

KASM310018432012



Presented on : 20-07-2012
Registered on : 20-07-2012
Decided on : 11-08-2026
Duration : 14 years, 0 months, 22 days

**IN THE COURT OF THE II ADDITIONAL CIVIL JUDGE & J.M.F.C,
BHADRAVATHI**

PRESENT: **Smt. Chethana,** B.A.,L.L.B.,
II Addl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Bhadravathi.

DATED THIS THE 11th DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

Original Suit No.406/2012

Plaintiff/s : Chandrashekar,
S/o. Late. Ramanna,
Aged about 54 years,
R/at: Coolie block shed,
New town, Bhadravathi.

(By Sri. T. S. S., Advocate)

V/s.

Defendant/s :

1. The Tahsildar,
Bhadravathi Taluk,
Bhadravathi.
2. Nagaraj ,
S/o. Ramanna,
Aged about 46 years,
R/at: Cooli block shed,
New town, Bhadravathi.

3. Saroja,
D/o. Ramanna,
Aged about 61 years,
R/at: Coolie block shed,
New town, Bhadravathi.
4. Yashoda,
D/o. Ramanna,
Aged about 36 years,
R/at: Coolie block shed,
New town, Bhadravathi.
5. Kumara,
S/o. Rangaswamy,
Aged about 41 years,
R/at: Bommanakatte Village,
Bhadravathi Taluk.
6. The State of Karnataka,
represented by its Chief Secretary,
Vidhana Soudha, Bengaluru,
Karnataka.

**(Def.Nos.1 and 6 by A.G.P.,
Def.Nos.2 and 5 by Sri.G.E.M. Adv.;
Def.No.3 placed Ex-parte;
Def.No.4 by Sri.G.M.S. Adv.)**

Date of Institution of suit	:	16.07.2012
Nature of suit	:	Declaration and Permanent Injunction.
Date of commencement of recording of evidence	:	26.11.2012
Date on which the judgment was pronounced	:	11.08.2016

Total duration	:	Days :	Months :	Years
		26	00	14

(Smt. Chethana)
II Addl. Civil Judge and JMFC,
Bhadravathi.

:- JUDGMENT :-

This is the suit filed seeking to declare the plaintiff as the absolute owner in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property; restrain the defendants from keeping entries under mutation and RTC entries pertaining to the suit schedule property in the name of Government and to retain the entries made in the name of Ramanan S/o. Narasappa and to restrain the defendants from dispossessing the plaintiff from the suit schedule property.

2. The case of the plaintiff's in brief is as follows:-

(a). The suit schedule property has been granted as per the Saguvali Chit dated 16.08.1995 in his favour by the defendant No.1. His father has died on 14.10.2009. After his death, the plaintiff is been in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. He is having right, title and interest over the suit schedule property. His father died leaving behind himself and

defendant Nos.2 to 4. As he is the elder male member of the family, he is looking after the family. Therefore, he has filed this suit on his behalf as well as other members of the family.

(b). His father was in possession, cultivation and enjoyment of the suit schedule property for a period of more than 35 years. One Rangaswamy colluding with revenue officials, managed to create the documents and the same came to the knowledge of the defendant No.1. Subsequently, the documents which are in the name of Rangaswamy such as Saguvali Chit and Grant Certificate has been cancelled in the year 1985. By considering the fact that, the father of the plaintiff was enjoying the land holding possession over the property, the defendant No.1 issued Grant Certificate and Saguvali Chit in favour of the plaintiff's father pertaining to the property in Sy. No.43 of Bommanakatte Village, Bhadravathi Taluk. The grant made in favour of his father to an extent of 1.00 acre in Sy.No.43 is bounded by East : Road towards Nanjapura from Bommanakatte Village, West : land of Vijayakumar and North : VISL Railway track now being used as road and South : Ningappa's land. The said land was being enjoyed by his father and the plaintiff as per grant.

(c). On 07.06.2010, the plaintiff received an endorsement under LND.CR.24/10-11. On the basis of the report of revenue inspector, the defendant No.1 extended police help in his favour. The defendant No.1 issued a strange endorsement dated 15.04.2011 stating that, one Kumara S/o. Rangaswamy had given application dated 07.08.2010 under RTI Act requesting to give information regarding issue of Saguvali Chit in favour of one P. Ramanna S/o. Narasappa pertaining to the suit schedule property to an extent of 1.00 acre; after verifying the ledgers in the department, the Saguvali Chit dated 16.08.1985 issued in favour of Ramanna S/o. Narasappa is not available in their records; hence, as the copy of Saguvali Chit is not available in the revenue department, the same cannot be given in favour of the said applicant. Having issued such an endorsement to said Kumara, the defendant No.1 created cloud on the title of the plaintiff in spite of the plaintiff furnishing the documents such as Saguvali Chit and Grant Certificate.

(d). As such an endorsement has been to said Kumara, he filed false complaint before the police and the police had interfered in the better enjoyment of the suit schedule property by the plaintiff. Therefore, on 02.07.2011, at about 12.00 noon and 4.00

pm., the plaintiff had approached the defendant No.1 and Circle Inspector of police and explained the right in existence of the plaintiff. However, the defendant No.1 had retracted without any reasons creating intimidation in the mind of the plaintiff. Therefore, having no other alternative, the plaintiff issued notice dated 02.07.2011 under Section 80 of CPC. However, even after lapse of 2 months, the defendant No.1 did not act in accordance with law and acted against the Land Grant Rules and Karnataka Land Revenue Act, passed impugned order dated 31.05.2012 to keep the entries pertaining to the suit schedule property as *Sarkari Phada*. Therefore, the plaintiff has filed this suit for declaration along with other reliefs. Hence, it is prayed to decree the suit.

3. The case of the defendant No.1 and 6 in brief is as under : -

(a). This suit is not maintainable in view of Section 42 of the Karnataka Forest Act, 1963 as this court does not have jurisdiction to entertain the suit. Lease Saguvali Chit pertaining to 2.00 acres of land each i.e., 1.00 acre of dry land and 1.00 acre of wet land has been given to one Kenchaiah S/o. Huchhaiah and others for a period of 5 years pertaining to the property in Sy.No.43 of Bommanakatte Village, Kasaba Hobli, Bhadravathi as per D.D.No.154/56-57, dated 09.01.1960 and M.4 DAR.280/58-

59, dated 24.11.1958. Out of the said 2.00 acres, 1.00 acre of property has been sold in favour of Rangaswamy S/o. Nanjappa of Bommanakatte for Rs.1,000/- as per S.R.O.No.1543/73/74, dated 31.05.1973. Thereafter, as per the order of the Court of Sub-Divisional Officer dated 13.03.1991 in PTCL No.8/90-91, the said sale has been canceled and *katha* has been effected as Government.

(b). The Saguvali Chit bearing No.597/95-96 dated 16.12.1995 which has been produced by the plaintiff has not been issued by the office of defendant No.1. There is no document in the office of defendant No.1 for having issued the said Saguvali Chit and the same is bogus one. It is seen that, as per the said Saguvali Chit, the father of the plaintiff has got changed the *katha* into his name. After this death, the plaintiff is in possession of said property. The same is illegal. There is dispute between the plaintiff and Rangaswamy S/o. Nanjappa pertaining to 1.00 acre of property in Sy.No.43/2P. On 03.09.2011, notice has been issued to both the parties and spot inspection has been conducted in the presence of the villagers, the plaintiff and said Rangaswamy. Since the actual fact has been depicted at that time, notice has been issued to the plaintiff and he has been called for to submit original

Saguvali Chit to the Taluk office. The plaintiff has produced the certified copy of the said document. After verifying the document, it has been confirmed that, the Saguvali Chit is bogus one.

(c). The property which has been purchased by the father of plaintiff had been given to one Kempaiah S/o. Huchhaiah and 29 others for measuring 2.00 acre i.e. 1 acre dry land and 1 acre wet land for the period of 5 years on 09.10.1960. After expiry of the said period, they have not obtained permanent Saguvali Chit by submitting requisition. Therefore, as per the order dated 05.12.2002 in SC/ST.21/2000-01 of the court of Deputy Commissioner, the said properties have been taken to Government and it has been intimated on 31.05.2012 to register the said property in the records.

(d). There is no document in the office of defendant No.1 to show that, during the year 1995-96, the Saguvali Chit has been issued to the father of the plaintiff. The same is created one. As per the order of the Court of District Commissioner, Shivamogga and as per the order dated 14.09.2011 of the Court of Sub-Divisional Officer in PTCL Mis.07/11-12 and as it has been intimated to take steps as per the Order dated 14.09.2011, 2.00

acres of property in Sy.No.42 (at present 1.00 acre in Sy.No.43/21 and 1.00 acre in Sy.No.43/23P, totally 2.00 acres) action has been taken to register as *Sarkari Pada*. As per the land grant Rules, the lease given to the original owners has been expired for 5 years. Since they have not obtained permanent Saguvali Chit by submitting requisition, the said land is belonging to Government. The father of the plaintiff had got effected the *katha* by creating illegal documents and giving false information to the Government. Therefore, it has been correctly entered as *sarakari pada*. The plaintiff does not have any kind of right over the said property. Hence, it is prayed to dismiss the suit.

4. Though summons has been served on the defendant No.3, she has not entered appearance. Hence, she has been placed *exparte*. Though, the defendant No.2, 4 and 5 have entered appearance through their counsel, despite giving sufficient opportunity, they have not filed written statement. Hence, written statement by these defendants have been taken as not filed. AGP filed memo stating that, the defendant No.6 would adopt the written statement filed by defendant No.1.

5. On the basis of the pleadings and documents on record, this Court has framed following;

ISSUES

1. Whether the plaintiffs prove that, he is the absolute owner of the suit schedule property?
2. Whether the plaintiff proves that, he is in lawful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as on the date of suit?
3. Whether the plaintiff proves that, the defendant is trying to interfere over the suit schedule property?
4. Whether the suit is bad for non joinder of necessary party?
5. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief sought for?
6. What Order or Decree?

6. In order to prove the case of the plaintiff, he himself has been examined as PW.1 and one witness by name Shivagangaiah has been examined as PW.2 and got marked 13 documents at Exs.P.1 to 13. Despite giving sufficient opportunity, the defendant Nos.1 and 6 have not lead any evidence. Hence, defence was taken as nil.

7. Heard arguments of learned counsel for both the parties and perused entire material available on record. The answer of this Court to the above issues are as follows:

- Issue No.1 : Partly in the Affirmative
 - Issue No.2 : In the Affirmative
 - Issue No.3 : In the Affirmative
 - Issue No.4 : Does not survive for consideration
 - Issue No.5 : Partly in the Affirmative
 - Issue No.6 : As per final order
- For the following:

-: REASONS :-

8. ISSUE No.1:- In the affidavit filed by PWs.1 and 2 in lieu of their chief examination, they have reiterated the plaint averments. The Ex.P1 is the office copy of notice dated 28.07.2011 issued to the defendant No.1 as well as Circle Inspector of police, Rural police station, Bhadravathi; Ex.P.2 is the certified copy of postal acknowledgment; Ex.P.3 is the application given by the plaintiff dated 17.01.2012; Ex.P.4 is the certified copy of Saguvali Chit; Ex.P.5 is the certified copy of Mutation Register extract in M.R.No.13/1997-98; Ex.P.6 is the certified copy of the tax paid receipt; Ex.P.7 is the certified copy of report given by the Revenue inspector; Ex.P.8 is the notice dated 28.04.1993;

Ex.P.9 is the report submitted by the Revenue Inspector; Ex.P.10 is the certified copy of memorandum; Ex.P.11 is the certified copy of RTC extract pertaining to the property in Sy.No.43/21 of Bommanakatte Village; Ex.P.12 is the tax paid receipts and Ex.P.13 is the RTC extract pertaining to Sy.No.43/21P of Bommanakatte Village for the year 2011-12.

9. In the plaint, at one stretch the plaintiff has asserted that, the suit schedule property has been granted to him and at another stretch, he had contended that, the property bearing Sy.No.43 of Bommanakatte village measuring 1.00 acre has been granted to his father. The schedule of the property which is said to have been granted to his father is shown at paragraph No.5 of the plaint that, East y : Road towards Nanjapura from Bommanakatte village, West by: land of Vijayakumar, North by : VISL Railway track now being used as road and South by : Ningappa's land. The description of property shown in the plaint schedule tallies with the description of property said to have been granted to the father of plaintiff which has been mentioned hereinabove. The Saguvali Chit number is shown in the plaint schedule as 43/1992-93.

10. Out of the documentary evidence relied upon by the plaintiff, the document at Ex.P.8 shows that, it has been proposed to grant 1.00 acre of property in Sy.No.43 of Bommanakatte to one P. Ramanna S/o Narasappa, who is none other than the father of the plaintiff. The consideration amount, which is shown in Ex.P. 8 to be remitted to the State for grant of property is Rs.973/-. Further, Ex.P.4 which is the certified copy Saguvali Chit reflects that, 1.00 acre of property in Sy.No.43, block No.21 of Bommanakatte Village has been granted in favour of father of the plaintiff on 16.12.1995. The schedule of the property shown in the said Saguvali Chit tallies with the plaint schedule. Accordingly, all the description of the property shown therein also tallies with the plaint schedule. Further, it reflects that, it has been ordered to pay Rs.973/- in 3 installments. The said grant has been made on 16.12.1995. It further discloses that, Saguvali Chit number is LND(1)-CR-SCR.43/1992-93, which is also shown in the plaint schedule. Further, Ex.P.5 which is the Mutation Register extract in MR.No.13/1997-98 also clearly shows that, as per the said grant at Ex.P.4, the *katha* has been mutated in the name of the father of the plaintiff pertaining to the suit schedule property. Even in the said Ex.P.5, the schedule shown tallies with the plaint schedule.

11. Ex.P.11 which is the handwritten RTC extract pertaining to the suit schedule property shows that, the said property is standing in the name of father of the plaintiff and both in column No.9 as well as column No.12, the name of father of the plaintiff has been reflected. The same is pertaining to the year 1997-98. Further, the Ex.P.13 which is the RTC extract for the year 2011-12 also reflects that, the property measuring 1.00 in Sy.No.43/21P is standing in the name of father of the plaintiff and in column Nos.9 and 12 of the said RTC extract, the name of the father of the plaintiff finds place. As such, from the oral evidence of PW.1 and the documents referred to hereinabove, it could be clearly inferred that, the property which has been granted in favour of father of plaintiff is the suit schedule property.

12. The evidence let in by the plaintiff also clarifies that, since from the date of grant even till the filing of the suit, the said property was standing in the name of father of the plaintiff. Though, the documents relied upon by the plaintiff are certified copies, which are issued by the competent authority. No doubt, the defendant No.1 and 6 have contended that, the said Saguvali Chit is bogus one. However, the defendant No.1 and 6 except taking such contention in the written statement, they have not

produced any document or evidence in proof of the said contention. Since the defendants have not let in any evidence, their contention stood unproven. No doubt, the defendant No.1 has cross examined PWs.1 and 2. However, nothing in support of their case has been elicited from them during their cross examination.

13. Moreover, it is not the case of the defendants that, either the grant made in favour of father of the plaintiff or any subsequent revenue entries made pertaining to the suit schedule property, have been ever in challenge. Hence, from all these documentary evidence coupled with oral evidence of PW.1 and 2, it is clear that, the suit schedule property has been granted in favour of father of the plaintiff. No doubt, as stated above, there are contradictory pleadings in the plaint with regard to the person in whose favour the suit schedule property was granted. However, merely on the basis of such inconsistency in the pleadings, which is essentially a technical aspect, the suit of the plaintiff cannot be dismissed, particularly when the plaintiff has produced sufficient oral and documentary evidence to establish his case. The Court is required to consider the pleadings as a whole and appreciate the evidence available on record in its proper perspective. Mere

discrepancies or inconsistencies in the pleadings, by themselves, would not be sufficient to non-suit the plaintiff, unless such contradictions go to the root of the matter and materially affect the very foundation of the plaintiff's claim. Therefore, the said inconsistency in the pleadings, by itself, cannot be a ground to dismiss the suit.

14. As asserted by the plaintiff himself, father of the plaintiff has died on 14.10.2009 leaving behind himself and defendant Nos.2 to 4 herein. When such being the case, the property which has been granted to P. Ramanna who is their father, liable to be inherited by his legal representative. Since the father of the plaintiff is no more, the plaintiff and defendant No.2 to 4 are entitled to be declared as owners of the suit schedule property. No doubt, the plaintiff has sought to declare himself as the owner. However, there is no specific pleading as to why himself alone has to be declared as owner of the suit schedule property when there are other children to P. Ramanna. On taking into consideration the pleadings of plaintiff in their entirety, it is evident that it is not the case of the plaintiff that the suit schedule property is his self-acquired property or that the same exclusively belongs to him. When such being the case, it cannot be declared

that the plaintiff alone is the owner and is in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Merely because defendant Nos.2 to 4 have not contested the matter, the same cannot be a ground to deny their right, title and interest in the suit schedule property or to declare the plaintiff as the absolute owner thereof. That apart, in the plaint itself, the plaintiff has asserted that, he has instituted this suit, on his behalf as well as on behalf of other members of the family. Moreover, merely because the plaintiff has sought a declaration that, he is the owner of the suit schedule property and has not sought a declaration that defendant Nos.2 to 4 are also the owners thereof, the suit cannot be dismissed for that sole reason. The Court is required to consider the substance of the plaintiff's claim, the nature of the right asserted by him and the evidence available on record. If, on appreciation of the pleadings and evidence, it is found that the suit schedule property was granted in favour of the father of the plaintiff and that, upon his death, the property devolved upon his legal heirs, the omission on the part of the plaintiff to seek a declaration in respect of the rights of defendant Nos.2 to 4 would not, by itself, be sufficient to non-suit the plaintiff. At the most, such omission may have a bearing on the nature and extent of the relief that can be granted in favour of the

plaintiff. Therefore, the suit cannot be dismissed solely on the ground that, the plaintiff has claimed exclusive ownership without specifically seeking a declaration regarding the rights of defendant Nos.2 to 4. Hence, for the foregoing reasons, the plaintiff has proved that, the suit schedule property has been granted in favour of father of plaintiff. As such, the plaintiff and defendant Nos.2 to 4 have to be declared as the owners of suit schedule property. Accordingly, issue No.1 is answered in the **Partly Affirmative**.

15. Issue No.2 and 3:- It is the assertion of the plaintiff that, his father was in possession of the suit schedule property since more than 35 years and even after grant, he was in possession. After the death of father of the plaintiff, the plaintiff is been in possession of the suit schedule property. Moreover, the defendant Nos.1 and 6 in the written statement, have clearly admitted that, after the death of father of the plaintiff, the plaintiff is been in possession of the said property. That apart, the RTC extracts produced by the plaintiff also show that the plaintiff's father was in possession of the suit schedule property. Obviously, after the death of their father, the plaintiff and defendant Nos.2 to 4, being his legal heirs, are entitled to succeed to his rights and interests in the suit schedule property and, consequently, to be in

possession and enjoyment thereof. Since the plaintiff and defendant Nos.2 to 4 are the legal heirs of their father, it is also quite possible that they were in joint possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property even during the lifetime of their father. The possession of the father during his lifetime, followed by the succession of his legal heirs after his death, has to be considered in the light of the pleadings and the evidence available on record.

16. As pleaded by the plaintiff as well as defendant Nos.1 and 6, as per order dated 31.05.2012, the suit schedule property has been ordered to be entered as *Sarkari pada*. However, the oral as well as documentary evidence available on record establishes that the suit schedule property was granted in favour of the father of the plaintiff and that he was put in possession of the same. Unless and until it is established that the father of the plaintiff or, after his death, his legal heirs were dispossessed from the suit schedule property by following due process of law, it cannot be presumed that they were not in possession thereof. Therefore, in the absence of any material to establish lawful dispossession, the possession of the father during his lifetime and, thereafter, the possession of his legal heirs has to be presumed to have continued in accordance with their respective rights.

17. All the documentary evidence relied upon by the plaintiff has evidentiary value in the eye of law. Hence, it can be clearly inferred that, the plaintiff and other legal heirs of P. Ramanna are in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Initially the plaintiff had filed this suit only against the defendant No.1. At that time, the plaintiff had sought to restrain the defendant from doing any sort of dispossession of the plaintiff from the suit schedule property. The said defendant referred is the Tahsildar who is the defendant No.1 as per the amended plaint. After impleading the defendant Nos.2 to 6, the plaintiff has not got amended either the pleading or prayer column of the plaint. As such it can be inferred that, the plaintiff has sought the relief of injunction in column (b) of the plaint only as against defendant No.1.

18. Admittedly, the defendant No.1 had issued endorsements to the plaintiff which have been referred above. Further, order has been passed on 31.05.2012 to keep the entries of suit schedule property as *Sarkari Phada*. However, the defendant Nos.1 and 6 have not adduced any evidence as to why such an order to keep the entries pertaining to the suit schedule property as *sarkari phada* has been passed also stood unproven

by the defendant Nos,1 and 6. When such being the case, defendant Nos.1 and 6 cannot be permitted to interfere with the possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property by the plaintiff and other legal heirs, merely on the ground that the said property has been ordered to be entered as '*Sarkari Pada*' or on any other ground. Unless and until they are dispossessed from the suit schedule property in accordance with due process of law, their possession cannot be disturbed and until then their possession has to be protected. Therefore, the plaintiff has proved that, they are in possession and enjoyment of the he is in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. It is settled principle of law that, for granting an order of injunction, a genuine and reasonable apprehension of interference with the plaintiff's lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property is sufficient, provided such apprehension is supported by the pleadings and the material available on record. The purpose of granting an injunction is to protect the existing possession. As stated above, the plaintiff has proved the possession over the suit schedule property. Therefore, where the plaintiff establishes possession and also demonstrates a reasonable apprehension that, the defendant No.1 is likely to interfere with such possession and dispossess them, it is necessary that, an order of permanent

injunction as sought has to be granted. However, the defendant Nos.1 and 6 cannot be restrained from dispossessing the plaintiff by following due process of law. Therefore, issue Nos.2 and 3 are answered in the **Affirmative**.

19. Issue No.4:- Since, the plaintiff has impleaded defendant Nos.2 to 6 in this suit, this issue does not survive for consideration. Therefore, the said issue is answered accordingly.

20 Issue No.5:- The plaintiff has sought to direct the defendant No.1 to restrain from keeping entries under mutation and RTC pertaining to the suit schedule property in the name of Government and to retain the entries made in the name of Ramanna S/o. Narasappa. However, this court does not have any such jurisdiction to direct the defendant No.1 as sought by the plaintiff. Therefore, the said relief sought by the plaintiff cannot be granted. Since the plaintiff proved that, himself along with defendant Nos.2 to 4 are the owners in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as on the date of the suit and the alleged interference, the plaintiff is entitled for the relief of declaration sought as well as the relief of permanent injunction restraining as sought except the relief of issuing direction to

defendant No.1. With these observations, issue No.5 is answered in the **Partly Affirmative.**

21. Issue No.6:- For the reasons stated while discussing issue Nos.1 to 5, this Court proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Suit of the plaintiff is hereby decreed in part.

The plaintiff and defendant Nos.2 to 4 are hereby declared as owners in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property.

The defendant No.1 is hereby restrained by way of permanent injunction from dispossessing the plaintiff and defendant Nos.2 to 4 from the suit schedule property.

However, it is hereby made clear that, this Order will not come in the way of defendant No.1 taken any action pertaining to suit schedule property by following due process of law.

The relief sought to direct the defendant No.1 to restrain from keeping entries under mutation and RTC pertaining to the suit schedule property in the name of Government and to retain the entries made in the name of Ramanna S/o. Narasappa is hereby dismissed.

No order as to costs.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the stenographer, typed by him, transcript revised, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open court this the **11th day of August, 2026**)

(Smt. Chethana)
II Addl. Judge and JMFC,
Bhadravathi.

ANNEXURES

LIST OF WITNESS EXAMINED BY THE PLAINTIFF:

PW.1 : Chandrashekar
PW.2 : Shivagangaiah

LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

Ex.P1 : Office copy of notice dated 28.07.2011 issued to the defendant No.1 as well as Circle Inspector of police, Rural police station, Bhadravathi;
Ex.P.2 : Certified copy of postal acknowledgment;

- Ex.P.3 : Application given by the plaintiff dated 17.01.2012;
- Ex.P.4 : Certified copy of saguvali chit;
- Ex.P.5 : Certified copy of mutation register extract in M.R.No.13/1997-98;
- Ex.P.6 : Certified copy of the tax paid receipt;
- Ex.P.7 : Certified copy of report given by the Revenue inspector;
- Ex.P.8 : Notice dated 18.04.1993 given to the father of the plaintiff;
- Ex.P.9 : Report submitted by the Revenue Inspector;
- Ex.P.10 : Certified copy of memorandum;
- Ex.P.11 : Certified copy of RTC extract pertaining to the property in Sy.No.43/21 of Bommanakatte village;
- Ex.P.12 : Tax paid receipts
- Ex.P.13 : RTC extract pertaining to Sy.No.43/21P of Bommanakatte village for the year 2011-12.

LIST OF WITNESS EXAMINED BY THE DEFENDANTS:

- Nil -

LIST OF DOCUMENTS MARKED FOR THE DEFENDANTS:

- Nil -

II Addl. Civil Judge and JMFC,
Bhadravathi.