

KAMS300003772023



**IN THE COURT OF I ADDITIONAL SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE
AND JMFC, HUNSUR**

Dated this the 5th day of August, 2026

:: PRESENT ::

Smt **Bhagyamma**, B.Com., LL.B.,
I Addl. Senior Civil Judge & JMFC,
Hunsur

O.S./63/2023

Plaintiffs :

1. Siddappa,
S/o Late Chikkakariyappa,
Aged about 50 years,
Agriculturist,
R/at Kallahalli village,
Hanagodu Hobli,
Hunsur Taluk.
2. Shivalinga,
S/o Late Chikkakariyappa,
Aged about 50 years,
Agriculturist,
R/at Kallahalli village,
Hanagodu Hobli,
Hunsur Taluk.

(By Sri MRS, Adv.)

V/s

Defendants :

1. Mahadevappa,
Aged about 52 years,

2. Chandrashekar,
Aged about 48 years,

Both sons of Chikkakariyappa,
And Residents of Kallahalli Village,
Anagodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk.

3. Vedhavathi,
W/o Gaimari,
Aged about 57 years,

4. Mahadevamma
W/o Suresh,
Aged about 55 years,

Both daughters of Chikkakariyappa and
both are R/at Jabagere Village,
Gawadagere Hobli, Hunsur Taluk.

(By Sri KCB, Adv.)

Date of Institution of Suit	:	07.03.2023
Nature of Suit	:	Partition & Separate Possession
Date of commencement of Recording of evidence	:	18.02.2025
Date of which judgment pronounced	:	05.08.2026
Total Duration	:	Years Months Days 03 04 29

(BHAGYAMMA)
I Addl. Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Hunsur.

J U D G M E N T

The plaintiffs have filed this suit against the defendants seeking relief of partition and separate possession of 1/6th share each in respect of suit schedule properties and such other reliefs.

2. Description of suit schedule properties:

'A' schedule:- Agriculture lands measuring 2 acres out of Sy.No.19 situated at Kallahalli Village, Angodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk, bounded on :

East by	-	Lands of Kullappa and Subbaiah
West by	-	Lands of Late Chikkakariyappa
North by	-	Land of Subbaiah
South by	-	Lands of Late Chikkakariyappa

'B' schedule:- Agriculture lands measuring 3 acres and another 20 guntas in Sy.No.19 situated at Kallahalli Village, Angodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk, bounded on :

East by	-	Doddakariyappa and Siddaiah
West by	-	Lands of Late Chikkakariyappa
North by	-	Lands of Late Chikkakariyappa
South by	-	Temple and there after road

'C' schedule:- Agriculture lands measuring 1 acre 20 guntas out of Sy.No.19 standing in the name of 2nd plaintiff situated at Kallahalli Village, Angodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk, bounded on :

East by	-	Lands of Nanjamma
West by	-	Lands of Late Chikkakariyappa
North by	-	Lands of Nanjamma
South by	-	Lands of Late Siddappa

'D' schedule:- Agriculture lands measuring 0-05.08.000 guntas in Sy.No.8/2 situated at Kallahalli Village, Angodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk, bounded on :

East by	-	Lands of Kallappa
West by	-	Lands of Cheluvaiah
North by	-	Lands of Cheluvaiah
South by	-	Road

'E' schedule:- Agriculture lands measuring 0-38 guntas in Sy.No.185 situated at Kallahalli Village, Angodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk, bounded on :

East by	-	Lands of Late Chikkakariyappa
West by	-	Lands of Vishakantappa
North by	-	Land pf Gangadhara
South by	-	Temple and Road

'F' schedule:- Tobacco licence bearing TBGR No.61/118/09 measuring 13x13 feet situated at Kallahalli Village, Hanagodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk, and Tobacco licence bearing TBGR No.61/118/2023 measuring 13x13 feet situated at Kallahalli Village, Hanagodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk.

'G' schedule:- Mangalore tiled house and vacant site in panchayathi khatha junjer No.112 measuring 70x40 feet situated at Kallahalli Village, Hanagodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk bounded on :

East by	-	Panchayath road
West by	-	House of Devanna
North by	-	House of Doddappachari
South by	-	Road

'H' schedule:- Agriculture land measuring 1 acres out of Sy.No.19 standing in the name of 1st plaintiff situated at Kallalli Village, Hanagodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk bounded on :

East by	-	Lands of Guruswamappa
West by	-	Lands of Vishakantappa
North by	-	Lands of 2 nd plaintiff
South by	-	Lands of Mahadevappa

'I' schedule:- Agriculture land measuring 2 acres out of Sy.No.19 standing in the name of 1st defendant situated at Kallalli Village, Hanagodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk bounded on :

East by	-	Lands of Guruswamappa
West by	-	Lands of Vishakantappa
North by	-	Lands of 1 st plaintiff
South by	-	Lands of Shivalinga

3. The factual matrix of the plaintiffs case is as under:

It is the case of the plaintiffs that, other than Plaintiff's 1 & 2 and Defendant's 1 to 5 are children of Chikkakariyappa and Nanjamma. Presently Chikkakariyappa and Nanjamma are no more and have left Plaintiffs' 1 & 2 and Defendants' 1 to 5 to succeed over the properties left behind them. During the life time of Chikkakariyappa without the knowledge of his children was executing registered WILLS in favour of his sons. At the same time the said Chikkakariyappa without the knowledge of his sons use to redeem the WILLS alleged to have relinquished by him. The aggrieved sons are the beneficiaries tried to effect khatha in respect of the properties which was disputed before the office of Tahasildar as well as Assistant Commissioner, Hunsur thus resulting in the Plaintiffs' and Defendants' 1 and 2 losing interest to sue further in respect of the disputed WILLS in respect of the suit schedule properties executed and redeemed by their father Chikkakariyappa.

4. The plaintiffs stated that, plaintiffs' together keeping out the alleged WILL requested and demanded the Defendants to join for effecting partition and separate possession in respect of the suit schedule properties as the Plaintiffs' and Defendants' together during the life time of their parents constituted a joint Hindu family and were enjoying the suit schedule properties jointly even after the death of their parents. The fair request and demand of the Plaintiffs' for effecting partition and separate possession of 1/6th share of the suit schedule properties fell into the deaf ears of the Defendants' thus resulting in the Plaintiff's filing the suit for partition and separate possession by metes and bounds. Hence they filed this suit seeking their shares in the suit schedule properties.

5. After registration of the suit, summons were issued to the defendants. In pursuance of the summons, defendants No.1 to 4 appeared through their counsel and filed their written statement as well as an additional written statement.

6. In the written statement, the defendants admitted the relationship between the parties, but denied all other averments made in the plaint. They contended that, except the plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 4, there are no other children born to late Chikkakariyappa and late Nanjamma. It is further admitted that, the plaintiffs and defendants, being the legal representatives, have succeeded to the properties left behind by late Chikkakariyappa and late Nanjamma.

7. However, the defendants denied the allegation that their father, late Chikkakariyappa, used to execute Wills in

respect of his self-acquired properties merely on his whims and fancies and would revoke or cancel them at his pleasure. The defendants specifically denied the remaining averments in the plaint, particularly the allegation regarding the execution of the last Will in favour of the defendants. They further contended that the suit is not maintainable for non-inclusion of two tobacco barns and a tiled house property measuring 70 x 40 feet.

8. The defendants have set out the defence that, Land bearing Sy.No.19 of Kallahalli Village, Hanagodu Hobli, Hunsur Taluk, originally measured 218 acres 29 guntas. Out of the said survey number, land measuring 4 acres in Sy.No.19/P7 and 4 acres in Sy.No.19/P6 was granted to their father late Chikkakariyappa. Similarly, 2 acres of land in Sy.No.19 was granted to their mother late Nanjamma and the said property is in the joint possession of both the plaintiffs and the defendants.

9. The defendants further contended that, out of the property granted to late Chikkakariyappa, an extent of 2 acres in Sy.No.19, bounded on the East by the land of Basappa, on the West by Manti, on the North by the remaining property of late Chikkakariyappa and on the South by a pathway, had been bequeathed by late Chikkakariyappa in favour of defendant No.1 under a Will dated 03.05.2011. Except the said 2 acres, the remaining properties are available for partition.

10. It is further contended that no pakka podi has been conducted in respect of Sy.No.19. Consequently, there is variation in the extent of land available in Sy.No.19 and in the absence of durasthu proceedings, the property cannot be conveniently

divided by metes and bounds. The defendants further stated that, the extents of Item Nos.D and E of the schedule properties are correctly reflected in the RTC records, whereas there is variation in the extent and possession relating to Item Nos.A and C of the schedule properties. The defendants have expressed their willingness to effect partition of all the remaining schedule properties except the aforesaid 2 acres of land bequeathed in favour of defendant No.1 under the Will dated 03.05.2011.

11. In the additional written statement, the defendants reiterated the same facts and contentions raised in the original written statement. They further prayed that, the suit be dismissed for non-inclusion of the Mangalore tiled house property and the two tobacco barns. Wherefore, the defendants prayed that the suit of the plaintiffs be dismissed with exemplary costs.

12. On the basis of above pleadings and documents produced by the plaintiffs and defendants, my predecessor in office has framed the following issues:

ISSUES

- 1.** Whether plaintiffs prove that they have given correct description of the suit schedule properties in their plaint ?
- 2.** Whether defendants prove that plaintiffs have not included the two Tobacco barn and a tiled house measuring 70'x40' in the suit hence suit is bad for partial partition ?
- 3.** Whether defendants further prove that out of 4.00 acres granted to plaintiffs and defendants father in Sy.No.19 of Kallahalli Village, 2.00 acres is bequeathed in favour of defendant no.1 under a Will dated 03.05.2011 and this property is not available for partition ?

4. Whether plaintiffs are entitled for the partition as sought for ?

5. What order or decree?

13. In order to prove the case, the plaintiff no.2 got examined himself as PW.1 and got marked 17 documents at Ex.P1 to Ex.P17. On the other hand the defendant No.1 got examined as DW.1, defendant no.4 got examined as DW.2 and one witness by name C.S.Nagaraju (Scribe) got examined as DW.3 and got marked one document at Ex.D1.

14. Heard the arguments on both side and perused the available records, documents and evidence of the parties.

15. My findings to the aforesaid issues are as below:

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

REASONS

16. ISSUE NO.1:-

The plaintiffs case is that, they and the defendants are the children of late Chikkakariyappa and late Nanjamma and jointly succeeded to suit schedule properties, which are joint family properties and no partition has taken place among the parties. Though late Chikkakariyappa had executed and revoked several Wills during his lifetime, the plaintiffs have ignored those disputed Wills and sought partition of the suit

schedule properties. As the defendants failed to accept their demand for partition and separate possession, the plaintiffs filed this suit seeking 1/6th share by metes and bounds along with consequential reliefs.

17. The defendants admit their relationship and they are legal heirs of late Chikkakariyappa and late Nanjamma. However, they contend that the suit was initially bad for partial partition due to the omission of two tobacco barns and a Mangalore tiled house. They further contend that, late Chikkakariyappa had executed a registered Will dated 03.05.2011 bequeathing 2 acres in Sy.No.19 in favour of defendant No.1 and therefore the said property is not available for partition. While expressing their willingness to partition the remaining properties, they denied the description of schedule properties and they seek exclusion of the property covered under the Will and dismissal of the suit to that extent.

18. In order to establish the correctness of the schedule properties, the plaintiff No.2 has entered the witness box as PW.1. In his examination-in-chief, PW.1 has reiterated the averments made in the plaint and deposed that all the suit schedule properties originally belonged to late Chikkakariyappa and late Nanjamma and that after their demise the parties continued to enjoy the same jointly. He has further stated that the descriptions furnished in the plaint correctly represent the survey numbers, extents and boundaries of the respective properties.

19. The plaintiffs have relied upon Ex.P1 to Ex.P17. The revenue records produced by the plaintiffs disclose the existence of the schedule properties and support the identity of the agricultural lands. During cross-examination, nothing worthwhile has been elicited to discredit the identity of the schedule properties described in the plaint. Though PW.1 has admitted that there are variations in the extent of certain lands in Sy.No.19, he has consistently maintained that the properties are identifiable.

20. On the other hand, DW.1 has not disputed the existence or identity of the suit schedule properties. His principal defence is that two tobacco barns and one tiled house were initially omitted from the plaint and that an extent of 2 acres in Sy.No.19 had already been bequeathed under Ex.D1. Therefore, the defendants have not seriously challenged the correctness of the description of the properties already included in the plaint.

21. The purpose of describing suit schedule properties in a partition suit is only to identify the subject matter of litigation. Minor discrepancies in boundaries or variations in extent, particularly in agricultural lands, do not affect the maintainability of the suit when the properties are otherwise capable of identification.

22. The Court finds that each schedule property has been described with survey number, extent, village, hobli and boundaries. The defendants have not produced any documentary evidence to establish that the properties described are non-existent or incapable of identification. Therefore, this Court is satisfied that the plaintiffs have

substantially proved the correctness of the description of the suit schedule properties. Accordingly, **Issue No.1 is answered in the Partly Affirmative.**

23. Issue No.2:- The burden of proving this issue lies upon the defendants. DW.1 has deposed that the plaintiffs initially omitted two tobacco barns and a tiled house from the suit schedule and, therefore, the suit is liable to be dismissed for partial partition. During the cross-examination of PW.1, it was suggested that the said properties belonged to the family. Though PW.1 admitted that the tobacco barns and tiled house belonged to the family, he denied that the suit was bad for partial partition.

24. It is pertinent to note that after the defendants raised the said objection in their written statement, the plaintiffs amended the plaint and incorporated the tobacco barns as Schedule 'F' and the tiled house as Schedule 'G'. Thereafter, the defendants filed an additional written statement and contested the claim relating to those properties. Thus, the omission, if any, stood cured before the commencement of evidence.

25. The object of the rule against partial partition is to ensure complete adjudication of the rights of all co-sharers and to avoid multiplicity of proceedings. Once the omitted properties were brought on record by amendment and both parties had an opportunity to contest their inclusion, the objection regarding partial partition ceased to survive.

26. Further, the defendants have not produced any evidence to show that any other joint family property still remains omitted from the suit schedule or that they have suffered any prejudice on account of the amendment. It is well settled that procedural law is intended to advance the cause of justice and not to defeat substantive rights. Therefore, the suit cannot be dismissed on the ground that certain properties were not included at the time of its institution when such omission has been rectified before the conclusion of the trial. Accordingly, the defendants have failed to establish that the suit suffers from the vice of partial partition. **Hence, Issue No.2 is answered in the Negative.**

27. Issue No.3:-

It is a settled principle of law that the propounder of a Will must prove its due execution and attestation in accordance with Section 63 of the Indian Succession Act, 1925 and Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. The initial burden therefore rests entirely upon the defendants.

28. To discharge this burden, defendant No.1 entered the witness box as DW.1. He has consistently deposed that late Chikkakariyappa executed a registered Will dated 03.05.2011 in a sound disposing state of mind and bequeathed 2 acres in Sy.No.19 exclusively in his favour. His evidence is in conformity with the pleadings.

29. The defendants have produced the original registered Will marked as Ex.D1. On careful examination of Ex.D1, this Court finds that it is a registered testamentary document executed before the Sub-Registrar. The document

bears the photograph and thumb impression of late Chikkakariyappa, signatures of the attesting witnesses and the registration endorsements. The recitals specifically disclose that the testator intended to bequeath 2 acres of land in Sy.No.19 exclusively in favour of defendant No.1. Though registration by itself does not dispense with proof of execution, it is nevertheless a relevant circumstance supporting the genuineness of the transaction.

30. The defendants further examined DW.2, one of the attesting witnesses. Though his examination-in-chief was recorded, unfortunately he expired before his cross-examination could be completed. Therefore, this Court is conscious that his evidence cannot be treated as the sole basis for proving the Will. However, the death of DW.2 was beyond the control of the defendants and therefore no adverse inference can be drawn against them on that count alone.

31. More importantly, the execution and attestation of Ex.D1 stand independently corroborated by the evidence of DW.3. DW.3 has deposed that late Chikkakariyappa personally instructed him to prepare the Will, after its preparation, the contents were read over and explained to the executant, thereafter late Chikkakariyappa admitted the contents to be correct and voluntarily executed the document in the presence of the witnesses. DW.3 has further stated that he signed the document as an attesting witness in the presence of the executant and the other attesting witness also subscribed his signature in the presence of the executant. His evidence clearly establishes compliance with

the requirements of Section 63(c) of the Indian Succession Act. Nothing material has been elicited in his cross-examination to discredit his testimony. More so, another attesting witness of the said Will was died long ago as admitted by the plaintiff witness.

32. The evidence of DW.3 is consistent with the recitals in Ex.D1 itself, which contains the signatures of the attesting witnesses together with the photograph, thumb impression and registration endorsements of the executant. The plaintiffs have not seriously disputed that late Chikkakariyappa executed registered Wills during his lifetime. During cross-examination, PW.1 admitted that his father had executed registered Wills. His only explanation is that his father used to execute and subsequently cancel such Wills. However, except making such oral assertions, PW.1 has not produced any subsequent Will, deed of revocation, codicil or any document recognised under Section 70 of the Indian Succession Act to establish that Ex.D1 stood revoked.

33. The plea of revocation therefore remains a mere allegation unsupported by any legal evidence. Once the defendants have established the execution and attestation of Ex.D1, the burden shifted upon the plaintiffs to prove the alleged revocation. The plaintiffs have failed to discharge that burden.

34. Equally, the plaintiffs have failed to establish any suspicious circumstance surrounding the execution of Ex.D1. There is no evidence to show that late Chikkakariyappa lacked testamentary capacity or that he acted under coercion, undue influence or fraud. Merely because one son

has been preferred over the others cannot itself constitute a suspicious circumstance so as to invalidate the testamentary disposition.

35. The principles governing proof of Wills have been clearly laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in H. Venkatachala Iyengar V/s B.N. Thimmajamma (AIR 1959 SC 443), Janki Narayan Bhoir V/s Narayan Namdeo Kadam ((2003) 2 SCC 91), Sridevi V/s Jayaraja Shetty ((2005) 2 SCC 784) and Mahesh Kumar V/s Vinod Kumar ((2012) 4 SCC 387). These decisions consistently hold that where the propounder proves due execution and attestation of the Will and removes all suspicious circumstances, the burden shifts upon the challenger to establish its invalidity.

36. Applying the above principles to the facts of the present case, this Court is satisfied that the defendants have succeeded in proving Ex.D1 through the original registered document, the cogent testimony of DW.3, the corroborative circumstances appearing from Ex.D1 itself and the admissions elicited from PW.1. The plaintiffs have utterly failed to establish either the alleged revocation or any suspicious circumstance affecting the validity of the Will.

37. Accordingly, this Court holds that late Chikkakariyappa validly executed the registered Will dated 03.05.2011 bequeathing 2 acres in Sy.No.19 in favour of defendant No.1. Consequently, the said extent of land ceased to form part of the estate available for partition and is liable to be excluded from the hotchpotch. **Hence, Issue No.3 is answered in the Affirmative.**

38. ISSUE No.4

The relationship between the parties is not in dispute. It is admitted by both the plaintiffs and the defendants that the parties are the legal heirs of late Chikkakariyappa and late Nanjamma. It is also not in dispute that, except to the extent covered under the Will, the suit schedule properties were left behind by the deceased and devolved upon their legal heirs.

39. This Court has held that the suit schedule properties are sufficiently described and identifiable. That the objection regarding partial partition does not survive in view of the amendment carried out by the plaintiffs by incorporating the omitted properties in the plaint. However, this Court has held that the defendants have successfully proved the due execution and validity of the registered Will dated 03.05.2011 marked as Ex.D1. Consequently, an extent of 2 acres in Sy.No.19 validly bequeathed in favour of defendant No.1 does not form part of the estate available for partition. Except the said extent covered under Ex.D1, there is no convincing evidence to establish that the remaining suit schedule properties have already been partitioned or otherwise ceased to be available for partition.

40. On the contrary, the evidence on record establishes that the remaining properties continued to be enjoyed jointly by the parties. Hence, the plaintiffs have sought partition and separate possession of 1/6th share in the suit schedule properties. Having regard to the relationship between the parties and the mode of succession

pleaded and proved in the present case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the plaintiffs are entitled to $1/6^{\text{th}}$ share each in all the suit schedule properties, except the extent of 2 acres in Sy.No.19 bequeathed in favour of defendant No.1 under Ex.D1, which is liable to be excluded from partition.

41. Accordingly, the plaintiffs are entitled to a preliminary decree for partition and separate possession of $1/6^{\text{th}}$ share each in the remaining suit schedule properties by metes and bounds, subject to the exclusion of the property covered under Ex.D1. Accordingly, **Issue No.4 is answered in the Partly Affirmative.**

42. Issue No.5: For the reasons and conclusions on the above issues as discussed above, this court proceeds to pass the following:-

ORDER

The suit of the plaintiffs is hereby partly decreed with costs.

It is declared that an extent of 2.00 acres in Sy.No.19 of Kallahalli Village, covered under Ex.D1, exclusively belongs to defendant No.1 and shall not form part of the properties available for partition.

The plaintiffs are entitled to partition and separate possession of their $1/6^{\text{th}}$ share each in the remaining suit schedule properties, excluding the aforesaid extent of 2.00 acres covered under Ex.D1.

Draw a preliminary decree accordingly.

Before parting with the case, it is pertinent to observe that a suit for partition is not concluded merely on the passing of a preliminary decree. The proceedings continue until a final decree is drawn by effecting actual partition of the property by metes and bounds. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that the Trial Court should not adjourn the matter sine die after passing the preliminary decree, but should proactively proceed to draw up the final decree in the same suit, as the rights declared under the preliminary decree attain status only upon actual partition and delivery of separate possession. Therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to continue the suit for final decree proceedings in accordance with Or XX Rule 18 CPC.

In view of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Kattukandi Eadathil Krishnan & Another v. Kattukandi Eadathil Valsan & Others*, Civil Appeal Nos. 6406-6407 of 2010, dated 13.06.2022 and in compliance with Circular No. DJA/1/105 dated 21.10.2022 issued by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, this

Court is required to initiate final decree proceedings suomotu upon passing a preliminary decree in a partition suit, in terms of Order XX Rule 18 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.

Accordingly, the Office is directed to register a separate Final Decree Proceedings (FDP) under Order XX Rule 18 of the CPC, 1908 on the basis of the preliminary decree passed in the present suit and to keep a certified copy of the preliminary decree on record in the said FDP proceedings.

The parties shall appear before this Court in the Final Decree Proceedings (to be registered) on 30.09.2026 without awaiting any further notice.

(Dictated to the stenographer, directly on computer, typed by her, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court on this the **5th day of August 2026**).

(BHAGYAMMA)

I Addl. Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Hunsur

ANNEXURE**WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR PLAINTIFFS :**

PW-1 : Shivalinga

DOCUMENTS MARKED FOR PLAINTIFFS :

Ex.P1 : G-Tree of Chikkakariyappa
Ex.P2 to 4 : RTC in r/o Sy.No.19, 2022-23
Ex.P5 : RTC in r/o Sy.No.8/2, 2022-23
Ex.P6 : RTC in r/o Sy.No.185, 2022-23
Ex.P7 to 15 : Tax paid receipts
Ex.P16 : Order passed by Sub-Divisional Officer of
Hunsur Sub-Division, Hunsur in
RA.69/2016-17 dated 19.09.2022

Ex.P17 : Will dated 29.11.2013

WITNESSES MARKED FOR DEFENDANTS:

DW-1 : Mahadevappa
DW-2 : Mahadevamma
DW-3 : C.S.Nagaraju

DOCUMENTS EXAMINED FOR DEFENDANTS:

Ex.D1 : Will dated 03.05.2011
Ex.D1(a)&(b) : Photos of Chikkakariyappa
Ex.D1(c)&(d) : Thumb impression of Chikkakariyappa
Ex.D1(e) : Signature of Shivalingappa
Ex.D1(f) : Signature of DW.3

(BHAGYAMMA)

I Addl. Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Hunsur