

KAUK710012692015



IN THE COURT OF PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC., KUMTA

**PRESENT: Narendra B.R, B.Sc.LLB.
Prl Civil Judge, Kumta**

ORIGINAL SUIT NO. 93/2015

Dated this 16th day of December, 2022

**PLAINTIFF : Smt.Mukambika @ Usha Kumar
Bhat Jambhe,
Aged about 60 years,
Household,
R/at C/o Savitri w/o Kashinath Marigoli,
Manibhadra Road, Gokarna,
Tal. Kumta.**

(By Sri. V.G.H., Advocate)

// Vs. //

**DEFENDANTS: 1. Smt.Nagaveni w/o Subray Bhat,
Kodlekere,
Aged about 80 years,
Household,
R/at Kotiteerhakatte, Gokarna,
Tal. Kumta. **(Dead)****

**2. Ganapati Subray Bhat, Kodlekere,
Aged about 58 years, Vaidik,
R/at H.No.123, Kotiteerthakatte,
Gokarna, Tal. Kumta (U.K.)
Since deceased by his L.Rs.**

2(a) Kartik Ganapati Bhat Kodlekere,

Aged about 25 years, Job,

2(b) Chaitra Ganapati Bhat Kodlekere,
Aged about 22 years, Student,

Both are R/at C/o M.S.Hadli Compound,
4th Cross, 4th Main, KUD Road,
Shrinagar, Dharwad-580003.

3. Rama Subray Bhat, Kodlekere,
Aged about 54 years, Job,
R/at H.No.123, Kotiteerthakatte,
Gokarna, Tal. Kumta.

4. Smt.Sumangala Rajagopal,
Aged about 48 years, Household,
R/at C/o Savitri w/o Kashinath Marigoli.
Manibhadra road, Gokarna,
Tal.Kumta.

5. Smt.Savitri w/o Kashinath Marigoli,
Aged about 48 years,
Household,
R/at Manibhadra road, Gokarna,
Tal.Kumta.

**6. Gangubai Vinayak Bhat, Kodlekere
(H.U.F.)**
Aged about 70 years,
R/at Near Mudaganapati Temple,
Prabhat Nagar, Honnavar
Since deceased by his L.Rs.

6(a) Krishna Vinayak Bhat, Kodlekere,
Aged about 55 years,
R/at KHB Colony, Honnavar,
Tal. Honnavar.

6(b) Mahadev Vinayak Bhat, Kodlekere,
Aged about 52 years,
R/at at KHB Colony, Honnavar,

Tal. Honnavar.

6(c) Usha Vijaykumar Adig,

Aged about 60 years,
R/at Pandeshwar Village, Sastana,
Tal.Kundapur, Dist. Udupi.

7. Dinesh Shankar Bhat,Kodlekere(U.F.)

Aged about 40 years,
R/at Kotiteerthakatte, Gokarna,
Tal. Kumta.

**(By Sri.SSS/VSS Adv. For D3)
(By Sri.HVG, Adv.for D.4,5)
(Lrs.,of D2 and D6 - Exparte)
(D1- dead) (D7-Absent)**

Date of Institution of the suit:	20.8.2015						
Nature of the suit:	Partition and Separate Possession						
Date of commencement of recording of evidence:	1.3.2017						
Date on which the judgment was pronounced:	16.12.2022						
Total Duration:	<table><tbody><tr><td><u>Year/s</u></td><td><u>Month/s</u></td><td><u>Day/s</u></td></tr><tr><td>07</td><td>03</td><td>27</td></tr></tbody></table>	<u>Year/s</u>	<u>Month/s</u>	<u>Day/s</u>	07	03	27
<u>Year/s</u>	<u>Month/s</u>	<u>Day/s</u>					
07	03	27					

Prl Civil Judge, Kumta.

J U D G M E N T

The plaintiff filed the preset suit against defendants seeking relief of partition and separate possession with respect of suit schedule properties.

2. THE BRIEF FACTS OF THE CASE OF THE PLAINTIFF CASE:-

The plaintiff and defendants are the members of joint family. The suit properties are the ancestral properties and the properties originally belonged to Nagappa Subray Kodlekere. After the demise of Nagappa Subray Kodlekere, the katha of the properties mutated to the name of father of plaintiff through inheritance. The katha pertaining to suit properties got mutated to the name of plaintiff's father as Manager of undivided family. After the demise of father of plaintiff by name Subray Nagappa Bhat Kodlekere, defendant no 3 got changed the katha of the properties with respect to 1/3rd share to his name. The suit properties are the ancestral properties and defendant no 3 alone does not have absolute right over the properties. Defendant no 3 denied to partition the properties and hand over possession of share of plaintiff which necessitated the plaintiff to filed the present suit seeking for partition and separate possession.

3. Defendant no 3 filed written statement wherein the relationship between the parties as mentioned in the plaint is admitted. The other averments of the plaint are denied by defendant no 3. Defendant no 3 contended that application is filed for change of katha to his name as per the

consent of given by plaintiff and defendant no 2, 4 and 5 and accordingly, katha of the properties are got mutated to his name. The plaintiff, defendant no 2, 4 and 5 relinquished their right over the property orally in favour of defendant no 3 based on which katha of the properties got mutated in the name of defendant no 3. Plaintiff and defendant no 2, 4 and 5 not objected for change of katha in favour of defendant no 3 as they have relinquished their right. Defendant no 7 filed suit in O S no 97/2012, along with his mother and sister, seeking partition and though plaintiff is a party to the suit, she has not contested the suit as she relinquished right in favour of defendant no 3. The present suit filed by plaintiff seeking partition is not tenable. The suit filed by plaintiff without making all the parties having right over the properties, is not tenable. The house property bearing no 123 is constructed by defendant no 3 from his own earnings and as such, said property is his self-acquired property. The plaintiff or other defendants are having no right over said property and they are not entitled for partition in the said properties. On the said grounds, defendant no 3 sought for dismissal of the suit.

4. Defendant no 4 and 5 filed the written statement separately wherein they admitted the relationship between the parties and also nature of suit properties. Defendant no 4 and 5 contended that house property is constructed / renovated from the amount of Subray Nagappa Bhat

Kodlekere and not from the amount of defendant no 3. Defendant no 4 and 5 denied the aspect of consenting for change of katha to the name of defendant no 3. Defendant no 4 and 5 also sought for division of their respective share in the properties and sought to pass suitable order in that regard.

5. Based on the pleadings of both the parties, the below mentioned issues are framed by this Court:-

ISSUES

1. Whether the plaintiff proves that the suit schedule properties are the ancestral joint family properties of the plaintiff and defendants and they are in joint possession of the same?
2. Whether the plaintiff proves that she is entitled to 1/18th share and separate possession of it?
3. Whether the defendant No. 3 proves that the B schedule property is self-acquired property of him?
4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the reliefs sought for in the suit?
5. What Order or Decree?
6. In order to substantiation the contentions plaintiff got examined as PW-1 and got marked Ex.P1 to P10 documents. The defendant no 3 got examined as DW-1 and

got marked Ex D-1 to D-15 documents. Defendant no 5 examined as Dw-2 and got marked Ex D-16 and D-17 documents. After closure of evidence of both parties, the matter is posted for arguments.

7. Heard arguments of both side. Perused the materials on record.

8. On consideration of materials placed before Court, this Court answers issues as follows:

Issue No.1: In the **Affirmative**

Issue No.2: In the **Affirmative**

Issue No.3: In the **Negative**

Issue No.4: In the **Affirmative**

Issue No.5: As per final order,

for the following;

REASONS

9. **ISSUE NO.1 AND 3** :- It is the contention of the plaintiff that the suit properties are the ancestral properties. On perusal of the materials placed before the court, there appears to be no dispute pertaining to the aspect of relationship between the parties. The suit properties are stated to have been belonged to Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere. The plaintiff furnished the D register extract which is marked as Ex P-6. The said document pertains to suit schedule item no 4 property and it discloses that the katha pertaining to item no 4 of suit schedule is standing in

the name of Nagappa Subray Bhat who is the grandfather of plaintiff. The plaintiff also furnished the M R extract pertaining to suit properties which is marked as Ex P-7. On perusal of Ex P-7, it clearly discloses the aspect of change of katha in favour of Subray who is the father of plaintiff. The recitals of Ex P-7 clearly disclose that the katha of the properties got mutated to the name of father of plaintiff, Subray, through inheritance after the demise of Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere. The properties to which the katha was mutated are mentioned in the document and properties mentioned therein are the suit properties. The katha of the properties got mutated to the name of Subray as Manager of undivided family. The katha got mutated to the name of Subray in the capacity as Manager of the undivided family. Ex P-7 clearly discloses that the suit properties belonged to Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere and after his demise, the properties are inherited by Subray i.e, father of plaintiff. It is also pertinent to note that the katha got mutated to the name of father of plaintiff as Manager of undivided family and father of plaintiff held the suit properties as Manager of the family. Defendant no 4 and 5 also not disputed the said aspect and they clearly admitted that the suit properties are the ancestral properties. Ex P-7 clearly discloses that the properties mutated to the name of plaintiff's father through inheritance.

10. The plaintiff also furnished the RTC extract pertaining to the suit properties which are marked as Ex P-1 to P-6. On perusal of RTC extracts, it discloses that the katha of the properties stand in the joint names of defendant no 3 and brothers of Subray Nagappa Bhat. The RTC extract pertaining to the suit properties stand in the joint names of defendant no 3 and brothers of Subray Nagappa Bhat which aspect indicates that there was no division of properties between father of plaintiff and his brothers. In the RTC extracts, the nature of properties is mentioned as ancestral. In column no 10 of Ex P-2 to P-5, the nature of properties is mentioned as ancestral and the katha is entered jointly in the names of defendant no 3 and brothers of Subray Nagappa Bhat. The entries in the RTC extract are having presumptive value unless the same is rebutted. Defendant no 3 not placed any materials to dispute or doubt the entries in the RTC extracts. Defendant no 3, who is examined as Dw-1, stated in the cross examination that all the properties mentioned in the suit schedule are not the ancestral properties. Defendant no 3 not specifically stated about the properties which are ancestral according to him. In the cross examination also, Dw-3 stated that all the properties are not ancestral but not stated which are those properties that are not ancestral. The RTC extracts clearly reveals that the suit properties are the ancestral properties. The mode of acquisition of suit properties is through inheritance which is

apparent from the materials placed on record. Ex P-7, M R extract, clearly discloses that father of plaintiff acquired the suit properties through inheritance from his father Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere. The RTC extracts furnished by plaintiff discloses the mode of acquisition of properties by defendant no 3 by inheritance. The RTC extracts discloses that the properties are ancestral properties. The documents furnished by plaintiff clearly disclose that the suit properties are acquired by her father through inheritance and they are ancestral properties.

11. The plaintiff furnished the assessment register extract pertaining to the year 1981-82 with respect to suit B schedule property which is marked as Ex P-8. Ex P-8 clearly discloses that the name of father of plaintiff is entered pertaining to suit B schedule property. In serial no 204 of the said document, the property bearing no 123 which is the suit B schedule is mentioned and katha with respect to said property is mentioned in the name of Subray Nagappa Bhat who is the father of plaintiff. The plaintiff also furnished the assessment register extract pertaining to the year 2008-2009 which is marked as Ex P-9. The said document also pertains to suit B schedule property and katha is standing in the name of defendant no 3. The said document discloses that the katha with respect to suit B schedule property stands in the name of defendant no 3 and the basis for change of katha to the name of defendant no 3 is not

mentioned. In the cross examination, Dw-1 stated that his name is entered in the assessment register extract through succession. The relevant portion of deposition of Dw-1 in page no 8 paragraph no 3 line no 8 is depicted as below:

“.... ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಮುದುವರಿದು ವಾರಿಸಾ ಆದ ನಂತರ ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರು ಸದ್ರಿ ಮನೆಗೆ ದಾಖಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುತ್ತಾರೆ. ...”

Thus, Dw-1 clearly stated that his name is entered through succession which aspect indicates that the suit B schedule property belonged to his father. The katha of suit B schedule property is changed to the name of defendant no 3 through inheritance after the demise of Subray Nagappa Bhat which aspect is stated by Dw-1 in the cross examination. Ex P-8 and P-9 clearly disclose that the suit B schedule property belonged to father of plaintiff by name Subray Nagappa Bhat and same mutated to the name of defendant no 3 after the demise of Subray Nagappa Bhat through inheritance. Though defendant no 3 not stated the mode of acquisition of suit B schedule property by him, in the cross examination, he clearly stated that he acquired the property through succession.

12. In the written statement at paragraph no 10, defendant no 3 specifically contended that suit B schedule property is his self-acquired property. Defendant no 3 not stated the mode of acquisition of suit B schedule property.

Defendant no 3 not stated in his written statement about the mode of acquisition of suit B schedule property by him. Though defendant no 3 contended that suit B schedule property is his self-acquired property, he has not stated the mode of acquisition of said property. No materials are placed by defendant no 3 to show that the suit B schedule property is his self-acquired property. Defendant no 3 neither averred nor furnished any materials to show the mode of acquisition of suit B schedule property. In the cross examination, Dw-1 clearly stated that he got the katha of B schedule property changed to his name through succession. The said aspect is contrary to the contention of defendant no 3. The acquisition of property through succession cannot be termed as self-acquisition when other members of the family are in existence. Only one legal heir cannot acquire the property by virtue of succession when other legal heirs are also in existence.

13. Defendant no 3 contended in his written statement that house property mentioned in suit B schedule is constructed by him by using his own wealth. In order to substantiate the said contention, defendant no 3 furnished certified copy of assessment / estimation given by Civil Engineer which is marked as Ex D-5. In the said document, the cost of construction is mentioned and it is also mentioned that defendant no 3 reconstructed the house. The said document mentions the estimate amount and it does

not reveal regarding expenditure being made by defendant no 3 alone. In the said document, it is not stated that entire expenditure of reconstruction is met by defendant no 3 alone. Defendant no 3 not examined the author of said document. The said document cannot be considered to substantiate the contention of defendant no 3. Defendant no 3 not provided the source of income from which he met the expenditure as mentioned in Ex D-5. The source of income from which defendant no 3 met the expenditure as mentioned in Ex D-5 is neither explained in the written statement nor any materials are furnished in that regard. Ex D-6, receipt, discloses the aspect of receipt of Rs 1,41,000/- by the contractor. The signatories of Ex D-5 and D-6 are one and the same. The contractor who issued letter of estimation as per Ex D-5, has also given receipt for having received a sum of Rs 1,41,000/-. In Ex D-6, it is mentioned that a sum of Rs 70,500/- is stated to have been received from defendant no 3 towards repair or reconstruction work. The amount mentioned in Ex D-5 is 24,35,200/- and the amount mentioned in Ex D-6 is 1,41,000/-. As per Ex D-6, out of total amount of Rs 1,41,000/-, defendant no 3 is stated to have paid Rs 70,500/-. Defendant no 3 not explained whether the expenditure mentioned Ex D-5 and D-6 pertains to same property or not. In Ex D-5, the period of completion of reconstruction is not mentioned. It also not mentioned in the said document that the expenses are paid entirely by

defendant no 3 only. The defendant no 5 furnished the certified copy of judgment and decree passed by Hon'ble Senior Civil Judge, Kumta in R A No 11/2016 which is marked as Ex D-16. In the said Judgment, Hon'ble Appellate court discussed regarding the documents which are marked as Ex D-5 and D-6 in the present case. The Hon'ble Appellate Court also observed that defendant no 3, who is the appellant in the Appeal, has taken divergent contention in the appeal. It is observed by Hon'ble Appellate court that at the trial court in O S No 97/2012, defendant no 3 contended that he and defendant no 2 to 6 in the said suit are having right over the house property whereas in the appeal, defendant no 3 taken the contention that house property is his self-acquired property and none are having any right over the said property. The plea of defendant no 3 before the trial Court in O S No 97/2012 and Hon'ble Appellate Court in R A No 11/2016 are contrary to one another. The Hon'ble Appellate Court observed the said aspect in the judgment and dismissed the appeal preferred by defendant no 3 herein. Thus, Ex D-5 and D-6 does not substantiate the contention of defendant no 3. Defendant no 3 does not appear to have challenged the decree passed by Hon'ble Appellate court in R A no 11/2016. Further, as Ex D-5 and D-6 are considered by Hon'ble Appellate Court in R A No 11/2016, again giving finding pertaining to the said documents, does not arise. Defendant no 3 failed to substantiate the contentions raised

by him with cogent and substantive materials. Defendant no 3 not placed any satisfactory materials to show that suit B schedule property is his self-acquired property.

14. The materials placed on record clearly disclose that the suit properties are the ancestral property. As per the settled principle of law, in a joint family, possession of one is considered to be possession of other members also. The documents furnished by plaintiff clearly reveal that suit properties are the ancestral properties. The entry of name of defendant no 3 in the revenue records do not appear to confer absolute right in his favour with respect to the suit properties. As the properties are ancestral properties, defendant no 3 is considered to be in possession of suit properties for and on behalf of joint family. The possession of defendant no 3 cannot be considered to be exclusive possession as no materials are placed to show that defendant no 3 is having absolute right and possession over the properties. On consideration of above stated aspects, the plaintiff succeeded in establishing that she is in possession of suit properties along with defendants.

15. Defendant no 3 also contended that plaintiff, defendant no 1, 2, 4 and 5 relinquished their right/share in the suit properties in his favour. But, no materials are placed by defendant no 3 in that regard. Except assertion in the written statement, defendant no 3 not placed any materials to show that plaintiff, defendant no 1, 2, 4 and 5 relinquished

their right in the suit properties in favour of defendant no 3. In the absence of any materials to substantiate the aspect of relinquishment, the said contention of defendant no 3 does not sustain for consideration.

16. Defendant no 3 also contended that suit in O S No 97/2012 is filed earlier seeking for partition and as such, the present suit is not tenable. Defendant no 3 furnished the certified copy of judgment and decree passed in the said suit which is marked as Ex D-10. On perusal of Ex D-10, the suit in O S No 97/2012 appears to have been filed by defendant no 8 herein seeking for partition and separate possession. In the said suit, partition is sought by defendant no 8 herein and the suit is decreed. Defendant no 1 to 6 in the said suit, who are plaintiff and defendant no 1 to 5 in the present suit, are together held entitled to 1/4th share in the suit properties. In the said judgment and decree, the specific share of plaintiff is not divided. Admittedly, plaintiff and defendant no 1 to 5 constitute branch of Subray Nagappa Bhat and they together held entitled to 1/4th share in the properties. The specific share of plaintiff is not determined in the said suit. The plaintiff filed the present suit seeking for determination of her specific share in the properties that are allotted to the branch of Subray Nagappa Bhat. In O S No 97/2012, plaintiff and defendant no 1 to 5 herein are together held entitled to 1/4th share in the properties as they represented the branch of Subray Nagappa Bhat and share

of plaintiff is not specifically determined. As such, the contention of defendant no 3 that the present suit not tenable, as suit filed for partition in O S No 97/2012 is determined and adjudicated, does not sustain for consideration. It is also pertinent to note that final decree proceedings do not appear to have been initiated against the judgment and decree passed in O S No 97/2012. The decree passed in O S No 97/2012 is a preliminary decree which only determines the right of the parties. As the right and share of plaintiff is not specifically determined in O S No 97/2012, the contention of defendant no 3 that the present suit is not tenable does not sustain for consideration. The plaintiff filed the present suit for determination of her specific share that has been allotted jointly in favour of plaintiff and defendant no 1 to 5 herein in O S No 97/2012. As such, the contention of defendant no 3 in that regard does not sustain for consideration. Hence, this court answers **issue no 1 in the affirmative and issue no 3 in the negative.**

17. **ISSUE NO 2:** As discussed above, there is no dispute regarding relationship between the parties. Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere is having four children by name Subray, Vinayak, Vishweshwar and Shankar. Out of four sons, one son by name Vishweshwar stated to have died issueless which aspect appears to be not in dispute. The other three sons of Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere is also dead. The plaintiff succeeded in establishing that suit

properties are the ancestral properties. There is no contention about any testamentary disposition of properties by Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere. There is no contention regarding division of properties between plaintiff and defendant and no materials are placed before the court in that regard. The materials on record do not disclose the aspect of partition of properties between the plaintiff and defendants and there is not contention in that regard. The properties of Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere will devolve upon his heirs as per S 8 of Hindu Succession Act. As one of the sons by name Vishweshwar died issueless, the properties devolve upon other three sons. On consideration of said aspects, the three sons of Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere are entitled to $1/3^{\text{rd}}$ share each in the suit properties. Subray is dead and plaintiff and defendant no 1 to 5 are the legal heirs of Subray and they are entitled to the properties allotted to the share of Subray. Another son of Nagappa Subray Bhat Kodlekere by name Vinayak is also dead and defendant no 6(a) to 6(c) are the legal heirs of Vinayak. Defendant no 6(a) to 6(c) are entitled to properties to which deceased Vinayak is entitled. Defendant no 7 is the son of Shankar, another son of Nagappa Subray bhat Kodlekere and he is shown to be representing his family consisting of wife and daughter of Shankar. As per the genealogy furnished by plaintiff, Shankar is having wife, son and daughter and defendant no 7 is the son who is shown as the Manager of

the family. The branch of Shankar is duly represented Defendant no 7 as the manager of family. Hence, defendant no 7 is entitled to properties to which Shankar is entitled. On consideration of said aspects, plaintiff and defendant no 1 to 5 are entitled to 1/18th share each in the suit properties. Defendant no 6(a) to 6(c) are together entitled to 1/3rd share in suit properties. Defendant no 7 is entitled to 1/3rd share in the suit properties and same is allotted to his share for and on behalf of Radha and Lalitha, who are the wife and daughter of Shankar. Thus, plaintiff is entitled to 1/18th share in the suit properties. As such, this court answers **issue no 2 in the affirmative.**

18. **ISSUE NO 4** : The plaintiff filed the present suit against the defendants seeking the relief of partition and separate possession. The plaintiff succeeded in establishing that the suit properties are the ancestral properties and also succeeded in establishing her right to have share over the suit properties. The defendant no 1 failed to substantiate the contentions raised by him. The plaintiff succeeded in establishing the contentions raised by her with cogent and substantive materials. As the plaintiff succeeded in establishing the contentions taken by him, she is entitled to the relief sought by her. Hence, this court answers **issue no 4 in the affirmative.**

ISSUE NO. 5:- On the basis of above discussions, this court proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

The suit of the plaintiffs is decreed.

The plaintiff and defendant No.1 to 5 are held entitled to 1/18th share each in suit schedule properties. Defendant No.6(a) to 6(c) are together held entitled to 1/3rd share in suit properties. Defendant No.7 is held entitled to 1/3rd share in the suit schedule properties.

No order as to cost.

Draw preliminary decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the stenographer directly on computer, typed by her, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the open Court on this **16th day of December, 2022**).

Sd/-

(Narendra B.R)

Pri. Civil Judge and JMFC., KUMTA

: ANNEXURE :

List of witnesses examined on behalf of the Plaintiff:-

P.W.1 : Smt.Mukambika Kumar Bhat Jambhe

List of witnesses examined on behalf of defendants;-

D.W.1 : Rama Subray Kodlakere

D.W.2 : Smt.Savitri Kashinath Marigoli

List of documents marked on behalf of the Plaintiff:-

Ex.P. 1 to 5 : RTC Extracts

Ex.P.6&7 : C/c of ME extracts

- Ex.P.8 : C/c of House Tax assessment extract
Ex.P.9 : C/c of Tax assessment extract
Ex.P10 : N/c of Order by A.C. Kumta

List of documents marked on behalf of the Defendants :-

- Ex.D1 : C/c of Judgment and Decree in RA 11/2016
Ex.D2 : C/c of Appeal memo in RA 11/2016
Ex.D3 : C/c of Terms of compromise in RA 145/2006
Ex.D4 : C/c of compromise application in RA 145/2006
Ex.D5 : C/c of Certificate
Ex.D6 : C/c of Receipt
Ex.D7 : C/c of terms of compromise(ಒಪ್ಪಂದದ ಜ್ಞಾಪನ).
Ex.D8 : C/c of Order sheet in RA 145/2006
Ex.D9 : C/c of Judgment and Decree in OS 96/1991
Ex.D10 : C/c of Judgment in OS 97/2012
Ex.D11to14 : C/c of RTC extracts
Ex.D15 : C/c of MR extract
Ex.D16 : C/c of Judgment in RA 11/2016
Ex.D17 : C/c of Decree in RA 11/2016

Sd/-

Prl.Civil Judge, Kumta.