



**IN THE COURT OF THE ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE &
JMFC, AT SIRA**

PRESENT: **Sri.VINOD KUMAR.M** BAL.,LLB,LLM.,
ADDL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC
AT SIRA

Original Suit No.73/2016

Dated this the 08th day July - 2026

1. Ashrafunnisa,
D/o late Ataulla,
Aged about 60 years,

2. Akthrunnisa,
D/o late Ataulla,
Aged about 54 years,

3. Zeenathunnisa,
D/o late Ataulla,
Aged about 52 years,

4. Riyazunnisa,
D/o late Ataulla,
Aged about 48 years,

All are R/at Kacheri Mohalla,
Sira Town, Tumakuru District.

... Plaintiffs

-VERSUS -

1. Bi Bi Fathima,
W/o Ismail Beig,
Major in Age,
R/at Peshumam Mohalla,
Sira Town, Tumakuru District.

2. Afzalunnisa,
W/o late Mahammed Mahaboob Sab,
Aged about 48 years,



3. Mohammed Ataulla @ Mujahid,
S/o late Mohammed Mahaboob Sab,
Aged about 28 years,

4. Mohammed Naheed,
S/o late Mahammed Mahaboob Sab,
Aged about 25 years,

5. Abdul Khadar Basha,
S/o late Athaulla,
Aged about 70 years,

6. Amina Sharifa,
D/o late Mahammed Mahaboob Sab,
Aged about 30 years,

Defendants No.2 to 6 are
R/at Kacheri Mohalla,
Sira Town, Tumakuru District.

7. Althaf Dead By LR's

a. Haseeba Banu,
W/o late Althaf,
Aged about 35 years,

b. Bi Bi Ayesha,
D/o late Althaf,
Aged about 14 years,
(His Minor R/by N/g
of the defendant No.7(a).
Both are R/at Kacheri Mohalla,
Sira Town, Tumakuru District.

... Defendants

* * * * *

Plaintiff – Sri. Y.T.R., Adv.,
Defendant No.1 – Sri. S.H.B., Adv.,
Defendants No.2 to 4 – Placed Exparte,
Defendants No.5 to 7 – Sri. H.N., Adv.,



Date of institution of suit	07-06-2016
Nature of the suit	Partition & Separate Possession
Date of commencement of the recording of evidence.	23-01-2021
Date on which the judgment was pronounced.	08-07-2026
Total duration	Year/s : Month/s : day/s
	10 01 01

Sd/-
(VINOD KUMAR. M)
 Addl. Senior Civil Judge &
 JMFC., Sira

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

This is the suit filed by the Plaintiffs against Defendants for the relief of partition & separate possession in respect of suit schedule property and to grant other reliefs, in the interest of justice and equity.

2. The brief facts of the Plaintiffs' case is as under:-

One Ataulla had two wives i.e., Khatoon Bi and Fathima Bi. The said Khatoon Bi had one son Abdul Kadar Bashan i.e., defendant No.5 and Fathima Bi died leaving behind four daughters & two sons i.e., 1. Ashraf Unnisa, 2. Akthar Unnisa, 3. Zeenath Unnisa and 4. Riyaz Unnisa i.e., plaintiffs and 1st son Mahammed Mahamood died leaving behind wife and children as defendants No.2 to 6 and 2nd son Althaf i.e.,



defendant No.7. Originally suit property belongs to Ataulla, who was absolute owner in possession of suit property. After death of Ataulla, they and defendants No.2 to 7 have succeeded the estate of suit property under inheritance and all are tenants in common of the suit property. Since there is no partition of the suit property by meets and bounds. It is further that, Abdul Kadar Basha and Althaf have jointly executed release deed dated 14.09.1990 in favor of their brother Mahammed Mahamood. The said release deed is void and not binding on their share in suit property. Upon strength of release deed, the revenue records of suit property got transferred in the name of Mahammed Mahamood vide M.R.No.07/1991-92. Even after death of Mahammed Mahamood, the revenue records got transferred in the name of defendant No.2 vide M.R.No.12/2003-04. In turn the defendant No.2 along with defendants No.2 to 4 sold the suit property under sale deed dated 12.10.2004 in favor of defendant No.1 without their knowledge and consent. On the strength of sale deed, the defendant No.1 got changed revenue documents in her name vide M.R.No.37/2004-05 respectively. The said transaction is only to deprive their share in suit property and also wrongful gain. In this regard, they issued legal notice on dated 31.03.2016 calling upon the defendant No.1 to settle. The cause of action for the suit arose on when they obtained sale deed dated 18.03.2016 and revenue documents pertaining to suit property as well as legal notice issued on dated 31.03.2016



within jurisdiction of this court. Hence, they constrained suit for the relief of partition & separate possession.

3. After service of suit summons, the Defendant No.1 appeared through their counsel and filed written statement by denying the contents of plaint. The defendants No.2 to 4 called out absent and placed exparte. After impleaded the defendants No.5 to 7 appeared through their counsel and not chosen to file written statement. The written statement of defendants No.5 to 7 taken as not filed. Thus, denial of written statement filed by defendant No.1 need not necessary to reiterate in once again.

4. The defendant No.1 specifically contended that, the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties and properties in the family. The suit is barred by limitation. She is bonafide purchaser of suit property having acquired under registered sale deed dated 12.10.2004. The revenue records of suit property got transferred in her name vide M.R.No.37/2004-05. The said revenue records have not challenged before revenue courts. After purchase, she raised coconut tree, Mango and Guvva tree includes Lemon tree in the suit property by dug up bore well with installation of electrical connection. The plaintiffs filed the suit in order to knock of the suit property. Since there is no tenants in common in the family of plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7. On these grounds, they prays to dismissal the suit with cost.

5. On the basis of both pleadings, this court has framed the following issues as hereunder:



- 1. Whether the plaintiffs prove that their father deceased Ataula was the absolute owner of the suit schedule property and they succeeded to his estate?***
- 2. Whether the Plaintiffs further prove that, they are tenants in common and co-owners as there is no partition in the suit schedule property?***
- 3. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for the share as sought for in the plaint?***
- 4. Whether the defendant No.1 proves that, she is the bonafide purchaser?***
- 5. Whether the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties?***
- 6. Whether the suit is barred by Limitation?***
- 7. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for the relief sought in the plaint?***

Additional Issue framed on 20.02.2024

- 1. Whether the defendant No.1 proves that, the plaintiffs being female coparcener in view of opening up the succession after death of this father. As such, they are not entitled for share?***

8. What order or decree?

6. In order to prove this case, original plaintiff No.2 herself examined as PW1 and got marked 32 documents as many as Ex.P.1 to 32 i.e. Ex.P.1/Family Tree, Ex.P.2/Grant certificate, Ex.P.3/Release deed, Ex.P.4/Sale deed, Ex.P.5 to 7/Mutation registers, Ex.P.8/Endorsement, Ex.P.9 to 28/RTC extracts, Ex.P.29/Death certificate, Ex.P.30/Legal notice, Ex.P.31 & 32/Postal receipts. On other hand, the GPA holder of defendant



No.1 examined as DW.1 and got marked 13 documents i.e., Ex.D.1/Demand register, Ex.D.2/SPA, Ex.D.3/Release deed, Ex.D.4/Mutation register, Ex.D.5/Form No.4, Ex.D.6/RTC extracts, Ex.D.7/Sale deed, Ex.D.8/Mutation register, Ex.D.9/Tax paid receipts, Ex.D.10/RTC extracts and Ex.D.11 to 13/Patta Book. Closed the both side evidence.

7. Heard the arguments by learned counsel for plaintiffs and learned counsel for defendant No.1 in detail.

8. The counsel for plaintiff argued that, originally suit property belongs to Ataulla acquired under grant. The said Ataulla died leaving behind seven children i.e., plaintiffs, husband of defendant No.2 and defendant No.5 & 7. After death of Ataulla the Khatha of suit property got transferred in the name of husband of defendant No.2 under inheritance. In turn, the defendants No.5 & 7 executed release deed in favor of husband of defendant No.2. The suit property is tenants in common of plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7. But after death of defendant No.2's husband/Mohammed Mahamood, the defendant No.2 got changed Khatha of suit property and sold the suit property in favor of defendant No.1 under sale deed without consent of plaintiffs and said sale deed is not binding on the plaintiffs share under Mohammedan Law. On these grounds, the counsel for plaintiffs prays to decree the suit.



9. On other hand, the counsel for defendant No.1 argued that, originally suit property belongs to Ataulla acquired under grant and Khatha got transferred in his name. After death of Ataulla, his son Mohammed Mahamood got transferred the Khatha of suit property under inheritance. As such, the suit property is self acquired property of Mohammed Mahamood. The plaintiffs have not challenged the revenue records in the name of Mohammed Mahamood and sale deed taken place in the year of 2004. The suit is barred by law of limitation. The plaintiffs have not include the Ex.D.1 property in present suit. It is further argued that, the defendant No.1 purchased the suit property from defendants No.2 to 5 under sale deed for valuable sale consideration. All the revenue records of the suit property got transferred in the name of defendant No.1 includes raising valuable trees like coconut, Mango and Guvva in the suit property. As such, the defendant No.1 becomes owner in possession and enjoyment of suit property as bonafide purchaser. On these grounds, the counsel for defendant No.1 prays to dismissal the suit.

10. On considering the both pleadings and oral as well as documentary evidence led by both sides includes oral arguments by both counsel, perused the materials available on record, my findings on the above said 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 : **In the Negative**
Issue No.5 : **In the Negative**
Issue No.6 : **In the Negative**
Issue No.7 : **In the Affirmative**
Additional Issue No.1 : **In the Negative**
Issue No.8 : As per the final order,
for the following.

:: R E A S O N S ::

11. Issue No.1, 2 & 4: These issues are interlinked each other in order to decide the contention of both parties. Thus, these issues have taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid the repetition of facts. The suit filed by the Plaintiffs against Defendants for the relief of partition & separate possession in respect of suit property, which is lies on Plaintiffs to prove their case as contemplated U/Sec.101 of the Indian Evidence Act.

12. It is not in dispute by both parties and their counsel that, originally suit property belongs to Ataulla acquired under grant by Govt., and the said Ataulla had seven children through two wives i.e., plaintiffs, husband of defendants No.2, 5 & 7. However, the defendants denied the relationship with plaintiffs in the arguments by the counsel. But in the written statement of defendant No.1 with cross of DW.1 clearly admits the relationship with plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7 as legal heirs of Ataulla. From the admission of defendant No.1/DW.1 in the cross examination itself establish that, originally suit



property belongs to Ataulla, who died leaving behind seven children i.e., plaintiffs/Ashraf Unnisa, Aktar Unnisa, Zeenath Unnisa, Riyaz unnisa and defendants No.2's husband Mohammed Mahamood, defendant No.5/Abdul Kadhar Basha and defendant No.7/Altaf and after death of Ataulla, the plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7 have succeed the suit property by way of succession and all are tenants in common under Mohammedan law. As such, the admission facts of property belongs to Ataulla and relationship with plaintiffs and defendants need not to be proved U/sec. 58 of Indian Evidence Act.

13. It is specific case of plaintiffs that, they and defendants No.2 to 7 are tenants in common of suit property under Mohammedan Law after death of their father Ataulla. On other hand, the defendant No.1 denied the tenants in common and claiming she is bonafide purchaser in possession of suit property acquired under sale deed.

14. In order to prove the case, PW.1 filed her affidavit in lieu of chief by reiterate the contents of plaint pleadings. PW.1 specifically deposed that, they and defendants No.2 to 7 are legal heirs of Ataulla and suit property is their tenants in common. During the cross-examination of PW.1 categorically admits that, she and other plaintiffs are daughters of Ataulla and said Ataulla was acquired the suit property under Govt., grant. In the further cross-examination of PW1 also admits that after death of Ataulla the Khatha of suit property got



transferred in the three sons name i.e., Abdul Khadar Basha, Mohammed Mahamood and Altaf. But PW.1 deposed that, she do not know about defendants No.2 to 4 sold the suit property to defendant No.1 in the year of 2004. Even though PW.1 further denied that, she do not have any right over the suit property.

15. To substantiate the oral evidence, PW.1 produced Ex.P.1/Family tree and Ex.P.2/Grant certificate clearly establish that, they are daughters of Ataulla, who acquired the suit property under grant. On other hand, the defendant No.1 and her counsel never disputed the relationship between plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7 with suit property originally belongs to Ataulla acquired under Govt., grant. PW.1 further produced Ex.P.3/Release deed dated 14.09.1990 clearly shows that, their two brothers Abdul Khadar Basha and Altaf have jointly executed release deed agreeing to release the rights of the suit property in favor of another brother/Mohammed Mahamood. On other hand, the counsel for plaintiffs and PW.1 never disputed the Ex.P.3/Release deed held among brothers. PW.1 further produced Ex.P.5/Mutation register shows the Khatha of suit property in the name of Mohammed Mahamood on the guise of Ex.P.3/Release deed. PW.1 further produced Ex.P.9 to 15/RTC extracts clearly establish that, the name of Mohammed Mahamood stood entered in possession and ownership column from 1967 to 2006 after death of father Ataulla, who was absolute owner of the property. PW.1 further



produced Ex.P.4/Sale deed dated 12.10.2004 clearly shows that defendants No.2 to 4 sold the suit property in favor of defendant No.1 for valuable sale consideration and revenue documents got transferred in the name of defendant No.1 as per Ex.P.17 to 28 from the year of 2004 to 2016. Even though, the plaintiffs and counsel admits the Ex.P.4/Sale deed executed by defendants No.2 to 4 and revenue documents got transferred in the name of defendant No.1 on the basis of Ex.P.4/Sale deed. But only contended in the plaint that plaintiffs were not parties in Ex.P.4/Sale deed either as vendor nor witness and said sale deed is not binding on their share.

16. In order to prove the contention DW.1 specifically deposed that, defendant No.1 purchased the suit property from defendants No.2 to 4 under sale deed for valuable sale consideration and she becomes owner in possession and enjoyment of the suit property as bonafide purchaser. But in the cross-examination of DW.1 admits the Ataulla had seven children and acquired the suit property under grant. Even in the further cross-examination of DW.1 categorically admits that, the plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7 are tenants in common of suit property after death of their father Ataulla. From the admission of DW.1 itself clarifies that, the plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7 are children of Ataulla, who was owner of the suit property and all are in tenants in common under Mohammedan Law. But the defendant No.1/DW.1 have



knowing fully purchased the suit property without signature of plaintiffs.

17. In order to prove the oral evidence DW.1 produced Ex.D.3/Release deed dated 14.09.1990 clearly shows that defendant No.5/Abdul Khadar Basha and defendant No.7/Altaf have jointly executed release deed of suit property in favor of husband of defendant No.2/Mohammed Mahamood. On other hand, the plaintiffs and counsel never disputed the Ex.D.3 as already exhibited in Ex.P.3 from their side. DW.1 further produced Ex.D7/Sale deed similar of Ex.P4 clearly shows the defendant No.2 to 4 sold the suit property in favor of defendant No.1 for valuable sale consideration. But on perusal of Ex.D.7/Ex.P.4/Sale deed, the plaintiffs have not made as parties either vendor nor witness to that documents. DW.1 further produced Ex.D.4 to 13/Revenue documents i.e., Mutation, RTC and Patta Books clearly admits the name of defendant No.1 stood entered in ownership and possession of suit property. On other hand, plaintiffs and counsel never disputed the revenue entries in the name of defendant No.1 because PW.1 also produced Ex.P9 to 28/RTC about name of Ataulla, name of Mohammed Mahamood and then defendant No.1 since the beginning.

18. The counsel for defendant No.1 argued that, the defendant No.1 becomes owner in possession of the suit property acquired under Ex.D.7/Sale deed as bonafide purchaser. On other hand, the counsel for plaintiffs and PW.1 clearly denied that, they are



not signatory to Ex.D.7/Sale deed and said sale deed is not binding. But on perusal of Ex.D.7/Sale deed, the children of Ataulla i.e., plaintiffs never signed to register documents except legal heirs of deceased/Mohammed Mahamood i.e., defendant No.2 to 4. Admittedly, the defendant No.1 and DW.1 are having knowledge of plaintiffs also daughters of Ataulla and sisters of vendors family. As such, the defendant No.1 purchased the suit property under Ex.D.7/Sale deed without consent of the plaintiffs as sharers under Mohammedan Law. Moreover that, defendant No.1 never verified the rights of the plaintiffs apart from defendants No.2 to 4 over suit property and purchased the same. Such being, the defendant No.1 cannot be consider as bonafide purchaser of suit property except gets share of vendors under the Ex.D.7/Sale deed.

19. It is important to note that, the plaintiffs/PW.1 claiming the rights of the suit property under Mohammedan Law. Admittedly, the suit property originally belongs to Ataulla and his seven children have succeed the suit property under tenants in common. During the cross-examination of DW.1 categorically admits the originally property belongs to Ataulla, who had seven children i.e., plaintiffs and husband of defendant No.2, 5 & 7 includes all are in tenants in common. But the defendant No.1 purchased the suit property without verifying the rights of the plaintiffs after death of Ataulla. If the Khatha and RTC got transferred in the name of brother of plaintiffs by name Mohammed Mahamood itself not sufficient



to hold that, it is his self acquired property. Admittedly, the husband of defendant No.2/Mohammed Mahamood acquired the suit property under inheritance and does not gets rights over the suit property. As such, the Ex.D.7/Sale deed executed by defendants No.2 to 4 is not binding on the share of plaintiffs daughter except binds on husband of defendant No.2, 5 & 7 includes their legal heirs only.

20. The counsel for plaintiffs has rightly argued that, suit property belongs to Ataulla and after his demise seven children have succeed the suit property under tenants in common and sale deed executed by defendants No.2 to 4 in favor of defendant No.1 is not binding on the share of plaintiffs/daughter. The oral evidence of PW.1 has corroborated with Ex.P.1 to 30 to show the they and defendants No.2 to 7 are tenants in common after death of their father/Ataulla. Therefore, the plaintiffs have prove that, originally suit property belongs to their father/Ataulla and they are tenants in common in the suit property after death of father. But the defendant No.1 failed to prove that she is bonafide purchaser of suit property except share of three sons i.e., husband of defendant No.1/Mohammed Mahamood, defendant No.5 & 7, but not becomes owner of plaintiffs share over the suit property by way of preponderance of probability. **Accordingly, I answered to Issue No.1 & 2 in the Affirmative and Issue No.4 in the Negative.**



21. Issue No.5: It is specific contention of defendant No.1 that, suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary party. Admittedly, the present suit filed for partition under Mohammedan Law. On perusal of Ex.D.1/Family tree clearly establish that, one Ataulla had seven children, who are plaintiffs and husband of defendant No.2, defendant No.5 & 7. All are on record as legal heirs of deceased Ataulla. During the cross-examination of DW.1 admits the children of Ataulla have already on record. In support of contention, the defendant No.1 never mentioned the who are left out from the case as necessary parties and not produced any documents to show the same.

22. It further contention of defendant No.1 that, the suit is non inclusion of necessary property of RCC house bearing assessment No.91/2/87/B/2788, measuring 11 X 55 feet stands in the name of plaintiff No.1. During the cross-examination of PW.1 confronted the Ex.D.1/Demand register clearly reveals that, property No.2538 measuring 17X88'5 house property stands in the name of plaintiff No.1 nothing but absolute property. But Ex.D.1 property is not tenants in common property of plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7 family. Such being, the plaintiffs have made all the parties and properties for adjudication. The contention of defendant No.1 is formal and cannot be accepted in the eye of law. **Accordingly, I have answered to Issue No.5 in the Negative.**



23. Issue No.6: The defendant No.1 specifically contended in para No.11 that, the suit is barred by limitation. In support of contention, the defendant No.1 and DW.1 with their counsel never explained about how suit of the plaintiffs for partition under Mohammedan Law would be barred by law of limitation. Admittedly, the brothers of plaintiffs by name Mohammed Mahamood, the defendants No.5 & 7 have jointly arrived for release deed in respect of suit property without their consent and knowledge & also the wife of Mohammed Mahamood by name defendant No.2 sold the suit property under sale deed dated 12.10.2004 in favor of defendant No.1 for valuable sale consideration but the said sale deed also not executed by plaintiffs, who are having tenants in common of the suit property after death of their father Ataulla. In the plaint the plaintiffs have challenged the sale deed dated 12.10.2004 in favor of defendant No.1 is not binding and null and void. Admittedly, the plaintiffs were not parties in said sale deed and does not binds on them in respect of their share. As such, the challenging the sale deed dated 12.10.2004 in the year of 2016 by filed the suit itself not barred by limitation. The contention of defendant No.1 cannot be consider in the eye of law. Thus, the suit of plaintiffs is not barred by limitation. **Accordingly, I answered to issue No.6 in the Negative.**

24. Issue No.3, 7 & Additional Issue No.1:- These issues are inter-linked each other in order to decide the relief of plaintiffs and contention of defendant No.1. Thus, these issues have



taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid the repetition of facts. In present suit, the plaintiffs sought for partition and separate possession of their share against defendants in suit property as being the suit property belongs to their father/Ataulla and plaintiffs & defendants No.2 to 7 are in tenants in the common in respect of suit property as discussed in issue No.1 & 2 supra.

25. Admittedly, the plaintiffs are children of Ataulla, who died after acquired the suit property under Ex.P.2/Grant certificate. On other hand, the defendant No.1 & his counsel never disputed the relationship between plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7 with suit property belongs to Ataulla. The plaintiffs and defendants No.2 to 7 are legal heirs of Ataulla and religion by Mohammedan. The plaintiffs are daughters, the defendant No.2's husband/Mohammed Mahamood, defendants No.5 & 7 are children of Ataulla. Such being, the children of Ataulla gets their share in suit property under Mohammedan Law.

26. It is important to note that, the sons & daughters of Ataulla i.e., defendant No.2's husband, defendants No.5 & 7 and plaintiffs gets share in the ratio of 2:1 in suit property under Mohammedan Law. Because the sons gets the double share of the daughters as per Mohammedan Law. As such, the plaintiffs would be entitled for 2/5th i.e., 40% share in suit property and defendant No.2's husband, the defendants No.5 & 7 would be entitled for 3/5th i.e., 60% share in suit property, which is fallen into share of defendant No.1 as purchaser of suit



property under equity. But the contention of defendant No.1 cannot be acceptable pertaining to plaintiffs are being female co-parcener after death of their father/Ataulla. In the present case, the defendant No.1 gets the share of alinee in respect of 3/5th share i.e., 60% in suit property as bonafide purchaser under equity. Therefore, the Plaintiffs are entitle for share of 1/10th each in respect of suit property and defendant No.1 failed to prove the plaintiffs are not entitle for share in suit property by way of preponderance of probability. **Accordingly, I answered to Issue No.3, 7 in the Affirmative and Additional Issue No.1 in the Negative.**

27. Issue No.8: In view of my findings on issue No.1 to 7 and Additional Issue No.1, this court answered the same in the Affirmative and Negative, the suit of the Plaintiffs is deserves to be decreed. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following:

:: O R D E R ::

The suit of the Plaintiffs is hereby Decreed.

It is declared that, the plaintiffs are entitle for 1/10th share each in suit property by meets and bounds for partition and separate possession.

It is further declared that, the Defendant No.2's husband, the defendants No.5 & 7 are also entitle to 1/5th share in suit schedule property by metes & bounds for partition & separate possession, which is fallen to the share of defendant



No.1 as bonafide purchaser of property under equity ground.

The Plaintiffs & Defendant No.1 shall get their share in suit schedule property U/Sec.54 of CPC by metes & bounds.

Office is directed to put up the records for drawing up final decree after completion of appeal period as per circular issued by Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka vide RJ.No.03/2024 on dated 03.01.2024.

Draw preliminary decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the stenographer by directly on Computer, script corrected, signed by me & then pronounced in the open Court on this the 08th day July – 2026)

Sd/-
(VINOD KUMAR. M)
Addl. Senior Civil Judge &
JMFC., Sira

:: A N N E X U R E S ::

List of witnesses examined on behalf of Plaintiff:

PW1 : Akthar Unnisa

List of documents marked for Plaintiff:

Ex.P1 : Family Tree
Ex.P2 : Grant certificate
Ex.P3 : Release deed
Ex.P4 : Sale deed
Ex.P5 to 7 : Mutation registers



Ex.P8 : Endorsement
Ex.P9 to 28 : RTC extracts
Ex.P29 : Death certificate
Ex.P30 : Legal notice
Ex.P31 & 32 : Postal receipts

List of witnesses examined on behalf of Defendant:

DW1 : Ismail

List of documents marked for Defendant:

Ex.D1 : Demand register
Ex.D2 : SPA
Ex.D3 : Release deed
Ex.D4 : Mutation register
Ex.D5 : Form No.4
Ex.D6 : RTC extracts
Ex.D7 : Sale deed
Ex.D8 : Mutation register
Ex.D9 : Tax paid receipts
Ex.D10 : RTC extracts
Ex.D11 to 13 : Patta Book

Sd/-
(VINOD KUMAR. M)
Addl. Senior Civil Judge &
JMFC., Sira