



**IN THE COURT OF THE HONOURABLE I ADDITIONAL CIVIL  
JUDGE & JMFC, AT KRISHNARAJANAGAR.**

**PRESENT: SMT.ASRINA.,B.A, LLB.**  
**I ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC, KRISHNARAJANAGAR.**

**DATED THIS 1<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF JULY, 2026**

**O.S.226/2024**

**BETWEEN**

|                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>PLAINTIFF</b>  | <p>Shri.Jagadish<br/>S/o Karigowda<br/>Aged 60 years.<br/>R/at:Dammanahalli village,<br/>Chunchanakatte Hobli,<br/>Saligrama Taluk.</p> <p>R/by his GPA Holder:<br/>Shri.Lokesh D.N,<br/>S/o Nagaraju D.K<br/>Aged 37 years.<br/>R/at:Dammanahalli village,<br/>Chunchanakatte Hobli,<br/>Saligrama Taluk.</p> <p><b>(By Shri.K.B.G. Advocate)</b></p> |
| <b>DEFENDANTS</b> | <p>1. Shri.Basavaraju D.K<br/>S/o Late.Karigowda,<br/>Aged 56 years.</p> <p>2. Shri.Puttaraju D.K<br/>S/o Late.Karigowda,<br/>Aged 60 years.<br/>R/at:Both are Dammanahalli village,</p>                                                                                                                                                               |

KAMS410008132024



|  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|  | <p>Chunchanakatte Hobli,<br/>Saligrama Taluk.</p> <p>3. Smt.Bhagyamma,<br/>W/o Late.Jayadeva,<br/>D/o Ningegowda,<br/>Aged 50 years,<br/>R/at: Karthalu Village,<br/>Chunchanakatte Hobli,<br/>Saligrama Taluk,<br/>Mysuru District.</p> <p><b>(Defendants No.1 to 3 by: Sri.P.N Advocate)</b></p> |
|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

|                               |                                |                 |               |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Date of Institution of suit   | 18/04/2024                     |                 |               |
| Nature of suit                | Suit for Perpetual Injunction. |                 |               |
| Date of recording of evidence | 17/09/2025                     |                 |               |
| Date of Judgment              | 01/07/2026.                    |                 |               |
| Total duration                | Years/s<br>-02-                | Month/s<br>-02- | Day/s<br>-14- |

**(SMT.ASRINA)**  
**I ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC**  
**KRISHNARAJANAGAR.**

### **J U D G M E N T**

Plaintiff has filed the present suit for the relief of perpetual injunction to restrain the defendants or anybody claiming through or under them from interfering in the peaceful possession of the

KAMS410008132024



plaintiff over the suit property, for costs of the suit and for such other reliefs.

**2. The Brief facts of Plaintiff's case is as under:**

It is the case of plaintiff that he is a absolute owner and possessor of the suit property. It is the case of the plaintiff that he has acquired the suit property under the registered partition deed dated 08/12/2022. It is the case of the plaintiff that ever since from the date of partition, he is in actual possession and enjoyment of the suit property as its absolute owner by mutating the suit property to his name. It is the case of the plaintiff that he is also regularly paying tax in respect of the suit property to the concerned authority. It is the case of the plaintiff that the defendants have no manner of rights over the suit property. It is the grievance of the plaintiff that without having any right, title and interest over the suit property, the defendants are causing illegal interference to the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit property. It is the case of the plaintiff that though the plaintiff has requested the defendants not to cause any illegal interference to the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit property but the defendants did not stop their illegal acts. Therefore the plaintiff has approached the jurisdictional police and submitted a complaint as against the illegal acts of the defendants. But the

**KAMS410008132024**

police did not take any action as against the defendants and the police has informed the plaintiff that since the dispute involved is a civil in nature, the police has advised the plaintiff to approach the court of law to work out his remedy. It is the case of the plaintiff that he is in actual possession and enjoyment of the suit property as its absolute owner by regularly paying necessary tax to the government in respect of the suit property. It is the case of the plaintiff that the defendants are not concerned with the suit property. It is the grievance of the plaintiff that without having any manner of rights over the suit property the defendants are causing illegal interference to his peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit property. Therefore the plaintiff has contended that the acts of the defendants is highly illegal and high handed and the same is against the law. Therefore, the illegal acts of the defendants has to be checked by this court by granting the reliefs as sought for in the suit. If not the plaintiff will suffer irreparable loss which cannot be compensated in terms of money. Therefore, having no other efficacious remedy the plaintiff has approached this court by filing the above suit. According to the plaintiff the cause of action to file the above suit arose on 03/04/2024 the date on when the plaintiff submitted a complaint as against the illegal acts of the defendants to the jurisdictional police and on all those dates when the defendants have caused illegal interference to the peaceful possession of the plaintiff over the suit property.

**KAMS410008132024**

Hence, with the above plea the plaintiff has prayed to decree the suit.

**3.** In pursuance to the summons issued by this court, the defendants have entered their appearance before this court through their counsel and the defendants have contested the above suit by filing their detailed written statement.

**4.** The defendants have filed their written statement wherein they have denied the possession of the plaintiff over the suit property. The defendants have specifically denied the allegation of alleged interference alleged to have caused by them to the peaceful possession of the plaintiff over the suit property. By denying rest of the plaint averments, the defendants have categorically contended that ever since from 1998-99 the plaintiff and the defendant No.1 are living in the joint family and they are also in joint possession of the suit property. It is the contention of the defendants that the defendant No.1 has provided education to the plaintiff by borrowing loan of Rs.4,00,000/- and even the defendant No.1 has also sent the plaintiff to foreign country by spending a sum of Rs.5,00,000/-. It is the contention of the defendants that all in total the defendant No.1 has spent a sum of Rs.9,00,000/- for the purpose of education and employment of the plaintiff. It is the contention of the defendants that for the purpose of repaying the said sum of Rs.9,00,000/- so incurred by the

**KAMS410008132024**

defendant No.1, the plaintiff has executed the general power of attorney dated 21/06/2001 in favour of the defendant No.1 in respect of all his properties including the present suit property. Therefore, it is the contention of the defendants that the suit property is still in possession of the defendant No.1. It is the contention of the defendants that since the defendants No.2 and 3 are also jointly cultivating the suit property along with the defendant No.1, the defendants have contended that all of them are in joint possession of the suit property. It is the contention of the defendants that now with an intention to evade the repayment of loan of Rs.9,00,000/- to the defendant No.1, the plaintiff has filed this false suit with an intention to dispossess the defendants from the suit property. Therefore the defendants have contended that by suppressing all the true and material facts the plaintiff has filed the present false suit. The defendants have contended that there is no cause of action to file the above suit and the alleged cause of action shown by the plaintiff is false and fictitious. The plaintiff has not approached this court with clean hands. The above suit being the false suit the defendants have prayed to dismiss the suit by awarding the compensatory costs. Hence, with the above contentions, the defendants have prayed to dismiss the suit with costs.

**5.** On the basis above pleadings and rival contentions, following Issues were framed:

KAMS410008132024



1. Whether the plaintiff prove his possession over the suit property?
2. Whether the plaintiff proves the alleged interference caused by the defendants?
3. Whether the defendants prove that ever since from 1998-99 the defendant No.1 is in possession of the suit property?
4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the reliefs as sought for?
5. What order or decree?

**6.** In order to establish the case of the plaintiff, the SPA holder of the plaintiff has stepped into the witness box and examined himself as Pw.1 and got marked Exhibit P-1 to Ex.P-9 documents. In spite of giving sufficient opportunities the defendants have not led any evidence in support of their defense. Thereafter the trial was concluded and the case was posted for arguments on merits.

**7.** Heard arguments from counsel for plaintiff. Counsel for defendants has filed written arguments.

**8.** On perusal of the pleadings, oral and documentary evidence placed before the court, my findings to the above Issues are as hereunder:

KAMS410008132024



**Issue No.1:** In the Affirmative.

**Issue No.2:** In the Affirmative.

**Issue No.3:** In the Negative.

**Issue No.4:** In the Affirmative.

**Issue No.5:** As per the final orders for the following:

### **REASONS**

**9. ISSUE NO.1:** Plaintiff has filed the present suit for the relief of perpetual injunction. It is the case of the plaintiff that he is a owner and possessor of the suit property. The defendants who are not at all concerned with the suit property, without having any right, title and interest over the suit property, the defendants have illegally tried to interfere in the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit property. Therefore, being aggrieved by the said illegal acts of the defendants, the plaintiff has filed this suit as against the defendants to restrain the defendants from interfering in the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit property.

**10.** In a suit for bare injunction it is incumbent on the part of the plaintiff to prove his possession over the suit property as on the date of the filing of the suit. Accordingly issue No.1 was framed casting burden on the plaintiff to prove his possession over the suit property.

**11.** In order to discharge the burden casted on him, the plaintiff has examined his SPA holder as Pw.1 and got marked Exhibit P-1



KAMS410008132024



to Ex.P-9 documents.

**12.** In the case on hand the plaintiff has claimed that the suit property is his self-acquired property and the same was acquired by him under the registered partition deed dated 08/12/2022 and as such the plaintiff has claimed himself to be the owner in actual possession and enjoyment of the suit property. In support of his said contention the plaintiff has relied on Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-6 documents.

**13.** Ex.P-1 is a SPA dated 15/06/2022 executed by the plaintiff in favour of the Pw.1 namely Mr.D.N.Lokesh authorizing him to sign and verify the plaint, vakalath, give evidence and to do all necessary acts in respect of the present suit. Hence, the Ex.P-1 document proves and establishes that the present suit was filed by the plaintiff through his SPA holder namely Mr.D.N.Lokesh.

**14.** Ex.P-2 is a registered partition deed dated 08/12/2022 registered as a document No.KRN-1-04287/2022-23. Ex.P-2 is a registered as well as undisputed document and the same was marked in evidence without any objections from the defendants and their counsel. Ex.P-2 being a registered and undisputed document, the contents and the recitals of the Ex.P-2 partition deed proves and establishes that under the said partition deed the suit property was allotted to the share of the plaintiff herein.

**KAMS410008132024**

Ex.P-2 document proves and establishes that it is under the Ex.P-2 partition deed the plaintiff has acquired the suit property. Further, Ex.P-2 being a registered and undisputed document, the contents and the recitals of the Ex.P-2 partition deed also proves and establishes that under the said partition deed the possession of the suit property was duly handed over and delivered to the plaintiff herein. Hence, Ex.P-2 partition deed proves and establishes the acquisition of title and possession over the suit property by the plaintiff.

**15.** Ex.P-3 is a RTC of the suit property for the year 2023-24. Even the Ex.P-3 is also a undisputed document and the same proves and establishes that on the basis of Ex.P-2 partition deed, the suit property was duly transferred and mutated to the name of the plaintiff herein. Ex.P-2 being a RTC of the suit property for the year 2023-2024, the same projects the name of the plaintiff as a owner and possessor of the suit property as on the date of this suit.

**16.** In the case on hand the plaintiff has claimed himself to be the owner in actual possession and enjoyment of the suit property. Ex.P-3 is a RTC of the suit property for the year 2023-24 and the same discloses that as on the date of this suit the name of the plaintiff was appearing in the RTC of the suit property as a owner and possessor of the suit property. At this juncture it is worth to fall back on Section 133 of Karnataka Land Revenue Act 1964

KAMS410008132024



which reads as follows:

**133. Presumption regarding entries in the records:** *An entry in the Record of Rights and a certified entry in the Register of Mutations [or in the patta book] shall be presumed to be true until the contrary is proved or a new entry is lawfully substituted therefor.*

**17.** The plain reading of Section 133 of Karnataka Land Revenue Act makes it abundantly clear that all the entries made in the record of rights shall be presumed to be true unless the contrary is proved. There lies a presumption in favour of the entries made in the record of rights that all the entries made thereto are true until the contrary is proved or a new or lawful entry is substituted. However, this presumption is a rebuttable presumption. The burden to rebut the said presumption lies on the person who alleges the entries in the RTC to be false. Until the contrary is proved all the entries made in the RTC shall be presumed to be true. In the case on hand the plaintiff has claimed himself to be in possession of the suit property. Ex.P-3 being the RTC of the suit property, the same discloses the name of the plaintiff as a possessor of the suit property as on the date of filing of this suit. The contention of the plaintiff is supported by Ex.P-3 document. Though the defendants have contested this suit, but they have not denied or disputed the legality and validity of the entries of name of the plaintiff in the RTC's of the suit property.

**KAMS410008132024**

The defendants have not placed any contrary evidence on record to prove that the name of the plaintiff is wrongly entered in the RTC's of the suit property. The defendants have not denied and disputed the Ex.P-3 document and so also the defendants have not denied and disputed the entries of the name of the plaintiff in the RTC's of the suit property. Therefore, in the absence of anything contrary, this court has no other go but to presume that the entries of the names of the plaintiff in the RTC's of the suit property are true and valid entries.

**18.** Ex.P-5 is a tax paid receipt in respect of the suit property and the same proves and establishes that the plaintiff is also paying necessary tax to the Government in respect of the suit property.

**19.** Ex.P-6 is a patta and receipt book. Even the Ex.P-6 is also a undisputed document. Ex.P-6 being a undisputed document, the same proves and establishes that the suit property continues to stand in the name of the plaintiff herein.

**20.** Hence, on combined reading of the evidence placed on record by the plaintiff, the same proves and establishes the factum of possession of the suit property by the plaintiff. The plaintiff has successfully discharged his burden and thereby the plaintiff has successfully established his possession over the suit property. Accordingly I hold that the plaintiff has successfully proved his

KAMS410008132024



possession over the suit property. Accordingly **I answer Issue No.1 in favour of the plaintiff in the Affirmative.**

**21. ISSUE NO.3:** Before discussing the Issue No.3, I feel it apposite to decide the present Issue first. Accordingly, the Issue No.3 is taken up for prior discussion.

**22.** It is the case of the plaintiff that he being the absolute owner, he is in actual and peaceful possession of the suit property. On the other hand, the defendants have contested the suit by contending that ever since from the year 1998-99 they are in possession of the suit property. Hence, in view of the said contention taken up by the defendants, the present Issue was framed casting burden on the defendants to prove their possession over the suit property ever since from the year 1998-99.

**23.** It is significant to note here that, though the defendants have taken up the contention in their written statement that ever since from the year 1998-99 they are in possession of the suit property, but the defendants have not produced any evidence before this court in order to prove the same. Even the defendants have also did not lead their evidence on oath reiterating the said contention. The defendants did not offer themselves to be cross examined by the counsel for the plaintiff to test the veracity of the defence

KAMS410008132024



taken by them in their written statement. Such being the case no credence can be given to the above defence set up by the defendants in their written statement. This view of this court gets support from the decision reported in **AIR 1999 SC 1441 in the case of Vidhyadhar Vs. Mankikrao and another** wherein, it is held as follows:

*“Where a party to the suit does not appear into the witness box and states his own case on oath and does not offer himself to be cross examined by the other side, a presumption would arise that the case setup by him is not correct”.*

**24.** The above ratio laid down in the aforcited decision squarely applies to the case on hand. As held above, though the defendants have taken up the contention that ever since from the year 1998-99 they are in possession of the suit property, but the defendants did not place any evidence before this court to prove the same. Nor have they led any evidence on their behalf. Therefore, the said contention taken up by the defendants has remained as merely a self-serving statement without any legs to stand. Such being the case, without there being any positive and cogent evidence in that regard, this court is not inclined to believe the bald contention taken by the defendants in their written statement. Absolutely, no evidence is placed before this court by the defendants to prove their possession over the suit property ever since from the year

KAMS410008132024



1998-99. Accordingly, I conclude that the defendants have utterly failed to prove the Issue No.3. Accordingly, **Issue No.3 is answered in the Negative.**

**25. ISSUE NO.2:** In order to grant the relief of perpetual injunction another facet to be proved by the plaintiff is about the interference made by the defendants to his peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit property.

**26.** The plaintiff has filed the present suit alleging that the defendants have caused illegal interference to his peaceful possession over the suit property. At para No.3 of cross-examination of Pw.1, learned counsel for the defendants has cross-examined the Pw.1 by admitting and acknowledging the interference caused by the defendants to the peaceful possession of the plaintiff over the suit property. The relevant portion of cross-examination of Pw.1 at para No.3 is extracted below:

3. ವಾದಿಯು ತಮಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ 9 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ತಮಗೆ ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಪಾಲಾಕ್ಷರವರಿಂದ 6 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯರು ದಾವಾ ಆಸ್ತಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ನಮಗೆ ಉಳುಮೆ ಮಾಡಲು ತೊಂದರೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯು ನಾವು ದಾವಾ ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಉಳುಮೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯರು ತೊಂದರೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನಿಜ ಎಂದು ನುಡಿದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕೇವಲ 9 ಲಕ್ಷದ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹಣದ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ

KAMS410008132024



ಮತ್ತು ಪಾಲಾಕ್ಷರವರಿಂದ ಜಮೀನು ತೆಗೆಸಿಕೊಡುವ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯರು ದಾವಾ ಆಸ್ತಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ನಮಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯರು ದಾವಾ ಆಸ್ತಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನಿಜ ಎಂದು ನುಡಿದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಮ್ಮ 9 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವವರೆಗೂ ಹಾಗೂ ಪಾಲಾಕ್ಷರವರಿಂದ ಜಮೀನು ಪಡೆಯುವವರೆಗೂ ದಾವಾ ಆಸ್ತಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ತೊಂದರೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯರಿಗೆ ನೈತಿಕ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

**27.** The above line of cross-examination made to the Pw.1 by learned counsel for the defendants itself is sufficient to hold that the defendants have caused illegal interference to the peaceful possession of the plaintiff over the suit property.

**28.** Further, Ex.P-8 is a acknowledgment issued by the police for having received the complaint from Pw.1 as against the defendant No.1 complaining the act of interference. Though the defendants have appeared before this court through their counsel, but the defendants have not denied or disputed the Ex.P-8 document. Even no cross-examination is made to the Pw.1 by denying or disputing the Ex.P-8 document. Thereby, the Ex.P-8 document has remained unchallenged by the defendants. Hence, such being the case this court has no reason to ignore the Ex.P-8 document. Hence, on combined reading of the evidence placed on record coupled with the Ex.P-8 document, the same proves and establishes the interference on the part of the defendants to the



KAMS410008132024



peaceful possession of the plaintiff over the suit property. Accordingly, I conclude that the interference on the part of the defendants is established. **Accordingly, I answer Issue No.2 in the Affirmative.**

**29. ISSUE NO.4:** In a suit for perpetual injunction, the plaintiff must prove his possession over the suit property and the alleged interference caused by the defendants to his peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit property. As held in issue No.1, the plaintiff has successfully proved his possession over the suit property. As held in Issue No.2, the interference on the part of the defendants is also held to be proved. When the key ingredients for grant of perpetual injunction are made out by the plaintiff, this court does not find any reason to deny the most equitable relief of perpetual injunction to the plaintiff. When the plaintiff has successfully established his possession over the suit property, then mere apprehension of interference in the mind of the plaintiff itself is suffice to grant the relief of Perpetual injunction. This view of this court receives support from the decision of the Honourable High court of Karnataka reported in **1991(1) KLJ 536 in the case of SMT.LAXMAMMA VS M.P KRISHNAPPA & OTHERS** wherein at Para 3 it is held that:

*“Once the court finds that the plaintiff is in possession, there should not be any hesitation*

KAMS410008132024



*on the part of the court to grant injunction. An aggrieved person comes to the court complaining of the interference of the defendants, may be at a particular point of time the defendants has not caused interference, but once the fear stands heavily in the mind of the aggrieved person, there shall be no difficulty for the court to grant injunction, especially when it found that, that particular aggrieved person is in possession. The fact that the plaintiff is in possession of the property has not been disputed. Hence it is the fit case to grant the injunction”.*

**30.** Further, in a decision reported in **(1998) 5 KLJ Page 168 in the case of Romeo M.F Aquinas Vs Florina Mothias** wherein at para 5 it is held that:

*“For a man to live in peace he resorts to court and seeks an order of injunction. When the defendants admits the claim of the plaintiff nobody will be prejudiced by granting the decree for injunction. After all at the best may be the security that is granted by the court to the plaintiff. If there is going to be no interference, the defendants is not prejudiced and passing such an order is not going to affect the defendants at all. Once the matter has been seized by the court, it is for the court to grant the relief, the parties desire to get and when the relief is available on*

KAMS410008132024



*the basis of averments made in the plaint and grantable on the basis of the written statement, there can be no impediment for granting such relief at all.”*

**31.** In the instant case the possession of the plaintiff over the suit property is held to be proved. Apprehending that the defendants may cause interference in future, the plaintiff has filed the present suit. When the plaintiff has established his possession over the suit property, then mere apprehension of future invasion in the mind of the plaintiff is sufficient to grant the relief of perpetual injunction. Further, admittedly the suit property and the property of the defendants, both are two different properties. Admittedly the defendants have no manner rights over the suit property. Admittedly the suit property belongs to the plaintiff. Since the defendants have no manner of rights over the suit property, preventing the defendants from causing interference to the peaceful possession of the plaintiff over the suit property will not cause any hardship to the defendants. The plaintiff being in possession of the suit property, he is entitled to own, possess and enjoy the suit property without any sorts of interference. Accordingly, I hold that the plaintiff is entitled to the most equitable relief of perpetual injunction. **Accordingly, I answer Issue No.4 in the Affirmative.**

KAMS410008132024



**32. ISSUE NO.5:** In view of my above discussions and findings on Issues No.1 to 4, I proceed to pass the following:

**ORDER**

The suit of the plaintiff is hereby decreed.

By an order of permanent prohibitory injunction, the defendants or anybody claiming through or under them are hereby restrained from interfering in the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit property.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case there is no order as to costs.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, typed by her, and the transcript revised and corrected by me and then pronounced in the open court on this **1<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2026**).

**(SMT.ASRINA)**  
**I ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC**  
**KRISHNARAJANAGAR.**

**ANNEXTURE**

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>List of Witnesses examined on behalf of the Plaintiff</u></b><br>PW-1: Shri.Lokesh D.N S/o Nagaraju D.K                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b><u>List of Documents marked on behalf of the Plaintiff</u></b><br><br>Ex.P-1: Special Power of Attorney dated 15/06/2022.<br>Ex.P-2: Registered Partition Deed dated 08/12/2022.<br>Ex.P-3 & 4: RTC's.<br>Ex.P-5: Tax paid receipt.<br>Ex.P-6: Patta Book.<br>Ex.P-7: Certified copy of Gift deed dated 03/04/2025.<br>Ex.P-7(a): Certificate annexed to the Ex.P-7.<br>Ex.P-8: Acknowledgment issued by police.<br>Ex.P-9: Certified copy of sketch. |
| <b><u>List of Witnesses examined on behalf of the defendants</u></b><br><br>-NIL-                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b><u>List of Documents marked on behalf of the defendants</u></b><br><br>-NIL-                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |

(SMT.ASRINA)  
I ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC  
KRISHNARAJANAGAR.