



**IN THE COURT OF THE IV ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE TUMAKURU, SITTING AT MADHUGIRI**

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

-.PRESENT:-

**SMT. SUMANGALA S BASAVANNOUR, B.COM., L.L.M.,
IV ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, TUMAKURU-MADHUGIRI**

R.A. No.5040/2024

- Appellant/ :
1. Alukuraiah,
S/o Late Gangappa,
Aged about 73 years.
 2. Honnuramma,
W/o Late Marappa,
Aged about 50 years.
 3. Gangadhara,
S/o Late Marappa
Aged about 23 years.
 4. Girish,
S/o Late Marappa
Aged about 21 years.
 5. Gayathri,
D/o Late Marappa
Aged about 20 years.
 6. M.Siddesha,
S/o Late Marappa,
Aged about 39 years.
 7. M.Alukurappa,
S/o Late Marappa,



Aged about 38 years.

8. M.Nagamani,
D/o Late Marappa,
Aged about 32 years.

9. H.Pushpa,
D/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 53 years.

10. H.Gangadhara,
S/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 49 years.

11. H.Latha,
D/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 43 years.

12. H.Jagadeesha,
S/o Late Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 40 years.

13. Harisha,
S/o Late G.Gopalappa,
Aged about 40 years.

14. Kavitha,
S/o Late G.Gopalappa,
Aged about 37 years.

15. Ravi,
S/o Late G.Gopalappa,
Aged about 34 years.

The appellant No.1 to 15 are



R/o Ambedkar Nagar, A1 Block,
Y.N.Hosakote Town and Hobli,
Pavagada Taluk, Tumkur District.

(The plaintiffs before the trial Court)

(By Sri. B.A.P, Advocate)

V/s

Defendants :

1. H.A.Hanumanthaiah,
S/o Late Anjinappa,
Aged about 74 years,
Retired Head Constable,
R/o Beside retired Master
Ningappa's house,
Near over head Water Tank,
AIE housing board,
11th main road, IUDP Layout
Chithradurga Town.
2. Narasamma,
W/o Late Jayachandra,
Aged about 55 years.
3. Nagesh,
S/o Defendant No.3 Radhamma,
Aged about 30 years.
4. Nagamani,
D/o defendant No.3 Radhamma,
Aged about 28 years.
5. Geetha,
D/o defendant No.3 Radhamma,



Aged about 26 years.

6. R.Anjaiah,
S/o Late Ramappa
Aged about 58 years.

7. R. Hanumantharaya,
S/o Late Ramappa,
aged about 55 years.

8. Jayamma,
W/o Late Marappa,
S/o Late Ramappa,
Aged about 60 years.

9. M.Balu @ Balakrishna,
S/o Defendant No.9 Jayamma,
aged about 38 years.

10. M.Raju.
S/o Defendant No.9 Jayamma,
Aged about 30 years.

The respondent No.2 to 10 are
R/o Ambedkar Nagara, A1 Block,
Y.N.Hosakote Town and Hobli,
Pavagada Taluk, Tumkur District.

(Defendants before the trial Court)

[By: R.1,3, 4 to 10- PNR, Advocate]



Date and nature of Judgment/Order appealed against.	The Senior Civil Judge & JMFC., Court, Pavagada, has passed Judgment and Decree in O.S.No.58/2022 dated 16.07.2024 and dismissed the suit of the plaintiffs.			
Date of institution of the appeal	10.09.2024			
Date of registration of the Cross appeal	10.09.2024			
Date on judgment pronounced in appeal.	27.06.2026			
Duration of the appeal	Year/s	Month/s	Day/s	
	01	09	17	

: JUDGMENT:-

The present Regular Appeal No.5040/2024 preferred under Section 96 R/w Order XLI Rule 1 of CPC challenging the judgment and decree in O.S.No.58/2022 dated 16.07.2024 passed by the Senior Civil Judge & JMFC., Court, Pavagada. The appellants were plaintiffs and respondents were defendants before the trial Court during appeal. The ranks of the parties are referred as plaintiffs and defendants as referred before the trial Court.



2. The plaintiff instituted suit in O.S.No.58/2022 before the trial Court for the relief of declaration to declare that the plaintiffs and defendant No.1 are the lawful owners in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property and for consequential relief of permanent injunction. As per the plaint averments, the contention of the plaintiffs that, originally the suit property was a Government darkasth land. That one Gangappa, father of plaintiff No.1 and grand father of plaintiffs No.2 to 9 and Anjinappa, the father of defendant No.1 and grand father of defendants No.10 to 13 were in unauthorized occupation of the suit property. The said Gangappa and Anjinappa had filed Form No.7 before the land tribunal Pavagada for grant of occupancy rights in their favour. Accordingly, the land Tribunal in LRF No.40/1974-75 passed an order dated 29.06.1977 and granted occupancy rights infavour of said Gangappa and Anjinappa. After the death of said Gangappa and Anjinappa, the plaintiffs have acquired the title by inheritance and continued in possession of the suit schedule property. After grant, the names of Gangappa and Anjinappa came to be entered in the RTC extracts of suit property. But, the concerned village accountant illegally and irregularly entered the name of one Gangamma, who is totally stranger to the property. In



fact, the said Gangamma never made claim over the said property till date. After, giving requisition, the revenue authorities deleted her name from the RTC. It is contended that, knowing fully of the said document, again the revenue authorities illegally and irregularly entered the names of Yallappa, Ramappa and sons of Hanumanthappa, who have no manner of rights, title interest and possession over the suit property. The plaintiffs have given many requisitions to the Tahsildar to delete the names of said persons. But, the Tahsildar did not take any action because of money and political influence by the said persons.

3. The defendants No.2 to 6 are the legal heirs of said Yallappa and Ramappa sons of Hanumanthappa. Taking undue advantage of said illegal entry in the RTC extracts, they are unnecessarily denying the title of plaintiffs and also causing unlawful interference with their possession over suit property. The defendants No.7,8 and their brother R.Marappa and sons of late Marappa had filed suit against plaintiff No.1, defendant No.1 and A.Gopalappa, the father of plaintiffs No.10 to 13 in O.S.No.372/1993 for partition, in respect of suit property and other properties, which came to be dismissed on



18.09.2001. Aggrieved by the said judgment and decree, they had preferred RA No.143/2001 before the Senior Civil judge, Madhugiri and the said appeal also came to be dismissed on 01.08.2008. Thereafter, they have not preferred any appeal against the said judgment and decree. Such being the case, by suppressing all the said facts, the defendant No.3 had filed application before the Tahsildar for change of katha in her name. Now she is making claim on the basis of illegal entries made by the revenue authorities. The plaintiffs have also given application for acceptance of katha in their names by inheritance, but defendant No.3 had filed objection. The Tahsildar initiated proceedings in R.R.T. Dis.No.204/2021-22, which is pending. But, the Tahsildar has also influenced by the defendant No.2 and trying to pass an order in her favour for changing katha in her name. Hence, the plaintiffs have filed the suit and prays to decree the suit.

4. After institution of suit, the suit summons issued to the defendants. In response to the summons, the defendants appeared through their respective counsels and defendant No.10 filed written statement and the same has been adopted by the defendants No.3 to 6, 9 and 11.



But, the other defendants did not choose to file written statement. In their written statement, the defendants No.3 to 6, 9 to 11 denied all the averments made in paras No.2 to 13 of the plaint. It is contended that, the plaintiffs have failed to implead Marakka D/o late Gangappa and Yellappa and Ramappa's branches in their G-tree. The said Marakka and decedents of Yellappa and Ramappa's branches are necessary parties to the suit. Hence, the present suit is hit by non-joinder of necessary parties. The suit property is the ancestral and undivided joint family property of plaintiffs and defendants and they are in joint possession of the suit property. The suit is barred by limitation. There is no cause of action rose to file the suit. The defendants No.3 to 11 are also the sharers in the suit property. The said Yallappa and Ramappa's branch are also entitled for 1/4th share each in the suit properties. On the said grounds, they have sought to allot their 1/2 share in the suit property and they are ready to pay the court fee as directed by the Court to an extent of their half share in the suit schedule property.

5. On the basis of above said plaint averments and written statement filed by the defendant trial Court framed following issues:-



1. Whether the plaintiffs prove that the suit schedule property was a Government land, the said land was granted to Gangappa and Anjinappa who are the father of plaintiff No.1 and grandfather of plaintiff No.2 to 9 and father of defendant No.1 and grandfather of plaintiffs No.10 to 13 as contended ?
2. Whether the plaintiffs prove that after the death of Gangappa and Anjinappa the plaintiffs have acquired the title over the suit schedule property, hence they are the lawful owners of the suit schedule property as contended ?
3. Whether the plaintiffs prove that they are in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as a lawful owners as contended ?
4. Whether the plaintiffs prove the alleged interference by the defendants as contended ?
5. Whether the defendant No.10, 3 to 6, 9 and 11 prove that they are the sharers in the suit schedule property and they are having 1/4th share each in the suit schedule property as stated in their written statement ?
6. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for the relief as sought for ?
7. What order or decree?



6. The trial Court conducted trial in the matter. In the trial the plaintiffs examined plaintiff No.1 as P.W.1. On behalf of the plaintiffs they got marked 26 documents as per Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.26. On the other hand the defendant No.10 got examined himself as D.W.1. On behalf of the defendants, they got marked 6 documents as per Ex.D.1 to Ex.D.6. After trial the learned trial Judge heard the matter on merits and passed decree and judgment dated 16.07.2024 and dismissed the suit of the plaintiffs with costs.

7. Challenging the decree and judgment passed by the trial Court the plaintiff preferred present appeal before the Court on the following grounds; the trial Court judge has failed check and verify the Ex.P1 i.e. Form No.7 filed before the Land Tribunal, Pavagada by first plaintiff father Gangappa and first defendant father Anjinappa in LRF.No.40/1974-75 for confirmation of their occupancy rights over the suit Sy.No.262 of Y.N.Hosakote. So also, the Ex.P.2 is the Form No.9, So also the Ex.P.3 is the public notice, So also Ex.P.4 is the Form No.9, So also Ex.P.5 is a individual notice, so also Ex.P.6 to Ex.P.12 are the notices and the order sheet maintained by the by Land tribunal, Pavagada in LRF.No.40/1974-75 wherein



the names of first plaintiff father Gangappa and first defendant father Anjinappa has clearly written and declared that their occupancy rights over the suit property. But the trail Court judge without appreciating these documentary evidence properly, erroneously answered the issue No.1 and 2 in the negative and dismissed the suit and hence the same is liable to be set aside. The Ex.P.14 and Ex.P.15 are the RTC extracts of suit Sy.No.262 where in column No.9 and 12 the names of first plaintiff father Gangappa and first defendant father Anjinappa has been written as they are the owners in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property after confirmation occupancy rights over the suit land by the Land tribunal, Pavagada in LRF.No.40/1974-75. But the alleged Yeguvinti Yellappa and Ramappa sons of Yeguvinti Hanumanthappa have filed Form No.7 before the Land tribunal, Pavagada nor granted occupancy rights in their favour in LRF.No.40/1974-75. But the trail court judge erroneously dismissed the suit by assuming that they are also entitled for 1/4th share in the suit schedule property which is against to law and hence the impugned judgment and decree which is challenged in this appeal liable to be set aside.



8. The Ex.P.22 is the judgment and decree passed by the principal Civil Judge (Junior division) and J.M.F.C, Pavagada in O.S.No.372/1993 which was filed by the defendant No.7, his brother R.Marappa and defendant No.8 against this suit plaintiff No.1 and others for partition and separate possession pertaining to four items properties. (This suit schedule property was the item No. 2 of the suit property in OS.No.372/1993). But after contest made by this first plaintiff and first defendant of this suit, that OS.No.372/1993 was dismissed on 18.09.2001. But the trail Court judge has not properly appreciated the judgment and decree passed in O.S.No.372/1993 Ex.P.22 and hence the impugned judgment and decree which is challenged in this appeal does not sustainable in law and on facts and it is liable to be set aside. In Ex.P.22 judgment and decree at page No.6, the relevant issue No.1 and 2 are:-(1) whether the plaintiffs prove that the suit properties are the joint family properties? and (2) whether the plaintiffs prove that they are entitled for 1/4th share in the suit properties? but the answer given for the said two issues are in the negative. But the trail court judge came to wrong conclusion in this case and erroneously dismissed the suit without decreeing the same and hence the same is liable to be set



aside. The Judgment and decree of the lower court is perverse, capricious, arbitrary and opposed to law, facts, probabilities and natural justice involved in this case. Hence the appellant prays to allow the appeal. In the impugned judgment and decree which is challenged in this appeal in page No.9, the issue No.5 is, whether the defendant No.10,3 to 6, 9 and 11 prove that they are the sharers in the suit schedule property and they are having 1/4th share each in the suit schedule property as stated in their written statement?. But the answer given for this issue No.5 is in the negative. But the trail Court judge has not perused issue No.1 and 2 in given O.S.No.372/1993. Hence the conclusion arrived at by the trail court judge in this regard is wrong and erroneously dismissed the suit without decreeing the same and hence the same is liable to be set aside.

9. In the Ex.P.25 (judgment and decree dated 01.08.2008 passed by this Court in R.A.No.143/2001) at page No.9, the point No.1 and 2 are (1) whether the appellants proves that the suit schedule properties are undivided joint family properties and they are entitled for 1/4th share in the suit properties? and (2) whether the judgment and decree passed by the lower court called for



interference?. For these two points, this court answered as in the negative. But the trail court judge has not appreciated and perused the Ex.P.25 while answering the issue No.1 to 4 and 6 and erroneously dismissed the suit without decreeing the same and hence the same is liable to be set aside. When the trail court judge answered the issue No.5 in the negative, automatically the trail court judge ought to have decree the suit without dismissing the same. Therefore the interference by this court is just and necessary. The trail court judge much discussed and relied upon Ex.D.1 which is notarized copy of the Genealogical Tree which is recently created by the defendant No. 2 to 11 just before filing of the suit. So also the copy of the order passed in RRT.Dis.204/2021-22 and subsequent RTC entries, Mutation Register Extract of Ex.D.2 to Ex.D.6. But the same are not weighed with the judgment and decrees passed in O.S.No.372/1993 and [R.A.No.143/2001](#). Hence the judgment and decree passed by the trail court judge is erroneous in law, facts and documentary evidence available on record and hence the same is liable to be set aside. The Trail Court Judge has erred in coming to conclusion that the branches of Ex.D.1 Genealogical Tree dated 22.03.2022 are the members of Hindu joint family and erroneously dismissed the suit



though the defendants have failed to establish the same in the proceedings of OS.No.372/1993 and [R.A.No.143/2001](#) and hence the judgment and decree passed by the trial court judge is does not sustainable in law and on facts and also the documentary evidence available on record and hence the same is liable to be set aside. Hence prays to allow the appeal.

10. Appeal is preferred within time limitation prescribed under law. After instituting appeal Court issued notice to the respondents. In respect of service of notice the respondents No.1, 3, 4 to 10 appeared before the Court. After completion of process, I have secured trial Court records and heard the matter on merits.

11. I have heard the counsel for the appellant and respondents. I have perused the written arguments filed by the appellant and respondents. After hearing the parties and after perusing the materials on record the points that arise for my consideration is:-

- 1] Whether the appellants have made grounds to interfere with the decree and judgment passed by the trial Court, ?
- 2] What order or decree, ?



12. My answer to the above said points is as under:-

Point No.1 : In the Negative;

Point No.2 : As per final order
for the following:-

:-REASONS:-

13. **POINT NO.1:-** The plaintiffs have filed the suit for declaration to declare them and defendant No.1 are the lawful owners in possession and enjoyment of of the suit schedule property and for consequential relief of permanent injunction. The suit schedule property is a landed property bearing Sy.No.262 measuring 5 acres 25 guntas excluding kharab of 25 guntas situated at Y.N.Hosakote Village and Hobli, Pavagada Taluk.

14. It is the case of the plaintiffs that,originally the suit property was a Government darkasth land. Gangappa, father of plaintiff No.1 and grand father of plaintiffs No.2 to 9 and Anjinappa i.e. the father of defendant No.1 and grand father of defendants No.10 to 13 were in unauthorized occupation of the suit property. The said Gangappa and Anjinappa had filed form No.7 before the land tribunal Pavagada for grant of occupancy rights in their favour. Their application was registered



before the the land Tribunal in LRF No.40/1974-75. Their application was allowed on 29.06.1977 and granted occupancy rights infavour of said Gangappa and Anjinappa. After the death of said Gangappa and Anjinappa, the plaintiffs have acquired the title over the suit schedule property under the right of inheritance and continued in possession of the suit schedule property. Hence the plaintiffs are in lawful owner in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. After grant, the names of Gangappa and Anjinappa came to be entered in the RTC extracts of suit property. But, the concerned Village Accountant illegally and irregularly entered the name of one Gangamma resident of Y.N.Hosakote Hobli, who is totally stranger to the property, though no piece of land was and is granted by the land Tribunal in her favour. In fact, the said Gangamma never made claim over the said property till date. After, considering the request, the revenue authorities deleted her name from the RTC entries of suit Sy.No.262. knowing fully aware of the said document, again the revenue authorities illegally and irregularly entered the names of Yallappa, Ramappa and sons of Hanumanthappa, who have no manner of rights, title interest and possession over the suit property. The



plaintiffs have given number of requisitions to the Thasildar, Pavagada to delete and remove the name of Yellappa and Ramappa sons of Hanumanthappa from the RTC entries of suit Sy.No.262. But no steps were taken against the said illegal and irregular RTC. Taking undue advantage of the above said illegal and irregular RTC entries in the name of Yellappa and Ramappa, now from the past six months, the defendants are unnecessarily denying the plaintiff's title over the suit schedule property and they are making unlawful attempt to interfere with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property from the past one month and on which they have no right to do so.

15. On the other hand, the defendants contended that the plaintiffs have failed to implead Marakka D/o Gangappa and Yellappa and Ramappa's branch in their Genealogical tree. The defendants had given a separate genealogical tree showing Marakka, Yellappa and Ramappa's branches. The said Marakka and descendants of Yellappa and Ramappa's branches are necessary parties to the suit. Hence suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties.



16. The plaintiff No.1 to substantiate his case examined himself as P.W.1 and got marked Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.26. During the cross-examination he has admitted the Ex.D.1 genealogical tree. Further he has stated that he has not included the Ramappa's children in this suit since they are not related to this case. He has also admitted that they have filed an application for change of khatha as per Ex.D.2. He has admitted that he has not produced grant certificate issued in the name of Gangappa and Anjinappa. He has also stated that on their behalf nobody have filed application before the land tribunal in respect of the suit schedule property. He has stated that Gangamma and Channappa filed an application before the land tribunal. Further the defendant No.1 A.Hanumanthaiah is his uncle's son. The defendant No.2 Narasamma is his uncle's wife. The defendant No.2 is also daughter of his uncle, defendant No.7 R.Anjaiah and defendant No.8 R.Hanumantharaya are the children of his uncle. He do not know defendant No.9 to 11 and he is not aware of that defendant No.10 and 11 are grand sons of Ramappa. During the cross-examination he has stated that O.S.No.372/1993 filed against him, Marappa, Hanumanthaiah, Gopalappa and Yellappa and the said suit is filed against Ramappa.



Further he admitted that since suit was filed against the Ramappa, his L.Rs are entitled to a share in the suit schedule property. Ramappa was not a party in Ex.P.20. He has also admitted that since suit is filed against Ramappa, his L.Rs are having a share in the suit schedule property.

17. On the other hand defendant No.10 examined himself as D.W.1. He has reiterated the averments of the written statement in the affidavit filed in lieu of his chief examination and got marked Ex.D.1 to Ex.D.13. D.W.1 during the cross-examination stated that after the death of Hanumanthappa the prepositor, the suit schedule property mutated in the name of his 4 sons.

18. It is the case of the plaintiffs that suit schedule property was granted in favour of Gangappa, grandfather of the plaintiff No.2 to 9 and Anjinappa, father of defendant No.1 and grandfather of plaintiffs No.10 to 13. pursuant to grant, the revenue authorities mutated the khatha in the name of Gangappa and Anjinappa and entered their names in the RTC extracts. However, the plaintiffs contended that the revenue authorities illegally and irregularly entered the name of one Gangamma in



the revenue records, despite the fact that she has no relationship with, or interest in, the suit schedule property. In the present case, the initial burden lies upon the plaintiffs to establish that, the suit schedule property was granted in favour of Gangappa and Anjinappa and that they are the absolute owners in lawful possession and enjoyment of the same. To substantiate their claim, the plaintiffs have relied upon Ex.P.1 to Ex.P.12. A careful scrutiny of these documents reveals that the proceedings before the land tribunal were initiated on the basis of Form Mno.7 filed by Gangamma. The records further discloses that the land tribunal has issued notice to Gangappa and Anjinappa as they were interested in the suit schedule property bearing Sy.No.262. It is also evident from the order-sheet at Ex.P.12 that the land tribunal had rejected form No.7 filed by Gangamma. However, the plaintiffs have failed to produce the order passed by the land tribunal granting the occupancy right in favour of Gangappa and Anjinappa. In the absence of such a crucial documents the plaintiffs have not satisfactorily established that the suit schedule property was granted in favour of Gangappa and Anjinappa.



19. It is pertinent to note that, although the plaintiffs denied that Ramappa was related to their family, P.W.1 during his cross-examination categorically admitted that Hanumanthappa had 4 sons namely Gangappa, Anjinappa, Yellappa and Ramappa. On perusal of the RTC extracts Ex.P.14 and Ex.P.15 it shows that suit schedule property jointly standing in the name of Gangappa, Anjinappa, Yellappa and Ramappa. He further admitted that L.Rs of Ramappa have not been included as a parties to the suit. This admissions clearly contradicts the plaintiff's plea that Ramappa was not connected to the suit schedule property and raise a serious doubt regarding the maintainability of the suit in the absence of legal representative of one co-sharer. Therefore the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties.

20. Ex.P.22 is a certified copy of judgment in O.S.No.372/1999. On perusal of said judgment the suit was dismissed. The judgment and decree passed therein were challenged in regular appeal No.143/2001, however the appeal also came to be dismissed thereby confirming the findings of the trial Court. A careful reading of Ex.P.22 further reveals that the Learned Additional Civil



Judge & JMFC., Court held that,

“viewing from any angle the plaintiffs are not entitled for any partition because the suit schedule properties are not joint family properties of plaintiffs and defendants except item No.2. But item No.2 was already partitioned and plaintiffs have not filed a suit for reopen the case in respect of item No.2 of suit schedule property. Hence question of seeking again partition in respect of divided properties does not arise and law does not permit. As above discussed, this findings is also confirmed in regular appeal No.143/2001.”

21. It is pertinent to note that said suit is filed by sons of Ramappa against sons of Gangappa, Anjinappa and Gopalappa. Admittedly the plaintiffs now claiming the right under Gangappa and Anjinappa. Once already the findings was given in the above said suit, said item No.2 property i.e. Sy.No.262 is ancestral property and it is partition between brothers. Now plaintiffs are claiming that said land is granted land in favour of Gangappa and Anjinappa. Hence I do not find any error in the findings of the trial Court.



22. On re-appreciation of oral and documentary evidence this Court finds no perverse, material illegality or probabilities in the trial Court findings. Findings of the trial Court is supported by law and evidence. Hence appeal lacks on merits and does not call for interference. Accordingly, I answer point No.1 in the Negative.

23. **POINT NO.2:-** In view of my finding to point No.1, I proceed to pass following:-

:-ORDER:-

The Regular Appeal in R.A.No.5040/2024 preferred by the plaintiffs under Section 96 R/w Order XLI Rule 1 of CPC, is herewith dismissed.

The decree and judgment in O.S.No.58/2022 dated 16.07.2024 passed by the Senior Civil Judge & JMFC, Court Pavagada is herewith confirmed.

The office is directed to draw decree accordingly.

From the facts and circumstance of the



case there is no order as to costs.

The office is directed to remit back trial court records to the concerned court along with judgment in the appeal.

*(Dictated to the stenographer, same is corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open court, on this the **27th day of June, 2026**)*

sd/-

(SUMANGALA S BASAVANNOUR)
IV Additional District & Sessions Judge
Tumakuru, Sitting at Madhugiri