

KARN220014182020



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & J.M.F.C. AT:
CHANNAPATNA**

DATED THIS 03rd JUNE 2026

-: PRESENT :-

**SRI. YOGESHA K B.A.L. LL.M. PGDHRM
PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & J.M.F.C.
CHANNAPATNA.**

O.S. No. 161 OF 2020

BETWEEN

**SHRI. CHANNAPPA C
S/O LATE CHANNEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,
R/O KEREMEGALADODDI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
CHANNAPATNA TALUK,
RAMANAGAA DISTRICT.**

. . . PLAINTIFF

(REPT. BY SRI. K.T.THIMME GOWDA., ADVOCATE)

AND



JUDGMENT

~ 2 ~

O.S. No.161 of 2020

1. SHRI.RIZWAN
S/O RRASUAL KHAN
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
2. SHRI.SYED SAFI
S/O SYED HUSSAINY,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
3. SHRI.SYED JEELU
S/O SYED PASHA
(SINCE DEAD – DELETED)
4. SHRI.SYED SALEEM
S/O SYED KHADER
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDING AT
NEWMAKHAN
BEHIND ASHRAYA HOTEL
NEAR TOTGATE, B M ROAD
CHANNAPATNA TOWN
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT.

. . . DEFENDANTS

(BY SRI. NISAR SAB ADVOCATE)



Suit presented on	18.08.2020		
Suit registered on	18.08.2020		
Nature of Suit	Permanent Injunction		
Commencement of evidence on	07.10.2023		
Suit decided on	03.06.2026		
Total Duration	Year/s	Month/s	Day/s
	05	09	16

-: J U D G M E N T :-

The plaintiff has filed this suit for the relief of **Permanent Injunction**, to restrain the defendants and their agents or anybody claiming under them from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property by the plaintiff; and for cost of the suit.

-: S C H E D U L E :-

Land bearing Sy. No. 124/2B measuring 3 ¼ guntas and 124/3A measuring 3 ¼ guntas adjacent to each other of Honniganahalli Village, Kasaba hobli, Channapatna Taluk now included to Vondaraguppe Panchayath in the year 2005-06 bearing K No. 625/124/3A/2B measuring 80X93 feet bounded by East - Land of Bhagyamma, West - Land of S Madhuraa, North - 30 feet Road, South - Conservancy Gully.

**GERMINATION OF FACT**

1. It is the contention of the plaintiff that he is the absolute owner in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. According to the plaintiff, he purchased the land bearing Sy.No.124/2B measuring 3¼ guntas and Sy.No.124/3A measuring 3¼ guntas situated at Honniganahalli Village, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, under a registered sale deed dated 27.03.1997 executed by one Shivakumar C.R. It is further contended that the khata was effected in his favour pursuant to the order passed in M.R. No.34/1996-97. The plaintiff further traces the title of his vendor and contends that the said property had earlier been purchased by Veeranna under a sale deed dated 17.04.1986 and that the said Veeranna derived title from one A.S. Krishna Singh, who had purchased the property on 12.07.1960.

2. The plaintiff contends that ever since the date of purchase, he has been in lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as its owner. According to him, he has been exercising all rights of ownership over the property and has been



paying land revenue and other taxes to the concerned authorities. It is further contended that subsequently the property came within the limits of Vondaraguppe Grama Panchayath and was assigned Katha No.625/124/3A/2B. Thereafter, he has been regularly paying taxes to the Panchayath. The plaintiff relies upon the sale deeds, mutation register extracts, RTC extracts, demand register extracts and tax-paid receipts in support of his claim and contends that the said documents clearly establish his title, possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property. According to him, no other person has any right, title, interest or possession over the suit schedule property.

3. It is further the contention of the plaintiff that the defendants are complete strangers to the suit schedule property and have no manner of right, title, interest or possession over the same. However, about fifteen days prior to the filing of the suit, the defendants allegedly started creating nuisance in and around the suit schedule property. The plaintiff contends that since the property is situated adjacent to a Muslim locality and had remained vacant for a long period, the defendants attempted



to take advantage of the situation and make a false claim over the property.

4. The plaintiff further contends that the defendants are influential persons in the locality and, with an intention to assert a false claim over the suit schedule property for the benefit of their community, they gathered local residents by giving false assurances and came near the property, creating nuisance. According to the plaintiff, prior to such incident, nobody had ever interfered with the suit schedule property and there was no such locality in existence at the time when he purchased the property.

5. The plaintiff contends that at the instigation of certain persons who were not well-disposed towards him, the defendants approached the suit schedule property without any semblance of right, title or possession and attempted to obstruct his possession and enjoyment thereof. It is further contended that he immediately lodged a complaint before the police and, due to the intervention of the police and neighbouring residents, the defendants could not succeed in their attempt. According to the



plaintiff, while leaving the place, the defendants threatened that they would dispossess him from the property sooner or later.

6. The plaintiff further contends that the defendants are taking advantage of the location of the suit schedule property and are making illegal attempts to grab the same. According to him, despite advice and intervention by the jurisdictional police, the defendants did not desist from their activities. The police allegedly advised the plaintiff to approach the Civil Court for appropriate relief. This is said to be the cause of action to file this suit. The same arose within the jurisdiction of this Court. Hence it is prayed to decree the suit.

7. After service of suit summons, defendant Nos.1 to 4 appeared through their learned counsel and contested the suit by filing a joint written statement. During the pendency of the proceedings, defendant No.3 was reported to have died. Consequently, by order dated 02.06.2023, the name of defendant No.3 was deleted from the cause title of the plaint.



8. The defendant Nos.1 to 4 have filed a joint written statement denying the material averments made in the plaint. It is the specific contention of the defendants that the plaintiff is neither the absolute owner nor in possession of the suit schedule property. The defendants dispute the title and possession claimed by the plaintiff and contend that the documents relied upon by him do not confer any valid right over the suit schedule property. According to them, the documents produced by the plaintiff are concocted, created and unreliable and cannot be made the basis for granting any relief in his favour.

9. The defendants further contend that the suit schedule property described by the plaintiff is not formed in Sy. No.124/2B measuring $3\frac{1}{4}$ guntas and Sy. No.124/3A measuring $3\frac{1}{4}$ guntas situated at Honniganahalli Village, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk. It is their contention that the boundaries and measurements mentioned in the sale deed relied upon by the plaintiff do not tally with the description of the property shown in the plaint schedule, thereby creating serious doubt regarding the identity of the property claimed by the plaintiff.



10. The defendants have further contended that the plaintiff was never in possession of the suit schedule property at any point of time. Therefore, according to them, the allegation that they interfered with or attempted to disturb the plaintiff's possession is wholly false and baseless. They contend that when the plaintiff is not in possession of the property, the question of interference by the defendants does not arise.

11. It is also their contention that no cause of action has arisen for filing the present suit and that the plaintiff has instituted the suit only with an ulterior motive and for unlawful gain. According to the defendants, the suit is not maintainable either on facts or in law and is liable to be dismissed. They further contend that no hardship would be caused to the plaintiff if the suit is dismissed, whereas serious hardship, injustice and irreparable loss would be caused to them if the suit is decreed. On these grounds, the defendants have sought dismissal of the suit with costs.

12. On the basis of above pleadings, the following issues were framed by my learned predecessor-in-office.



<u>:- I S S U E S :-</u>	
1.	Whether the plaintiff proves that, he is in possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as on the date of filing the suit?
2.	Whether the plaintiff proves that, the alleged interference caused by the defendants?
3.	Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of Permanent Injunction?
4.	What order or decree?

13. In order to substantiate his case, the plaintiff examined himself as PW.1 and got marked 13 documents as Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.13. Thereafter, he closed his side evidence. During the course of cross-examination of PW.1, 13 documents were confronted to him and marked as Ex.D.1 to Ex.D.13.

14. To rebut the case of the plaintiff, defendant No.1 examined himself as DW.1 and produced 13 documents, which were



marked as Ex.D.14 to Ex.D.26. The defendants also examined four other witnesses as DW.2 to DW.5. However, despite sufficient opportunities being granted, DW.2 to DW.4 failed to tender themselves for cross-examination. Consequently, by order dated 09.03.2026, their chief-examination affidavits were discarded. Thereafter, the defendants closed their side evidence.

15. I have heard the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the plaintiff and perused the written arguments filed on behalf of the defendants. I have carefully considered the pleadings of the parties and scrutinized the oral and documentary evidence available on record.

16. My findings on the above issues are as under;

Issue No.1	:	In the Affirmative
Issue No.2	:	In the Affirmative
Issue No.3		In the Affirmative
Issue No.4	:	As per final order;

for the following;



-: R E A S O N S :-

17. **ISSUE No. 1:-** The present suit has been filed seeking the relief of a permanent injunction. A permanent injunction is a discretionary remedy that can be granted by the court to prevent a party from doing certain acts or from continuing an act that is detrimental to the rights of another party. In order to obtain this discretionary relief, the plaintiff must establish a prima facie case for the relief sought. This involves demonstrating certain foundational rights over the suit property or proving lawful ownership of the property in question. In this context, the plaintiff must show that she has a legal and rightful claim to the property and that the act she seeks to prevent is unlawful.

18. In order to prove his case, the plaintiff examined himself as PW.1 and filed affidavit in lieu of his chief examination by reiterating the plaint averments. The plaintiff has consistently deposed that he purchased the suit schedule property under a registered sale deed dated 27.03.1997 from Shivakumar C.R. and that since the date of purchase he has been in possession and enjoyment of the same.



19. In a civil suit, documentary evidence plays an important role in deciding the rights of the parties. Since civil cases are decided on the principle of preponderance of probabilities, documentary evidence generally carries greater evidentiary value. Therefore, before appreciating the oral evidence on record, it is necessary to first examine the documentary evidence produced by both parties.

20. The foundation of the plaintiff's claim rests upon Ex.P.1, the original registered Sale Deed dated 27.03.1997 executed by Shivakumar C.R. in his favour. The said document discloses the transfer of Sy.No.124/2B measuring 3¼ guntas and Sy.No.124/3A measuring 3¼ guntas. Being a registered document, Ex.P.1 carries a presumption of genuineness and legality unless successfully challenged before a competent forum. Admittedly, neither the defendants nor any third party have challenged the validity of Ex.P.1 before any Court or authority. Even the DW.1 has categorically admitted in his cross-examination that neither he nor his associates have questioned the said sale deed. Therefore, Ex.P.1 constitutes a substantial piece of evidence in support of the plaintiff's claim.



21. The plaintiff has not merely relied upon his own sale deed. He has also produced the antecedent title documents, namely Ex.P.2, the certified copy of the registered Sale Deed dated 22.06.1960, Ex.P.3, the original registered Sale Deed dated 17.04.1986, and Ex.P.12, the certified copy of the registered Sale Deed dated 13.02.1948. These documents disclose the chain of transactions through which title to the property has travelled over several decades. Though this is a suit for bare injunction, these documents assume importance as they demonstrate that the plaintiff's possession is not a stray or isolated claim but is founded upon a long chain of registered transactions.

22. The Ex.P.4, the certified copy of Mutation Register No.34/1996-97, assumes considerable significance. The said document reflects the mutation of revenue records consequent upon the plaintiff's purchase. Revenue entries by themselves may not confer title, but they are relevant pieces of evidence for determining possession and enjoyment of immovable property. Significantly, the defendants have not produced any material to show that the said mutation entry was ever cancelled or set aside by the competent revenue authorities.



23. The plaintiff has further relied upon Ex.P.5, the Akarbandh extract, and Ex.P.6 and Ex.P.7, the Pakka Book extracts relating to Survey Nos.124/2B and 124/3A. These documents identify and describe the survey numbers in question and lend corroboration to the plaintiff's case regarding the identity of the suit property. Though the defendants attempted to dispute the identity of the property, no contrary survey records have been produced to demonstrate that the suit schedule property is different from the property purchased under Ex.P.1.

24. The plaintiff has also produced Ex.P.8 and Ex.P.9, being Tax Demand Extracts, along with Ex.P.10 and Ex.P.11, being Tax Paid Receipts. These documents disclose that taxes in respect of the suit property were assessed and paid. Payment of taxes may not by itself establish title; however, it is a relevant circumstance indicating assertion of possession and enjoyment over the property. The defendants have not produced any tax receipts standing in their names in respect of the suit schedule property.

25. The Ex.P.13, the Encumbrance Certificate, further supports the plaintiff's case by reflecting the transactions pertaining to the



property. Nothing has been elicited in the cross-examination of PW.1 to discredit the authenticity of the said document.

26. Thus, the documentary evidence produced by the plaintiff forms a continuous chain consisting of title deeds, mutation entries, survey records and tax records. Collectively, these documents establish that the plaintiff has been asserting rights over the suit property and that such assertion is supported by official records maintained by public authorities.

27. Before examining the documents produced by DW.1, it is pertinent to note that Ex.D.1 to Ex.D.13 were not produced through the defendants' evidence but were confronted to PW.1 during the course of his cross-examination and came to be marked through him. These documents consist of RTC extracts, mutation extracts and photographs relied upon by the defendants to dispute the plaintiff's possession and the identity of the suit schedule property. Therefore, the evidentiary value of these documents has to be appreciated in the light of the admissions elicited from PW.1 as well as the other evidence available on record.



28. Ex.D.1, Ex.D.3, Ex.D.4, Ex.D.5, Ex.D.6, Ex.D.8 and Ex.D.9 are RTC extracts relating to Survey Nos.124/9, 124/8, 124/2A, 124/2B and 124/3A. Ex.D.2, Ex.D.7, Ex.D.10 and Ex.D.11 are mutation extracts pertaining to M.R. Nos.T8/2019-20 and T9/2019-20. These documents mainly disclose the phodi proceedings and subsequent renumbering of Survey Nos.124/2B and 124/3A as Survey Nos.124/8 and 124/9. In fact, PW.1 has admitted such phodi proceedings in his evidence. Therefore, these documents do not negate the plaintiff's case regarding the identity of the property and, to some extent, corroborate his version regarding the subsequent survey subdivision.

29. The Ex.D.12 and Ex.D.13 are photographs confronted to PW.1 during his cross-examination. The defendants have relied upon these photographs to contend that a road exists in the suit schedule property. It is true that PW.1, upon being confronted with the photographs, stated that a road had been formed in the property and further asserted that the same was formed after institution of the suit. However, such statement, elicited while confronting the witness with the photographs, cannot be treated as a conclusive admission regarding the nature, extent or legality



of the alleged road. A stray admission made in the course of cross-examination, divorced from the surrounding circumstances and unsupported by independent evidence, cannot by itself determine the rights of the parties. Except producing the photographs, the defendants have not placed any cogent and acceptable evidence to show who formed the alleged road, when it was formed, under whose authority it was formed, or whether it is a public road. Significantly, the photographs do not disclose that the alleged road is a formed road laid with tar, concrete or cement by any local authority. In the absence of supporting documentary or oral evidence, the photographs and the isolated statement of PW.1 are insufficient to establish the defence contention or to displace the plaintiff's evidence regarding possession of the suit schedule property.

30. Apart from the documents confronted to PW.1, the defendants have produced Ex.D.14 to Ex.D.26 through the evidence of DW.1. Ex.D.14 to Ex.D.24 are photographs and Ex.D.25 and Ex.D.26 are compact discs. The defendants have relied upon these documents to contend that the suit schedule



property is being used by the public and that the plaintiff is not in possession thereof.

31. It is pertinent to note that DW.1 has produced a certificate under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act in respect of the electronic evidence and consequently the photographs and compact discs came to be marked as Ex.D.14 to Ex.D.26. However, admissibility of a document is one thing and its evidentiary value is another. The Court is still required to assess the probative value of such evidence in the light of the entire material available on record.

32. A careful scrutiny of Ex.D.14 to Ex.D.24 reveals that they are photographs depicting certain portions of land and surrounding areas. However, the photographs do not indicate the survey number, boundaries or any identifiable feature connecting them conclusively to the suit schedule property. Significantly, DW.1 has admitted in his cross-examination that the property shown in the photographs falls within Survey No.124/1. The suit schedule property, on the other hand, pertains to Survey Nos.124/2B and 124/3A. Therefore, the photographs do not



directly establish the condition or possession of the suit schedule property.

33. Even assuming that the photographs depict a road or passage, they do not disclose who formed such road, when it was formed, or under whose authority it came into existence. No official records, survey sketch, Panchayath records, Public Works Department records or evidence of any local authority have been produced to establish that the alleged road is a public road. Further, a mere pathway visible in a photograph cannot, by itself, establish that the defendants are in possession of the suit property or that the plaintiff has lost possession thereof.

34. The Ex.D.25 and Ex.D.26, being compact discs, have also been relied upon by the defendants. However, except producing the electronic records, no independent material has been placed before the Court to establish that the contents thereof conclusively relate to the suit schedule property. Therefore, these documents do not materially advance the defence case. Thus, even upon accepting Ex.D.14 to Ex.D.26 as admissible evidence, they do not establish any right, title or possession of the



defendants over the suit schedule property. At the highest, they indicate the existence of certain physical features in the locality. Consequently, these documents are insufficient to displace the documentary evidence produced by the plaintiff regarding his possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Accordingly, this Court answers Issue No.1 in the **Affirmative**.

35. **Issue No. 2:** In a suit for permanent injunction, mere proof of possession is not sufficient. The plaintiff is also required to establish that the defendants have interfered with or attempted to interfere with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Such interference need not necessarily result in dispossession. Even a threatened invasion of the plaintiff's lawful possession would entitle him to seek preventive relief from the Court.

36. In the present case, the plaintiff has specifically pleaded that the defendants, claiming no manner of right, title or interest over the suit schedule property, started creating obstruction and nuisance in respect of the property shortly prior to the institution of the suit. According to him, the defendants gathered local



residents, asserted false claims over the property and attempted to prevent him from exercising his rights over the suit schedule property. PW.1 has reiterated these averments in his oral evidence.

37. During his cross-examination, PW.1 consistently maintained that whenever he visited the suit schedule property, several persons associated with the defendants used to gather at the spot and obstruct him. He specifically deposed that the defendants and their supporters used to cause hindrance whenever he attempted to enter or carry on activities in the property. Nothing worthwhile has been elicited in his cross-examination to discredit this portion of his testimony.

38. Further, though the defendants have denied the plaintiff's possession, they have failed to establish any lawful right of their own over the suit schedule property. As already discussed while answering Issue No.1, neither DW.1 nor DW.5 has produced any document showing ownership or possession of the defendants. In the absence of any lawful claim over the property, their



persistent opposition to the plaintiff's enjoyment of the property itself constitutes a strong circumstance indicating interference.

39. The evidence on record also discloses that the defendants have consistently disputed the plaintiff's right over the property and attempted to project the property as belonging to some religious institution or as being used by the public. However, no acceptable documentary evidence has been produced in support of such contentions. The very fact that the defendants have set up rival claims without any supporting title documents and have actively opposed the plaintiff's enjoyment of the property probabalises the plaintiff's allegation of interference.

40. An important circumstance which cannot be overlooked is the incident recorded in the order sheet of this Court dated 27.02.2025. The order sheet discloses that when the matter was called out, an application under Order I Rule 10(2) CPC filed by the applicant came to be dismissed. Thereafter, though the application had already been disposed of, a memo was filed stating that the application was not pressed. At that stage, the learned counsel appearing for the applicant made submissions in



open Court, in a loud voice, to the effect that despite the plaintiff having obtained an injunction order and police protection, the applicant's community would not permit the plaintiff to take possession of the property. It was further submitted that when the plaintiff had earlier attempted to enter the property, he was compelled to leave due to a mob gathered by the applicant.

41. It is pertinent to note that there appears to be a separate dispute concerning a vacant site situated adjacent to the Court premises at Channapatna, involving members of the Muslim community and PWD department pertains to the property allotting to the Court premises. Though the said dispute has no nexus whatsoever with the suit schedule property involved in the present case, the learned counsel appearing for the defendants, while addressing the Court on 27.02.2025, referred to the said dispute and submitted that when possession of the property adjacent to the Court premises itself could not be secured, the plaintiff would likewise not be able to take possession of or enjoy the suit schedule property.



42. The tenor and manner of the said submission, as recorded in the order sheet dated 27.02.2025, appears to be in the nature of a threat intended to discourage the plaintiff from asserting his rights under the orders of the Court. Such a statement has the tendency to lower the authority of the Court and interfere with the administration of justice. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that this is a fit case to place the relevant records before the Hon'ble Principal District and Sessions Judge, Bangalore South, for consideration of appropriate action in accordance with law, including examination of whether proceedings for criminal contempt are warranted against the learned counsel concerned.

43. The cumulative effect of the oral evidence of PW.1, the surrounding circumstances, the conduct of the defendants during the proceedings and, in particular, the incident recorded in the judicial order sheet clearly establish that the defendants have interfered with and attempted to obstruct the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Therefore, this Court is satisfied that the plaintiff has successfully



proved the alleged interference by the defendants. Accordingly, **Issue No.2 is answered in the Affirmative.**

44. **Issue No. 3:** The plaintiff has filed this suit for the relief of permanent injunction and costs of the suit. The plaintiff has been able to prove his possession over the suit property and also proved that the defendants without any justification illegally are trying to interfere with the plaintiff possession over suit property. When a person has able to prove his possession, definitely he is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction. Accordingly, **Issue No.3 is answered in the Affirmative.**

45. **Issue No. 4:** In view of the above discussion, this Court proceeds to pass the following;

:: O R D E R ::

- The suit of the plaintiff is decreed with cost.
- The defendants, their agents, henchmen, supporters, servants or anybody claiming through or under them are hereby



JUDGMENT

~ 27 ~

O.S. No.161 of 2020

permanently restrained from interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property.

- The office is directed to draw the decree accordingly.

[Given under my hand and seal of this court on this 03th June, 2026 within the premises and during the working hours of this Court and is pronounced in an open court.]

(YOGESHA K)
PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & J.M.F.C.
CHANNAPATANA.



JUDGMENT

~ 28 ~

O.S. No.161 of 2020

-: ANNEXURES :-

List of Witness examined on behalf of the Plaintiff

P.W-1	Shri. C Channappa
-------	-------------------

List of Documents exhibited on behalf of the Plaintiff

Ex.P.1	Original Registered Sale deed dated 27.03.1997
Ex.P.2	Certified copy of Registered sale deed dated 22.06.1960
Ex.P.3	Original Registered Sale deed dated 17.04.1986
Ex.P.4	Certified copy of MR No.34/1996-97
Ex.P.5	Certified copy of Akarabandh
Ex.P.6	Certified copy of Pakka Book of Sy.No.124/2B
Ex.P.7	Certified copy of Pakka Book of Sy.No.124/3A
Ex.P.8-9	Certified copies of Tax demand extracts
Ex.P.10-11	Tax paid receipts
Ex.P.12	Certified copy of registered sale deed dated 13.02.1948
Ex.P.13	Certified copy of encumbrance certificate

**List of Witness examined on behalf of the Defendants**

D.W.1	Shri. Rizwan
D.W.2	Shri.P Raju
D.W.3	Shri.Syed Azam
D.W.4	Shri.Sharfuddin
D.W.5	Shri.Durvesh

List of Documents exhibited on behalf of the Defendants

Ex.D.1	Certified copy of RTC of Sy.no.124/9
Ex.D.2	Certified copy of M.R.No.T8/2019-20
Ex.D.3	Certified copy of RTC of Sy.no.124/8
Ex.D.4	Certified copy of RTC of Sy.no.124/2A
Ex.D.5	Certified copy of RTC of Sy.no.124/2B
Ex.D.6	Certified copy of RTC of Sy.no.124/3A
Ex.D.7	Certified copy of M.R.No.T9/2019-20
Ex.D.8	Certified copy of RTC of Sy.no.124/8
Ex.D.9	Certified copy of RTC of Sy.no.124/9
Ex.D.10	Certified copy of M.R.No.T9/2019-20
Ex.D.11	Certified copy of M.R.No.T8/2019-20



JUDGMENT

~ 30 ~

O.S. No.161 of 2020

Ex.D.12-24	Photographs
Ex.D.25-26	Compact disc

(YOGESHA K)
PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & J.M.F.C.
CHANNAPATANA.