

KARN020000912021



Presented on : 29-01-2021
Registered on : 29-01-2021
Decided on : 08-07-2026
Duration : 05 years, 5 months, 09 days

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE
& CJM., AT RAMANAGARA.**

O.S.No.39/2021

**Presided Over by : SRI. LOKESHA, B.A., LL.B.,
Prl. Senior Civil Judge and CJM,
Ramanagara.**

Dated: This 8th day of July, 2026.

Plaintiff :- Smt. Nandini K.
W/o Thagadappa,
aged about 35 years,
R/at Kolliganahalli Village,
Harohalli Hobli,
Kanakapura Taluk,
Ramanagara District.

(Rep. by Sri.P.K. Adv.,)

-V/s-

Defendant :- Smt. Shashikala B.S.
W/o K. Revanasiddappa,
aged about 47 years,
R/at No.43/44/45,
Babasahebarapalya Village,
Mysore Road Check Post,
Kengeri Hobli,



Bengaluru South Taluk.

(Rep. by Sri.K.P.P. Adv.,)

* * *

JUDGMENT

This is a suit filed by the Plaintiff against the Defendant for the relief of specific performance of contract.

2. A brief reference to the factual aspects would suffice:-

That the defendant being the absolute owner in possession and enjoyment of suit schedule property vacant site bearing Khaneshumari No.237, measuring 40X30 feet situated at Sheshagirihalli Colony, Hamlet of Sheshagirihalli, Bidadi Hobli, Ramanagara Taluk and District had offered to sell the suit property and plaintiff has accepted the said offer. The defendant has executed agreement of sale dated 28.08.2019 in favour of the plaintiff agreeing to sell the suit schedule property for ₹ 5,60,000/-



and the defendant has received total advance amount of ₹ 2,50,000/- from the plaintiff and agreed to execute regular sale deed by receiving balance amount of ₹ 2,10,000/-. As the defendant has not come forward to execute the regular sale deed, the plaintiff has issued legal notice to the defendant on 08.12.2020 through RPAD and it has been served on the defendant on 10.12.2020. It is further stated that the plaintiff has always been ready and willing to perform her part of contract and the other hand defendant is not ready to perform her part of contract in terms of the agreement of sale. Hence the plaintiff has filed suit and prayed for decree the suit.

3. In response to the summons, the defendant appeared before the court through her counsel and filed a written statement admitting the fact that she is the absolute owner of the suit schedule property and it is her



own property. The defendant pleads her case that the suit is not properly valued by the plaintiff. It is specifically pleaded that as the defendant was in need of money for family legal necessity she requested her friend Krishna and Krishna introduced the defendant to Suresha who is the brother of the plaintiff and said Suresha would submit that his sister would lend money subject to furnish security document. As such the plaintiff has lent sum of ₹ 3,50,000/- on 28.08.2019 and the defendant has executed agreement as security for the money lent. That the defendant is being paid interest of ₹ 1,200/- per month to the plaintiff. Due to COVID-19 the defendant could not pay the subsequent lent period interest. As such the plaintiff had obtained cheque of the defendant's husband and when the defendant's husband could not pay the interest she had intentionally presented the said cheque and said cheque came to be dishonored, based on which the plaintiff's husband had filed



C.C.No. 529/2021 on the file of Addl. Civil Judge and JMFC., Ramanagar for an offence under Section 138 NI Act and same is pending for consideration. It is further stated that suit property is the only source of income for the defendant and she has no other source of income to lead her life. The defendant is ready to return the principle amount to the plaintiff. Hence she has sought for dismissal of suit.

4. On the basis of the rival pleadings of both the parties, this court has framed the following Issues:-

ISSUES

1. *Whether the Plaintiff proves that the Defendant has agreed to sell the suit schedule property in her favour for a total sale consideration of Rs.5,60,000/- by receiving the advance sale consideration of Rs.3,50,000/- and executed the sale agreement dated 28.08.2019 in her favour?*
2. *Whether the Plaintiff proves that she was, she is and she has always been ready and willing to perform her part of the contract?*



3. *Whether the Plaintiff proves that the Defendant has failed to perform her part of the contract as agreed upon?*
4. *Whether the Defendant proves that the transaction in question was one of loan of Rs.3,50,000/- on 28.08.2019 and the agreement in question was executed only as a security for the said loan transaction?*
5. *Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief as sought for?*
6. *What Order or Decree?*

ADDL. ISSUE

1. *Whether the Plaintiff is entitled for decree for alternative relief of refund of advance amount as sought for?*

5. In support of the case of the plaintiff, plaintiff himself examined as PW.1 and examined two witnesses by name Sri. Suresh K. and Sri. D. Chandrashekar as PW.2 and 3 and Ex.P1 to 6 are marked on behalf of the plaintiff. On the other hand, the defendant, Smt.



Shashikala examined herself as DW.1. She got examined one witness by name M. Krishnamurthy as DW.2 The Defendant produced in all 3 documents Ex.D1 to 3.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the Plaintiff and Defendant. I have perused the case records.

7. My findings to the above Issues are as under:-

Issue No.1 : In the Affirmative;

Issue No.2 & 3 : In the Negative;

Issue No.4 : In the Negative;

Issue No.5 : Partly Affirmative;

Addl. Issue
dated 18.03.2026: In the Affirmative;

Issue No.7 : As per the final order
for the following:-

REASONS

8. Issue No.1 and 4:- As these Issues are interconnected they require common discussion and



appreciation of evidence, they are taken together for consideration. To establish the case of the Plaintiff, Plaintiff Smt. Nandini examined herself as PW.1. This PW.1 files her chief affidavit by retraining the averments of the Plaintiff. Plaintiff has produced in all 6 documents as Ex.P1 to 6. Before going to discuss the fact in issue, it is necessary to note the admitted facts herein itself to narrow down the controversy between the parties to the suit. It is not in dispute that the defendant is the absolute owner of the suit schedule property, having purchased the same through registered sale deed. Exhibit P1 agreement of sale has also not been disputed by the defendant. But according to the defendant, this Exhibit P1 was executed towards security of the loan amount of ₹ 3,50,000/- borrowed from the plaintiff by the defendant and Exhibit P1 was not executed with an intention to sell the suit schedule property. I have carefully scanned Exhibit P1 which is the registered



agreement of sale dated 28.08.2019. As I have already noted above, execution of Exhibit P1 agreement of sale has not been disputed by the defendant. But the purpose for which it is executed is denied by the defendant. According to the defendant, Exhibit P1 was not executed with an intention to sell the suit property. Rather it was executed towards security of the loan amount of ₹ 3,50,000/- borrowed by the defendant from the plaintiff.

9. In order to appreciate the case of the both parties, now I advert to the recitals of Exhibit P1. As per contents of Exhibit P1, the defendant Smt. Sashikala B.S. had agreed to sell the property mentioned therein in favour of plaintiff Smt. Nandini for total sale consideration of ₹ 5,60,000/- and as she had received ₹ 2,50,000/- through Cheque No.242392, Dated 28.08.2019 and also ₹ 1,00,000/- through cash from the plaintiff. As per contents of Exhibit P1 the defendant



agreed to execute the regular sale deed within 11 months by obtaining 11-E sketch, khata document and other documents required for registration by receiving balance amount of ₹ 2,10,000/-. Undisputedly as per recitals of Exhibit P1 possession has not been delivered to the plaintiff under this agreement of sale.

10. It is to be noted that Exhibit P1 being a registered document has got presumptive value. When the defendant admits the execution of Exhibit P1 agreement of sale and as it is a defence that it was executed towards the security of the loan amount, but it was not executed with an intention to sell the suit property, the onus would shift on the defendant. So, the initial burden has been discharged by the plaintiff by producing Exhibit P1 which is registered document. Keeping in view the defence raised by the defendant in a written statement, now I advert to the oral



testimony of PW.1 out of curiosity. PW.1 deposes that she herself and defendant are residents of different district and the defendant is residing at Sheshagirihalli. She further deposes that she came to know that the defendant was intending to sell the suit property through her elder brother. The said fact has been stated in the chief affidavit. Indeed, it has not been stated by PW.1 in the chief affidavit. However, PW.1 deposes that the defendant's husband and her elder brother were also present at the time of negotiation. PW.1 further deposes that at the time of negotiation, the defendant had produced land paper, RTC, tax paid receipts. And at that day she had paid ₹ 1,000/- as token advance. She further deposes that subsequently after one month of negotiation agreement was executed.

11. It is to be noted that some strange suggestions have been made to PW.1 by the learned counsel for the



defendant which has not been supported with pleadings. It is suggested to PW.1 that the defendant's husband had requested the husband of PW.1 to lend money for educational expenses of his children. It is denied by PW.1. This suggestion is not supported with pleadings. It is further suggested that on 28.08.2019 she herself and her husband had agreed to give amount to the defendant for educational expenses of the children of the defendant. It has also been specifically denied by PW.1. It is to be noted that this suggestion is also not been specifically pleaded by the defendant. It is suggested that on 28.08.2019 she had paid ₹ 1,00,000/- to the husband of the defendant and she paid ₹ 1,00,000/-. But she denied that on that day she demanded the defendant husband to issue a cheque. It is significant note that this suggestion has not been supported with pleadings. It is further stated that the husband of the defendant had issued a cheque drawn on Thyagaraj Co-



Operative Bank pertaining to her husband's account. It is denied by PW.1. It is further suggested that she also demanded the defendant's husband to issue a cheque towards security of the loan amount. The said suggestion has also been denied. It is further suggested that as there were no document in the name of the husband of the defendant, the property document of the defendant was handed over to her. It is also denied by PW.1. It is further suggested that since 28.08.2019 till 19.10.2020 the defendant's husband has paid interest to her husband. PW.1 has deposed her ignorance for the said suggestion.

12. It is significant to note that so many suggestions have been made to PW.1 by the learned counsel for the defendant with respect to the issuance of cheque by the defendant husband and to the plaintiff husband towards receipt of the loan amount borrowed by the defendant



husband from the plaintiff husband. All the suggestions made to PW.1 by the learned counsel for the Defendant have been categorically denied by PW.1. It is significant to note that it is further suggested that, there was only a transaction between her husband and defendant's husband. It is also categorically denied by PW.1. It is further suggested that this false suit has been filed by misusing the document executed by the defendant husband towards security of the loan amount. The said suggestion has also been categorically denied by PW.1. It is further suggested that on the day and the date of agreement, the defendant was not present. But husband of the plaintiff took the defendant to obtain the signature of the defendant on the document. It is also been categorically denied by PW.1.

13. It is significant to note that in the written statement the defendant took a contention that as the



defendant was in need of money she approached one Krishna and she Krishna introduced the defendant to brother of the plaintiff by name Suresha and said Suresha told the defendant that her sister would lend the money subject to furnish security document. As such she has executed agreement of sale towards security of the loan amount and Plaintiff lent ₹ 3,50,000/-. This is the defence of the defendant taken up in the written statement. But during the course of cross-examination, that defendant took a inconsistent contention suggesting that the defendant's husband had received loan amount from the plaintiff's husband, for which P1 was executed as instructed by the plaintiff's husband towards security of the loan amount and the plaintiff's husband had also obtained the cheque of the defendant. These are all the suggestions made by the defence counsel to PW.1, which have been categorically denied by the PW.1. It is significant to note that what has



been pleaded by the defendant in the written statement as a defence has not been specifically suggested to PW.1. Moreover, whatever the suggestions have been made to PW.1 during the course of cross examination by the learned counsel for the defendant have not been supported with pleadings. In other words the suggestions made to PW.1 are not supported with pleadings.

14. With respect to the object of cross-examination, it is well settled principle of law that the cross-examination is a matter of substance, not of procedure. One is required to put one version in cross-examination of opponent. The effect of non cross-examination is that the statement of witness has not been disputed. It is also well settled principle of law that, the party is obliged to put its case in cross-examination of witness of opponent. The rule of putting one's own version in cross-examination is one of essential justice, not mere



technical one. So it is to be noted that as I have already discussed above so many suggestions are made to PW.1 by the learned counsel for the defendant which has not been supported with pleadings. Only during the course of cross examination many suggestions have been made with respect to the alleged transaction between husband of the plaintiff and husband of the defendant. But not between the plaintiff and husband of the defendant or defendant. So it can be said that the defendant counsel during the course of cross-examination of PW.1 traveled beyond the pleading which is not permissible and which cannot be considered as an evidence on behalf of the defendant.

15. It is well settled principle of law that, no amount of plea without corroborative evidence and all evidence without corresponding pleadings cannot go on to establish a fact. The Civil Courts are required to act and adjudicate based on



pleadings and evidentiary material placed before it. Moreover, Evidence of PW.2 and PW.3 is also inconsistent with the evidence of PW.1 and Exhibit P1. Even though PW.2 and PW.3 have been cross examined by the learned counsel for the defendant, nothing is elicited to disbelieve their case and to infer that Exhibit P1 was executed towards security of the loan amount, but it was not executed with an intention to sell the suit property by the defendant. It is to be noted that there has not been even a remote suggestion in Exhibit P1, that there was any loan or borrowing transaction between the plaintiff and defendant and it was executed towards security. On the contrary the recitals and stipulation in Exhibit P1 that agreement has been only in affirmation of the agreement for sale of the receipt of part payment of ₹ 3,50,000/- from the plaintiff by the defendant. Exhibit P1 being registered document has got presumptive value and by producing Exhibit P1 registered agreement of



sale and by examining PW.2 and 3, the plaintiff has discharged the initial burden. The onus would shift on the defendant. So the evidence on the part of the defendant in the case remains rather vague and sketchy and it is difficult to accept the oral assertion of the defendant, as against the recitals of Exhibit P1 agreement of sale.

16. It is well recognized principle of law that where it is not possible to obtain evidence which conclusively establish or rebut the allegations, the case must be dealt with on reasonable probabilities and legal inferences arising from proved or admitted facts. So it can be said that the case of the plaintiff is more probable than the case of the defendant. No pleadings by the defendant that husband of the defendant had requested the plaintiff's husband to lend for education purpose of the defendant's children. No pleadings by the defendant that on 28.08.2019 plaintiff and her



husband had agreed to pay amount to the education expense of the children of the defendant subject to execution of the security document. No pleadings by the defendant that the defendant husband had received the amount of ₹ 2,00,000/- and ₹ 1,00,000 from the plaintiff husband but not the defendant. No pleadings by the defendant that plaintiff and her husband insisted the defendant and her husband to give cheque towards security of the amount and also to execute the agreement of sale. No pleadings by the defendant that husband of the defendant used to pay interest in every month to the defendant. So it can be said that the case of the plaintiff is more probable than the case of the defendant. Therefore I come to conclusion that Exhibit P1 is executed by the defendant with an intention to sell the suit property.

17. It is true that the defendant has produced Exhibit



D2 which is the copy of the Judgment of Criminal Case No.529/2021 filed by the plaintiff's husband Thagadappa as against the defendant's husband Ravanasiddappa. It is true that in the said criminal case the husband of the present defendant had taken up a defence that the plaintiff's husband had obtained cheques from the defendant's husband towards security of the loan amount borrowed by the husband of the defendant from the husband of the present plaintiff. It is true that in the said criminal case, the husband of the present defendant probablized his defence and he was acquitted. It is true that there is a mention about the alleged agreement of sale in this Exhibit D2. But there is no clear findings by the learned Additional Civil Judge and JMFC., that the present Exhibit P1, agreement of sale, was executed towards security of the loan amount by the husband of the present defendant in favour of the husband of the present plaintiff in the said case. Moreover



any findings recorded in criminal case will not bearing on the civil case. Civil case has to be decided on the evidence on record. But any conclusion arrived at in a criminal case is not a conclusive proof in a civil case. However Exhibit D2 judgment of acquittal of the husband of the present defendant in C.C.No. 529/2021 will not probablise the defence of the defendant raised in the present suit. Therefore, I come to conclusion that Exhibit D1 to D3 will be of no bearing on the case of the defendant and they are not sufficient to probablise the defence of the defendant in view of the fact that Exhibit P1 is registered agreement of sale. Moreover, the defendant has failed to probablise her case by effective cross examination of PW.1. Therefore, I come to conclusion that Exhibit P1 agreement of sale has been executed by the defendant only in favour of the plaintiff with an intention to sell the property mentioned therein for ₹ 3,50,000/-. Moreover the defendant has failed to probablise



her case that Exhibit P1 has been executed by her in favour of the plaintiff towards the loan amount. **With these reasons, I answer Issue No.1 in Affirmative. Issue No. 4 in Negative.**

18. Issue number 2 and 3. The plaintiff pleads in the plaint that she has always been ready and willing to perform her part of contract as per the terms of the agreement of sale. But the defendant is not ready to perform her part of contract as per the terms of the agreement of sale. It is true that as per Exhibit P1, advance amount of ₹ 3,50,000/- has been paid and the balance amount to be paid by the plaintiff to the defendant is ₹ 2,10,000/-. Under Exhibit P1, period for registration of sale was fixed as 11 months. As per contents of Exhibit P1, the defendant had agreed to obtain e-katha document, Encumbrance Certificate for registration of the sale deed.



19. It is significant to note that during the course of cross-examination of PW.1 there is no single suggestion by the learned Principal and defendant. still the defendant is not ready with E-katha to execute the sale to Exhibit P1 in favour of the plaintiff. There is no whisper by the plaintiff during the course of cross-examination of DW.1. However the balance amount to be paid by the plaintiff under Exhibit P1 is ₹ 2,10,000/-. It is well recognized principle of law that under Section 16 of specific law, it is the duty of the plaintiff to establish that she has always been ready and willing to perform her part of contract. Readiness is with respect to the financial capacity. Willingness is with respect to the mental status of the plaintiff. It is significant to note that except issuance of notice by the plaintiff no document has been produced by the plaintiff to show that the she has always been ready with balance sale consideration of ₹ 2,10,000/- to get the sale registered in her favour. In order



to prove her financial capacity the plaintiff has not produced any single document. It is true that during the course of cross examination of PW.1 the defendant has not disputed the financial capacity of the plaintiff to pay the balance amount. However in spite of it is the primary duty of the plaintiff to establish her financial capacity to pay the balance and consideration amount. In this regard it is useful to refer the decision of the ***Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No.150/2022 in case of Shenbagam and others Vs. K.K. Rathinvel.*** In para No.31 of the judgment wherein the lordships have held as follows:-

31. The "readiness" of the respondent to perform his obligations refers to whether he was financially capable of paying the balance consideration. Both the trial court and the first appellate court have observed that the respondent was ready to pay the balance consideration as (i) he was paying income tax since 1988 and (ii) his bank passbooks indicate that he had sufficient funds. The payment of income tax by itself does not show



that the respondent had sufficient resources to pay for the suit property. Moreover, the bank passbooks submitted in evidence by the respondent were for accounts opened on 11 March 1992 and 22 July 1994, that is, after the expiry of the period written in the contract. The first appellate court despite noting this, has chosen to hold that the respondent was PART C ready and willing to perform the agreement. The respondent however did not lead any evidence to indicate that in the year 1990 he had the money to pay the balance consideration. The first appellate court shifted the burden on the appellants to prove that the respondent-plaintiff was incapable of paying the balance consideration. It is an established principle of law that the plaintiff must prove that he is ready and willing to perform the contract. The burden lies on the plaintiff. The respondent has not led any evidence that he was ready or willing to perform his obligations under the agreement.”

20. It is also useful to refer another decision reported in **2016 (5) KAR LJ 91 DB, Punni Akat Philipraju (Since Dead) by his Lrs.**, In this decision at paragraph 38, their lordships have held as follows:-



“38. Section 16(c) of the Specific Relief Act is an exception to this general rule-Unless a person avers and proves that he has performed or has always been ready and willing to perform the essential terms of the contract which are to be performed by him, he is not entitled to enforce the specific performance of the contract. In other words, before a Court can grant a decree for specific performance, this mandatory requirement of the statute has to be complied with by the plaintiff irrespective of the defence taken by the defendant. Only if this mandatory requirement is complied with, the Civil Court gets jurisdiction to grant a decree for specific performance. If this requirement is not met, the Civil Court has no jurisdiction to grant a decree for specific performance. Therefore, it is obligatory on the part of the Court, that, in every suit for specific performance to frame an issue regarding readiness and willingness to perform the essential terms of the contract by the plaintiff irrespective of the fact whether the defendant has specifically denied the allegations in the plaint regarding readiness and willingness to perform or not. Therefore, what follows is that a plaintiff, who comes to the Court seeking a decree for specific performance must aver and prove that he has performed or is always ready and willing to perform the essential terms of the contract



which are to be performed by him. Whether the defendant denied those allegations are not in the written statement, the Court is under an obligation to frame an issue regarding readiness and willingness on the part of the plaintiff to perform the terms of the contract. Once that issue is framed, the burden of proving readiness and willingness is on the plaintiff. It is not dependent upon the admission of the defendant either in the written statement or in the evidence. Unless the plaintiff proves to the satisfaction of the Court that he was ready and willing to perform his part of the contract,, the Court gets no jurisdiction to pass a decree for specific performance.”

So, as per the dictum of this decision, it is the initial burden upon the plaintiff to establish that she has always been ready and willing to perform her part of contract. But the plaintiff in order to prove her financial capacity has not produced any document. It is to be noted that the plaintiff has not produced any document to show that she has always been ready with balance sale consideration amount



to get the sale deed registered in her favour. The plaintiff cannot succeed on the weakness of the defendant. It is the initial burden on the plaintiff to establish her financial capacity to get the salary registered in her favour. In the absence of documentary proof it cannot be said that the plaintiff has always been willing to perform her part of contract. So therefore, as per the dictum of the above decision cited by the learned counsel for the defendant, this court is of the opinion that the plaintiff has not established that she has always been ready and willing to perform her part of contract. Therefore I come to conclusion the plaintiff has failed to establish that she has always been ready and willing to perform her part of contract. **Therefore I answer Issue No.2 and 3 in the Negative.**

21. Issue No. 5 and Addl. Issue No.1

dated:18.03.2026:-It is to be noted that, as the plaintiff



has failed to establish that she has always been ready and willing to perform her part of contract, decree for specific performance contract be granted in the case of the plaintiff because the decree for specific performance of contract is discretionary power of the court for the reason that plaintiff has value to establish a readiness and willingness, this court is of the opinion that, it is not a fit case to exercise a discretionary power in favour of the plaintiff. However, as an alternative relief the plaintiff has sought for decree for refund of advance amount with interest. Therefore, the plaintiff has paid advance amount of ₹ 3,50,000/- in the year 2019. If the said amount is deposited, the plaintiff would have get interest at the rate of interest fixed by the RBI. Under such circumstances, this court is of the opinion that if interest is awarded at the rate of 12% from the rate of agreement till realization it would be a sense of justice. Therefore, I come to conclusion that it is a fit case to grant alternate decree for



refund of advance amount, at the rate of 12% per annum from the date of agreement till realization which would metes ends of justice. **Hence I answer Issue No.5 in Negative and Addl. Issue No.1 in Affirmative.**

22. Issue No.6:- In view of my findings to Issues No.1 to 5 and Addl. Issue No.1, I proceed to pass the following:-

ORDER

The suit filed by the plaintiff for decree for specific performance of contract is hereby dismissed.

The suit for alternative relief of recovery of advance amount is decreed with costs.

Alternatively, the plaintiff is entitled for recovery of the advanced amount of Rs.3,50,000/- with 12% interest from the date of Ex.P1 till realization from the defendant, failing which plaintiff is at liberty to get the decree executed in accordance with law.



Draw decree accordingly.

(Judgment is dictated to the laptop by me in Adalat Ai through dicta-phone and same is pronounced by me corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open court on this 8th day of July 2026).

(LOKESHA)
Prl. Senior Civil Judge & CJM
Ramanagara.

Annexure

1. List of witness/s examined for the Plaintiff:-

P.W.1 : Smt. Nandini;
P.W.2 : Sri. Suresh K.;
P.W.3 : Sri. D. Chandrashekhar.

2. List of Documents exhibited for the Plaintiff:-

Ex.P1 : Sale Agreement dated:28.08.2019;
Ex.P1(a to e) : Signatures of witnesses;
Ex.P2 : Encumbrance Certificate;
Ex.P3 : Copy of Legal Notice;
Ex.P4 : Postal Receipts;
Ex.P5 : Track Result;
Ex.P6 : RPAD acknowledgment.

3. List witness/s examined for the Defendants:-

D.W.1 : Smt. Shashikala;
D.W.2 : Sri. M. Krishnamurthy.

4. List of documents exhibited for the Defendants:-

Ex.D1 : Bank Statement Extract;

KARN020000912021



33

O.S.No.39/2021 J

Ex.D2 : Certified copy of Judgment
in C.C.No.529/2021;
Ex.D3 : Certified copy of evidence
in C.C.No.529/2021.

Prl. Senior Civil Judge & CJM.,
Ramanagara.