaintiffs they are in the possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property for the entire extent. Whereas, defendants taken the contention that, suit schedule property was granted to the joint family and it is the joint family property and in the family partition portion of the suit schedule property for the extent of 1 acre 20 guntas fallen to the share of the father of the defendants. After the death of their father they are in the possession and enjoyment of the 1 acre 20 guntas land in the suit schedule property. In spite of having the knowledge of the same plaintiffs have filed false suit for the relief of declaration and injunction.

19. On going through the Ex.P1 which is the grant certificated issued by the Government infavour of the father of the plaintiff/Biliyaiah. Now, plaintiffs also claiming the same that suit schedule property was granted in the name of plaintiffs father to a joint family, thereafter in the partition their father received 1 acre 20 guntas of land in the suit schedule property and after the death of their father defendants are in the possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Plaintiffs also produced the Ex.P2 which is report given by the revenue inspector with respect to the possession in the suit schedule property. Ex.P3 is the sketch. It is to be noted here that, on going through the Ex.P1 to 3 it is no doubt that, suit schedule property was granted to the father of the plaintiffs and he was in possession of the suit schedule property. Even grant made in the name of the father of the plaintiffs is admitted by the defendants, but they have taken the contention that, said grant was made in the name of the father of the plaintiffs for the joint family. The main crux of the case is that, whether the father of the plaintiffs given the $\frac{1}{2}$ share to the father of the defendant No.2 to 4 as per the family partition.

20. Plaintiffs also produced Ex.P4 which is the MR.No.3/1991-92 dated 07.03.1992 on going through the said MR it can be seen that, as per the family

partition suit schedule property divided between the father of the plaintiffs and father of the defendants. Plaintiffs also produced Ex.P5 and 6 which are the handwritten RTCs for the year 1982-83 to 1989-90. On careful perusal of the said documents it can be seen that, the name of the father of the plaintiffs appearing in the column No.9. Further plaintiffs also produced Ex.P7 which is the computerized RTC for the year 2019-20 with respect to the suit schedule property. On careful perusal of the same it can be seen that father of the plaintiffs and father of the defendant No.2 to 4 and husband of the defendant No.1 is appearing in the column No.9 of the RTC. Further plaintiff also produced Ex.P8 which is certified copy of the order dated 10.07.2023 by the learned Assistant Commissioner, Hunsur in RA.No.215/2022, wherein AC dismissed the application asking the both the parties to approach the civil court. Hence plaintiffs are here before this court. Further it is to be noted here that, earlier the father of the plaintiffs had also filed declaration and injunction suit against this defendants along with others and in the said suit father had claimed ownership of 1 acre 20 guntas out of the suit schedule property and same was decreed. Now, once again the children of the Biliyaiah come before the court with the instant suit claiming right over the entire extent of the suit schedule property. By stating that, their

father was innocent he do not know what case he has filed. Further they also stated that these defendants have no right over the suit schedule property by colluding with the revenue officials got mutated their name.

21. The defendants seriously taken the contention that, as per the partition in the family, their father got right over the 1 acre 20 guntas in the suit schedule property. defendants produced old RTCs at Ex.D1 and 2 which are the documents already produced by the plaintiff at Ex.P1 to 4. The defendants also produced the Ex.D3 certified copies of the examination-in-chief affidavit of Biliyaiah and his son Ningaraju who is the plaintiff No.1 in the instant case. On careful perusal of Ex.D3, which is the examination-in-chief and cross examination of father of the defendants in O.S.No.426/2012, he clearly admits the possession of the defendants for the extent of 1 acre 20 guntas in the suit schedule property. During the course of the cross examination, he clearly admits that he had given the portion of the land in the suit schedule property through the partition to the father of the defendants. Further in the said evidence he also admits the partition taken place in the family and as per the partition extent of 1 acre 20 guntas in the suit schedule property given to the father of defendants No.2 to 4. Further, it is to be noted here that defendants also

produced Ex.D9 which is the certified copy of the judgment and decreed in O.S. No. 426/2012. On going through the said judgment, it can be seen that the father of the defendant filed the suit for the declaration and injunction against the defendants with respect to the 1 acre and 20 guntas of the land in the land bearing Sy.No. 1/35. Thereafter, suit was decreed in favour of the plaintiffs. Further it is to be noted here that as per the evidence it can be seen that the one Ningaiah had four sons and one daughter, namely Chikkalingaiah, Biliyaiah who is the father of the plaintiffs, Sannaswamaiah and Shivalingaiah. Further, it is to be noted here that the father of plaintiff and Chikkalingaiah had applied for land and same was granted by the government. Thereafter, 4 brothers partitioned the said properties and in the partition 1 acre 20 guntas fallen to the share of the father of defendants and same was also admitted by the father of the plaintiffs. Further in the O.S.No.426/2012 the father of the plaintiffs filed suit against the defendants in that suit for the reliefs of declaration and injunction and same was decreed as prayed. Now, once again after the death of the father Biliyaiah, his children had filed the suit for the declaration and injunction of the suit schedule property. It is to be noted here that "ನನ್ನ ತಂದೆ ಜೀವಂತವಿದ್ದಾಗ ದಾವೆ ಸರ್ವೆ

ನಂಬರಿನ 1-20 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ನನಗೆ ವಿಲ್ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸದರಿ ವಿಲ್‌ನಾಮೆ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಅರ್ಜಿ ನೀಡಿ ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ಎಂ.ಆರ್-1/2022-23 ರಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಖಾತೆಯಾಗಿರುವುದು ನಿಜ, ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಅರ್ಜಿ ನೀಡಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವರು.”

22. On going through the above evidence, it can be seen that as per the will, 1 acre 20 guntas was mutated in the name of the plaintiff No.1. But when counsel for the defendants suggested this witness that during the lifetime of his father he had bequeath the will in his name for the extent of 1 acre 20 guntas in the suit schedule property, for that he pleaded ignorance. When counsel once again suggested that as per the will his name was mutated as per MR. No. H1/ 2022-23. For that he admitted the same. But he again says he had not given any application to the concerned authority to change the khata in his name, which clearly shows that in spite of having the knowledge, this plaintiff has come up with instant suit, claiming for the whole extent of the 3 acres in the suit schedule property. Defendants father had only right with respect to the 1 acre 20 guntas in the suit schedule property. Further as per the will it can be

seen that the father of the plaintiff only bequeathed 1 acre 20 guntas for the reason best known to them. If really, he had possession of entire extent of 3 acres in the suit schedule property then he would have bequeathed the will for the entire extent. Further it is to be noted here that, since father of the plaintiffs he himself admitted the partition taken place in the family and as per the family partition name of the defendant father was mutated in the 1 acre 20 guntas in the suit schedule property. Now, the name of the defendants appearing in the RTC with respect to 1 acre 20 guntas. Since, plaintiff father himself claimed 1 acre 20 gunta in the suit schedule property in the earlier suit in OS.No.426/2012. Now, once again plaintiffs cannot claim entire extent of 3 acres in the suit schedule property. Since, defendants proved that their father was in the possession and enjoyment of 1 acre 20 guntas in the suit schedule property the question of interference by the defendants in the suit schedule property does not arise at all. Hence for the above said reason, plaintiffs have failed to prove the case. Therefore, I answer Issue No. 1 and 2 in the negative.

23. Issue No.3:- The plaintiffs have filed the instant suit for the relief of the declaration and injunction. It is the case of the plaintiffs are that, plaintiffs are the owners

and in possession of the suit schedule property. The defendants without having any right over the suit schedule property mutated their name in the portion of the suit schedule property trying to interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Further it is stated that, suit schedule property was granted in the name of his father Late.Biliyaiah from the Government. Thereafter, the father of the plaintiff was in possession and enjoyment of the same, after his death his legal heirs i.e., the plaintiffs are in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Whereas defendants contended that, they are the owners of the portion of the suit schedule property for the extent of 1 acre 20 guntas towards the eastern side, Further it is stated suit schedule property was granted to the joint family and suit schedule property is the joint family property and as per the partition and in the family 1 acre 20 guntas of the property towards eastern side fallen to the share of the defendants. Further it is stated that, during the life time of the father of the plaintiffs have challenged the said property in OS.No.426/2012 and same was dismissed and now once again they have come up with the false suit. Further it is to be noted that, the father of the plaintiffs already in OS.No.426/2012 have filed the suit for the same relief and in the said case the father of the plaintiffs claimed right over the 1 acre 20

guntas in the suit schedule property and same was decreed in their favour. Now, after the death of the plaintiff father, plaintiffs have once again come with the instant suit claiming right over the entire suit schedule property. But plaintiffs failed to show that there are the owners and in possession of the suit schedule property with the cogent evidence and for the reason assigned in the above issues plaintiffs failed to prove their case. Hence for the above said reason Issue No.3 in the Negative.

24. ISSUE No.5:- For the reasons discussed above this court proceeds to pass the following:

O R D E R

The suit of the plaintiffs for the relief of declaration and permanent injunction is hereby dismissed with cost.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer in part and dictated directly on the computer and computerized by her, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 31st day of July 2026).

Sd/-

(Mahesh.B.T)
Senior Civil Judge & J.M.F.C
H.D.Kote

ANNEXURE**List of witnesses examined by the plaintiff/s:**

PW.1 : Ningaraju

List of documents marked by the plaintiff/s:

Ex.P1 : C/c of the grant certificate
Ex.P2 : C/c of the Revenue Inspector's report,
Ex.P3 : C/c of the map
Ex.P4 : C/c of M.R.No.7-1991/92
Ex.P5 : C/c of the handwritten certificate
Ex.P6 : Computerized certificate
Ex.P7 : Order of A.C.Hunsur
Ex.P8 : Death Certificate of plaintiff
Ex.P10 : Computerized certificate.

List of witnesses examined by the defendants:

DW.1 : Lingaraju
DW.2 : Lakshmegowda

List of documents marked by the defendant/s:

Ex.D1 : Land records of the RTC
Ex.D2 : MR Extract
Ex.D3 : Cross-examination of Biliyaiah &
Ningaraju in OS.426/2012
Ex.D4 : Copy of the order R.R.T.C.R.152/2020-21

- Ex.D5 : Copy of the order R.A.115/2022
Ex.D6 : RTC in Sy.No.1 of Mattare Village
Ex.D7 : M.R.Extract No.5/2022-23
Ex.D8 : RTC in Sy.No.1 of Mattare Village
Ex,D9 : Copy of the judgment and decree in
O.S.426/2012.

Sd/-

(Mahesh.B.T)
Senior Civil Judge & J.M.F.C
H.D.Kote