

(Witness is present and duly sworn on 07-03-2025)

Cross examination by: Sri. B.R.N., Advocate for defendants

After issuance of legal heir certificate I came to know that name of father and my father's name is one and the same. After my mother's death I came to know that mutation is effected in the name of defendant. It is false to suggest that, PDO mentioned in the mutation extract saying mother of the defendants having only 2 sons. I have questioned mutation. I have produced bank statements and other documents to show that I am a member of joint family. It is false to suggest that, I am not a member of Mithakshara school of law. I have filed refugee certificate to show that I am a refugee from Barma. It is false to suggest that, defendants are not the refugees.

2. It is false to suggest that, I am no way related to the defendants and I am not concerned to the suit property. It is false to suggest that, I have not produced documents to show that I am related to the defendants. It is true to suggest that, the documents produced by me are all from Tamilanadu state. Witness volunteers that, I have produced ration card issued by Government of Karnataka of my prior my marriage. It is false to suggest that, I have produced family pedigree from government of Tamilunadu State. It is true to suggest that, I have produced legal heirs certificate from Tamilanadu State. Witness volunteers that, since local authorities at Sindhanur refused to issue said certificate, therefore, I got it from Tamilanadu State. It is false to suggest that, whatever documents I have produced they are issued by Tamilanadu state and not state of Karnataka. It is false to suggest that, legally defendants have got their names mutated in ROR in respect of suit properties.

3. It is false to suggest that, for 30 years I have not challenged mutation order. It is false to suggest that, since, I am no way related to

the defendants, therefore I have not challenged the mutation order for more than 30 years. It is false to suggest that, Pachhayamma voluntarily consented to effect mutation in the name of defendants. It is false to suggest that, since we plaintiffs are no way related to Pachhayamma and Dharmu, therefore, I have not produced any documents to prove our relationship with them. It is false to suggest that, by misguiding the Government of Thamilanadu I have secured documents from that State to prove by relationship. It is false to suggest that, since I am no way related to Pachhayamama and Dharmu, therefore, I have not produced documents issued by the Government of Karnataka.

4. It is false to suggest that, I am not in constructive possession over suit property. It is false to suggest that, I have no locus standy to file the suit as I am no way related to defendants. It I false to suggest that, I am misusing taking advantage of similarity of names of father of defendants and my father. It is false to suggest that, I have no right title over suit properties. It is false to suggest that, to get unlawful possession over suit properties I have filed the suit. It is false to suggest that, I am refugee of Barma and the defendants are repatriates of Barma, therefore suit is not maintainable.

5. As per will and wish of Pachhayamma suit property is mutated in the name of defendants. It is true to suggest that, after mutation Pachhayamma died in the year 2019.

Re-examination:NIL

(Evidence is dictated by me to the typist in open court as stated by witness)

R.O.I & A.C.

Sd/-

Senior Civil Judge & JMFC
Sindhanur.