



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRL. SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AND JMFC, AT GUBBI.**

Dated, this the 27th Day of JUNE 2026

Present: Smt.ANUPAMA D.

B.COM.,LL.B.

Prl.Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,

O.S.135/2019

Plaintiffs

- :1. Gangamma
W/o Late Doddananjaiah,
Aged 65 years,
2. Doddabasavaiah
S/o Eraiah,
Aged 60 years,
3. Nanjundaiah
S/o Late Eraiah,
Aged 52 years,
4. Basavaiah
S/o Late Gubbaiah,
Aged 65 years,
5. Shivanna
S/o Late Gubaiah,
Aged 61 years,
6. Ramanna
S/o Late Gubbaiah
Aged 59 years,



7. Lakshmana
S/o Late Gubbaiah,
Aged 57 years,
8. Chikkamma
D/o Late Siddalingiah,
W/o Rangaiah, dead by Lrs,
- 8(a) Rangaiah
S/o Sannathimmaiah,
Aged about 65 years
- 8(b) Doddarangamma
D/o Rangaiah
W/o Late Kumar, dead by Lrs
- 8(b)(i) Shilpa
D/o late Kumar,
W/o Raghu,
Aged about 25 years,
- 8(b)(ii) Chethan Kumar
S/o Late Kumar
Aged about 22 years
- 8(b)(iii) Mohan Kumar
S/o Late Kumar
Aged about 20 years

All are r/at Thippur,
Kasaba Hobli,
Gubbi Taluk.
9. Siddamma
D/o Late Siddalingaiah,
W/o Late Eraiah,
Aged 63 years,



10. Basavaiah @ Basavaraju
S/o Siddaiah,
Aged 80 years
11. Nanjundaiah
S/o Late Siddaiah,
Aged 75 years

All are R/at G. Harivesandra,
Kasaba Hobli,
Gubbi Taluk

**(Represented by
Sri.S.Ranganath.Advocate)**

V/s

- Defendants:**
1. Kalegowda
S/o Late Basavegowda
**(dead by Lrs D3 to 6 who are
already on record)**
 2. Special Land acquisition
Officer, National High
Way aughority 206,
Bettasiri complex, 1st
floor, Renuka Bazaar,
5th cross, 60 feet road,
Sapthagiri Extn,
Tumkur.
 3. Special Land Acquisition
Officer, Hemavathi Canal Zone,
Kunigal Road, Tumkur



4. H.K. Basavaraju
S/o Kalegowda dead by Lrs
- 4(a) Girijamma w/o Late
H.K. Basavaraju
Aged about 50 years,
- 4(b) Kowshik
S/o Late H.K. Basavaraju
Aged about 25 years,
- 4(c) Yogeesh
S/o Late H.K. Basavaraju
Aged about 23 years,

All are R/at G. Harivesandra,
Kasaba Hobli,
Gubbi Taluk.
5. H.K. Girisha
S/o Kalegowda
Aged 38 years,
6. H.K. Raveesha
S/o Kalegowda,
Aged 36 years,
7. H.K. Revanna
S/o Kalegowda,
Aged about 34 years

All are r/at G. Harivesandra,
Kasaba Hobli,
Gubbi Taluk.

**(Represented by D2 - Sri BVP.,
D3 – S. Rajesh,
D4 to 7 - CRB)**



Date of institution of Suit	09.09.2019
Nature of Suit	For Declaration, Mandatory Injunction & Permanent Injunction
Date of commencement of evidence	02.12.2019
Date of conclusion of evidence	17.04.2026
Date of pronouncement of judgment	27.06.2026
Total Duration	Y <u>Year/s</u> <u>Month/s</u> <u>Day/s</u> 06 09 17

Sd/-

(Smt.ANUPAMA D.)

**Prl.Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Gubbi.**

JUDGMENT

This is the suit filed by the plaintiffs against the defendants for the relief of declaration of their title over the suit schedule property and for permanent injunction restraining the defendants their agents, servants or anybody acting on their behalf from interfering with the



plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property and also for mandatory injunction directing the defendant no. 2 to give the compensation amount in respect of acquired land in the suit schedule property to the plaintiffs.

2. The suit schedule property is land in Sy.No.18/5 measuring 1-24 guntas, out of which remaining land 22.08 guntas assessed at Rs.2.24, situated at G. Harivesandra, Kasaba Hobli, Gubbi Taluk bounded by

East: Land of Panagaar Muddaiah

West: Sy No. 18 belongs to plaintiff

North: N.H. 206 road

South: Land of Kalegowda

3. The brief facts of the case of plaintiffs are:

3(a) The propositus namely Huchaiah died leaving behind his two sons namely Kalasiddananjaiah and Huchavaradaiah. Said Huchavaradaiah died as bachelor.



Another son Kalasiddananjaiah died leaving behind his three sons namely Nanjundiah, Huchaveeraiah and Siddaiah. Among them, first son Nanjundaiah died leaving behind his sons Eraiah, Gubbaiah and Siddalingaiah. All of them are no more. First son Eraiah died leaving behind Doddananjaiah, Basamma, Doddabasavaiah, the plaintiff no. 2, and Nanjundaiah, the plaintiff no. 3. Doddananjaiah died leaving behind his wife Gangamma the plaintiff no.1 and her sons. Gubbiah died leaving behind his sons and daughters namely Basavaiah, the plaintiff no. 4, Mallaiah, Shivanna the plaintiff no. 5 and Ramanna the plaintiff no. 6 and Lakshmana the plaintiff no.7. Siddalingaiah S/o Nanjundaiah died leaving behind two daughters namely Chikkamma the plaintiff no. 8 and Siddamma the plaintiff no. 9. The Second son of Kalasiddananjaiah namely Huchaveeraiah and his wife died without issues. The third son of Kalasiddananjaiah namely Siddaiah died leaving



behind his two sons namely Basavaiah @ Basavaraju the plaintiff no. 10 and Nanjundaiah the plaintiff no. 11.

3(b) It is further contended that, the suit schedule property originally belongs to plaintiffs' grandmother Kali @ Kamma w/o Kalasiddananjaiah. During her life time she was in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. After her death, her legal heirs, who are plaintiffs, have succeeded to the suit schedule property. Kamma during her life time never executed any document in favour of anybody with respect to suit schedule property. The plaintiffs are in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property by cultivating the same till today. The suit schedule property is the ancestral property of the plaintiffs. The suit schedule property consists of old sy no. 18 measuring 4.37 acres. Subsequently it was phoded and new sy nos. were allotted as sy nos. 18/1, 18/2, 18/3, 18/4 and 18/5. All these properties are belonging to the plaintiff



and none else. Among these properties, sy no. 18/5 is the schedule property of this suit.

3(c) It is further contended that, the defendant no. 1 is the stranger to the suit schedule property. He has illegally got transferred the khatha of the same into his name. He has no manner of right, title and interest over the suit schedule property. He is illegally claiming right over the suit schedule property and he is attempting to interfere with plaintiffs' peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property by denying plaintiffs title over the same. The defendant is attempting to dispossess the plaintiffs from the suit schedule property.

3(d) It is further contended (by way of an amendment) that, during the pendency of suit, D3 to 6 got changed khata and pahani of the suit schedule property into their names under some concocted deed. Now the major portion of the suit schedule property was acquired by the defendant no. 2 for formation of National High way 206. The 2nd



defendant had issued award notice in favour of defendant no.1. The defendant no. 1 by colluding with defendant no.2 is attempting to withdraw the compensation amount with regard to the acquisition of said land.

3(e) It is further contended (by way of an amendment), that, In the suit schedule property 0.10 guntas was acquired by the Government for formation of Hemavathi Channel. Further 0.31.08 guntas was acquired by the National Highway Authority for formation of Road. The remaining land is only 22.08 guntas which is the suit schedule property. Since the defendants are now trying to dispossess the plaintiffs and causing interfere into the possession of the plaintiffs over the suit schedule property, they have constrained to file this suit.

4. After service of suit summons, all the defendants have appeared before the court through their counsels, but only Defendant no. 1 has filed his written statement.



5. The brief facts of the written statement of D1 are;

5(a) The defendant no. 1 has denied the entire averments of the plaint except acquisition of land in suit schedule property and further contended that, there is no cause of action to the present case on hand. The suit property bearing sy no. 18/5 originally belongs to one Rangamma w/o Siddananjegowda. She was in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. All the revenue documents pertaining to the suit schedule property were standing in the name of said Rangamma.

5(b) It is further contended that, said Rangamma had got 5 sons namely Huchegowda, Muddegowda, Ningegowda, Rudregowda and Basavegowda. The said Basavegowda s/o Rangamma had got 3 sons namely Kalegowda the defendant no. 1, Rudranna and Eshwaraiah. Rangamma died long back leaving behind her 5 sons as her legal heirs. Subsequent to death of Rangamma, her 5 sons have



succeeded the suit schedule property as her class I heirs. In the partition took place among the said 5 sons of Rangamma, the suit schedule property was fallen to the share of Basavegowda. From the date of partition, the said Basavegowda and his sons namely Kalegowda, and others, the 1st defendant is in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. Khatha and pahani are standing in the name of 1st defendant. He is growing regular crops in it.

5(c) It is further contended that, the Special LAO, Tumkur had acquired 10 guntas of land in the suit schedule property for formation of Hemavathi Channel. The 1st defendant had filed a petition before this Court in LAC No. 394/2010 for enhancement of compensation amount. This court had awarded compensation by enhancing the same. The defendant no. 1 has received the said compensation amount from this court.

5(d) It is further contended that, though the plaintiffs have got no manner of right, title, interest, possession and



enjoyment over the suit schedule property, they have filed this suit only to cause harassment and inconvenience to the defendant no. 1 and to receive the compensation amount from D2. The suit is barred by Limitation. On these grounds he prays to dismiss the suit of the plaintiffs.

6. Upon rival contentions, the following issues have been framed.

- 1.** Whether the plaintiffs prove that they are the absolute owners of the suit schedule property?
- 2.** Whether the plaintiffs prove that the defendant No. 1 has illegally got transferred the katha of the suit schedule property in his name?
- 3.** Whether the plaintiffs prove that major portion of the suit schedule property was acquired by defendant no. 2 for formation of National High way 206?
- 4.** Whether the plaintiffs prove that the defendant no. 1 colluding with defendant



no. 2 attempting to draw the compensation amount in respect of acquired land suit schedule property?

5. Whether plaintiffs are entitled for mandatory injunction against the defendant no. 2 as sought in the plaint?
6. Whether the plaintiffs prove the alleged interference by the defendant no. 1 over the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property by the plaintiffs?
7. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for reliefs as sought for in the plaint?
8. Whether the defendant No. 1 proves that there is no cause of action to the plaintiffs to file the present suit?
9. Whether the defendant no. 1 proves that in partition between Kalegowda and his brothers the suit schedule property was fallen to the share of 1st defendant?



10. Whether the defendant no. 1 proves that the suit of the plaintiffs is barred by law of limitation?

11. What Order or Decree?

7. In order to prove the case, the plaintiff no.6 Ramanna has examined as PW1, two witnesses have been examined on behalf of plaintiff namely Suresh H.B and Anand H.P.N as Pws 2 to 4. Through their evidence the plaintiffs have got marked as many 15 documents as Per Exs. P1 to 15.

8. On the other hand, D5 got examined as DW1 and one witness namely H.G. Girish examined as DW2. Through them they have got marked 29 documents as per Exs. D1 to 29. (The details of documents have been explained in Annextures)

9. I have heard both sides.

10. My answers to the above Issues are as follows:

ISSUE No.1 : In Affirmative



ISSUE No.2	:	In Affirmative
ISSUE No.3	:	In Affirmative
ISSUE No.4	:	In Affirmative
ISSUE No.5	:	In Affirmative
ISSUE No.6	:	In Affirmative
ISSUE No.7	:	In Affirmative
ISSUE No.8	:	In Negative
ISSUE No.9	:	In Negative
ISSUE No.10	:	In Negative
ISSUE No.11	:	As per final order, for the following:-

-.REASONS:-

11. Issue no. 3: Here in this suit, it is the contention of the plaintiffs that, major portion i.e., 10 guntas and 31.08 guntas of property was acquired by D2 and D3 for formation of Hemavathi Channel and National High Way 206 and compensation was also awarded. The defendant no. 1 who has filed his written statement, has admitted this



fact. He has also contended that, he has received compensation amount with respect to acquisition of 10 gunta of land. It is also his defence that, he has filed LAC 394/2010 for enhancement of compensation before this court and got receive enhanced compensation amount also. Thereby there is not dispute with respect to acquisition of property by D2 and 3 in suit schedule property for formation of Hemavathi Channel and also National High Way 206. Hence, I have answered this issue in **Affirmative.**

12. Issue no. 8: In this suit, the defendant no. 1 has taken up a specific defence that, there is no cause of action to the present case on hand. The Ld. Predecessor has framed this issue with respect to said defence is concerned.

12(a) It is the settled principle of Law that, the cause of action is bundle of facts. “The cause of action” has been defined as that, “as meaning simply a factual situation existence of which entitles one person to obtain from the



Court a remedy against another person. The phrase has been held from earliest time to include every fact which is material to be proved to entitle the plaintiff to succeed, and every fact which a defendant would have a right to traverse. 'Cause of action' has also been taken to mean that particular action the part of the defendant which gives the plaintiff his cause of complaint, or the subject-matter of grievance founding the action, not merely the technical cause of action."

In view of this meaning, it is clear that, only on the basis of the date of cause of action mentioned by the plaintiffs in their pleadings, it cannot be considered that, it is the only cause of action to the suit. As already stated above, the cause of action is bundle of facts. Hence, this court cannot considered that, this suit does not have cause of action.

Hence, I have answered this issue in **Negative.**

13. Issue no. 9: In this case, the defendant no. 1 has contended that, the suit schedule property originally



belongs to his grandmother Rangamma. She has 5 sons namely Huchegowda, Muddegowda, Ningegowda, Rudregowda and Basavegowda. This defendant no. 1 is Basavegowda's son. After death of Rangamma, suit schedule property was succeeded by her 5 sons. In a family partition, suit schedule property was fallen to the share of Basavegowda. After death of Basavegowda, his son the defendant no. 1 Kalegowda has succeeded the same. Now the defendant no. 1 Kalegowda is dead and his Lrs i.e., D4 to 7 have succeeded the same. In order to establish the partition held between Basavegowda and his brothers sons of Rangamma, the DW1 has not produced partition deed. It is also not the defence of defendant no. 1 that it was an oral partition. Simply he has contended that, "In the partition took place among the above said sons of Rangamma namely Huchegowda and others the suit schedule proprty was fallen



to the share of Basavegowda.” This is not clearly clarifying that, whether the said partition is oral or written.

13(a) Further the DW1 has produced as many as 29 documents and got marked them as per Exs. D1 to 29. Only in Ex. D11 RTC, at column no. 10 it is mentioned that, property measuring 1.14 acres was acquired by Kalegowda s/o Basavegowda under partition. Except this entry, none of the other documents are giving the details with respect to partition of the family properties. Since, the defendant no. 1 has taken a contention of partition it was his bounden duty to produce the partition deed before this court. Only on the basis of this stray entry in Ex. D11, this court cannot consider that, the suit property was acquired by father of D1. Moreover, according to the defence, the suit property was acquired by his grandmother Rangamma. No documents produced in this regard also. According to D1, suit property was allotted to the share of his father Basavegowda in a family partition held between



Basavegowda and his brothers, but there are no documents available in the name of Basavegowda to consider the same. If suit property was fallen to the share of Basavegowda, his name ought to have been entered in any revenue document. But no such document is produced by D1 in his evidence. Thereby it is clear that, D1 has failed to prove the family partition held between his father and his brothers after death of Rangamma. Hence, I held this issue in **Negative.**

14. Issue no. 10: In this suit, the Defendant no. 1 has taken another important defence that, the suit is barred by Limitation. In this regard he has not at all cross examined PW1. In the entire cross examination of PW1, nowhere any questions of suggestions with respect to Limitation point is put forth by the Ld. Counsel for defendant no. 1. It is the contention of the plaintiffs that, the defendants have caused interference into their peaceful possession over the suit schedule property by denying their



title, then only cause of action arose to file this suit. Nothing has been elicited from the mouth of PW1 with regard to limitation point is concerned. It is true that, the limitation period to file a suit for declaration of title is 3 years. But, in this regard the defendant no.1 has not at all put forth any suggestions to PW1. Hence, it is clear that, the Defendant no. 1 has failed to prove that the suit is barred by Limitation. Hence, I held this issue in **Negative.**

15. Issue nos. 4 and 5: Since these two issues are inter-connected to each other, both issues have taken up together for discussion, in order to avoid repetition of facts.

15(a) It is the contention of the plaintiffs that, the defendant no. 1 by colluding with defendant no. 2 is attempting to withdraw the compensation amount with respect to acquisition of a portion of property is the suit schedule property. Thereby this court has to issue direction to D2 to pay compensation amount to plaintiffs. It is the



contention and defence of both plaintiffs and defendant no. 1 that, 10 gunta and 31.08 gunta of property was acquired by D2 and 3 for formation of Hemavathi Channel and National High Way 206. The compensation awarded by D3 for acquisition of land measuring 10 guntas for formation of Hemavathi channel is already been received by D1. He has filed LAC petition before this court for enhancement of compensation amount and this court has passed an award by enhancing the amount in LAC 394/2010. Now D2 has again acquired 31.08 guntas of land in suit sy no. for formation of National High Way 206 and awarded compensation. It is the contention of plaintiffs that, now the defendant no. 1 by colluding with D2 is trying to receive award amount. In view of discussion made to Issue nos. 1, 2 and 9, it is clear that, the suit property originally belongs to Kamma w/o Kalasiddananjaiah. The defendant no.1 has failed to prove his defence that, this property originally belongs to Rangamma. Hence, it is clear that, the defendant



no. 1 by colluding with D2 is trying to receive the compensation amount with respect to acquisition of 31.08 guntas of property for formation of National High Way 206 as he received the amount earlier with respect to acquisition of 10 gunta of property. On the basis of revenue entried made in the name of D1, now his lrs are trying to receive the award amount. According to the discussion made to issue nos. 1, 2 and 9 the plaintiffs are the absolute owners and in possession of suit schedule property. Earlier they were in possession of the acquired land measuring 31.08 gunta in sy no. 18/5 also. Hence, they are the persons who have to receive the compensation amount from D2. Hence, a direction through Mandatory injunction to be issued to D2 to pay compensation to plaintiffs and not D1. Hence, I held these two issues in Affirmative.

16. Issue nos. 1, 2 and 6: Since these three issues are inter-connected to each other, both have taken up together for discussion in order to avoid repetition of facts.



16(a) In this suit the plaintiffs have contended that, the suit schedule property originally belongs to their great grandmother Kali @ Kamma s/o Kalasiddananjaiah. In order to prove the same they have examined plaintiff no. 6 Ramanna as PW1. This PW1 has produced as many as 15 documents as per Exs. P1 to 15. In this case, the plaintiffs are entirely depending upon one revenue document i.e., Khethvar Pathrike which is marked as Ex. P1 and P11. Ex. P1 is the certified copy of Kethvar Pathrike produced by the plaintiffs and Ex. P11 is secured from Taluk Office. In both the documents the details of name entered at column no. 6 is not properly visible. However, the defendant no. 1 has produced Ex. D1 the Index of Lands in which the name of Kamma w/o Kalasiddananja is mentioned at column 18 with respect to sy no. 18 is concerned. In the very same document at column no. 18 the details of transfer to one Nanjundaiah s/o Kamma is mentioned as “ಮಗ ನಂಜುಂಡಯ್ಯನಿಗೆ”. This detail is later inserting entry in between



two lines i.e., Kamma w/o Kalasiddanjan and Eraiah s/o Nanjundaiah. There is no clarification is forthcoming in this regard. However on perusal of this Ex. D1 it is made clear that, the name of Kamma w/o Kalasiddanjan i.e., great grandmother of plaintiffs has been entered in it.

16(b) In this suit in the cross examination of PW1 the defendant no.1 has admitted that, originally suit sy no. 18 was belongs to Kamma. Later the said sy no. has been phoded and new sy nos have allotted as sy nos. 18/1, 18/2, 18/3, 18/4 and 18/5. These 18/1 to 18/4 property belongs to plaintiffs but sy no. 18/5 belongs to Rangamma. The defendant no.1 has not at all explained that how only this 18/5 property belongs to his grandmother Rangamma when all the remaining phoded properties i.e., sy nos. 18/1 to 18/4 belongs to the plaintiffs?

16(c) It is true that, the revenue documents do not confer the right of title of the party to the suit. However, the long possession with revenue entries are confirming the



same. In this suit, the witness of defendant no.1 who has been examined as DW2 has also admitted the possession of the plaintiffs over the suit schedule property. Initially he admitted the same and immediately he changed his mind and submits that the defendants are in possession. This admission of DW2 also confers the possession of the plaintiffs over the suit schedule property.

16(d) As already discussed above, the revenue document does confer the title of the party. But, in a decision which is referred by the Ld. Counsel for plaintiffs which is reported in 2020 (3) KCCR 1966 held between Smt. Jayamma Venkatram and Another Vs. Smt. Ashraf Jahan Begum and Another, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka has held at head note 'A' that, *"whenever a person has been in possession of an immovable property, especially ancestral in character, for quite a long time, and revenue entries stand in the lineage of his family continuously*



without any challenge to it, or if challenged, the same being overruled or rejected; and being not in a position to produce any document conferring title other than revenue records, there is no impediment to declare title based on possession which is otherwise called possessory title. If this kind of interpretation is not given, the title over the property will remain in vacuum, which should not be allowed to happen.”

16(e) According to this decision, as such there are admissions and prove to believe that, sy no. 18 was phoded and allotted new numbers as sy no. 18/1 to 18/5 and sy nos. 18/1 to 18/4 belongs to the family of plaintiffs, and there are no documents available on record to believe that, this suit sy no. i.e., only sy no. 18/5 belongs to the family of defendants and since DW2 himself has admitted the possession of the plaintiffs over the suit schedule property, and the details of Ex D1 is clearly disclosing the name of great grandmother of plaintiffs with respect to sy no. 18, it



is clear that, the plaintiffs have successfully proved their long possession over the suit schedule property. But the defendant no. 1 and his predecessors have created the revenue documents without having any valid title over the suit schedule property. The documents furnished by the plaintiff and also Ex. D1 are clearly establishing the case of the plaintiffs. The RTCs have been created by the defendant no. 1 in his name without being having any valid title over the suit schedule property. The defendant no. 1 has not at all produced title deed of Rangamma, partition deed held between his father Basavegowda and his brothers, but he has produced the RTCs entered in the names of his grandmother Rangamma and in his name which are not valid proof to deny the title of the plaintiff great grandmother kali @ Kamma. In view of the above reported decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the long possession of the plaintiffs to be considered to declare their title over the property. Moreover, as already discussed, their



witness i.e., DW2 himself has admitted the possession of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property. Moreover, the DW1 himself has admitted that, he has not produced any document before the court to establish that, how his family members have acquired the suit schedule property. He has also feigned his ignorance when a suggestion has been put forth as that, the suit schedule property is ancestral property of plaintiff. He has not denied the said suggestion put forth by the Ld. Counsel for plaintiffs. All these details are going prove and establish the long standing possession of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property. Thereby it is clear that, the plaintiffs are having long standing possession over the suit schedule property and now the defendants nos. 4 to 7 are trying to cause interference into their possession. Thereby, by considering the above referred decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka as mention supra, I held these issues accordingly.



17. Issue no. 11. For the foregoing reasons I proceed to pass the following:

-:ORDER:-

Suit of the plaintiffs is DECREED WITH COST.

Accordingly, it is declared that, the plaintiffs are the absolute owners having title and possession over the suit schedule property.

Consequently, the defendants 4 to 7, their agents, servants, attorneys and anybody acting on their behalf are hereby restrained permanently from causing interference into the peaceful possession of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property.

Further, by way of Mandatory Injunction, the defendant no. 2 is directed to pay compensation amount awarded with respect to acquisition of 31.08 guntas of



**land in suit sy no. 18/5 infavour of
plaintiffs.**

Draw decree accordingly.

(On my dictation directly in my official Laptop to stenographer Kum: Ramya, typed and print out taken by her, corrected and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 27th Day of June 2026.)

Sd/-

(ANUPAMA D.)

**Prl.Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Gubbi.**

ANNEXURE

List of witnesses examined for the Plaintiff :-

PW.1	Ramanna
PW.2	Suresh Babu
PW.3	Anand H.P.N

List of documents marked for the Plaintiff:

Ex.P.1	Certified copy of Kethuvaru
Ex.P.2	Certified copy of Aakar Bandh
Ex.P.3	Certified copy of Encumbrance Certificate
Ex.P.4 to 8	RTC Extracts
Ex.P.9	Certified copy of registered Sale deed dated 28.03.1947



Ex.P.10	Certified copy of Kethuvaru
Ex.P.11	Certified copy of Kethuvaru
Ex.P.12	Certified copy of Official Memorandum
Ex.P.13	Certified copy of Division map
Ex.P.14	Order on Deputy Divisional Officer No. R A TUM 137/2020
Ex.P.15	Order on Deputy Divisional Officer No. R A GUB137/2020

List of witnesses examined for the defendants:

DW-1	H.K. Raveesh
DW-2	H.T. Girish

List of documents marked for the defendants:

Ex.D.1	Index of Land
Ex.D.2	Revnue Record
Ex.D.3 -6	RTC Extracts
Ex.D.7	M.R. Register
Ex.D.8	Copy of Order sheet on LAC No. 394/2010
Ex.D.8(a)	Copy of Order on LAC No. 394/2010
Ex.D.9-29	RTC Extracts

Sd/-
(ANUPAMA D.)
Prl.Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.,



Gubbi.