

KAYG030011692013



**IN THE COURT OF THE PRL CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC,
YADGIRI**

PRESENT

SRI. ARUN CHOUGULE

B.A.,LL.,B.(HONS.)

PRL.CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC, YADGIRI.

DATED THIS THE 07th DAY OF MARCH-2026.

ORIGINAL SUIT NO.251/2013

<u>PLAINTIFF/S:</u>	Hanamantha S/o Banya Rathod, Age: 31 years, Occ: Agriculture & Business, R/o Mundergir village, Tq: & Dist: Yadgiri.
	(By Sri.B.B.K Advocate)
	//V/s//
<u>DEFENDANT/S:</u>	<p>1. Banya S/o Ganya Rathod, (Since dead represented by L.R's)</p> <p>1(a). Bhimabai W/o Late Banya Rathod, Age:65 years, Occ: House hold R/o: Ashok Nagar Tanda, Mundergir, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>2. Somya S/o Banya, Age: 37 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o: Mundergl Village, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.</p>

KAYG030011692013



	<p>3. Devibal W/o Gangaram (D/o Banya Rathod), Age:35 years, Occ: House wife, R/o: Mudnal Tanda, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>4. Vijibal W/o Gopal Chavan (D/o Banya Rathod), Age:31 years Occ:House wife, R/o Yelheri village, Tq: & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>5. Sonibal W/o Jayaram Chavan (D/o Banya Rathod), Age: 29 years Occ: House wife, R/o Yelheri village, Tq: & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>6. Shantibal W/o Somu Chavan (D/o Banya Rathod), Age: 27 years, Occ: House wife, R/o Mundergi (Ashok Nagar) village, Tq: & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>7. Gowribai W/o Lachya Jadhav (D/o Banya Rathod), Age: 25 years, Occ: Nil, R/o: Haligera Village, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>8. Mannu S/o Banya Rathod, Age: 19 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o: Mundergi Village, (Ashok Nagar), Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>9. Khaja Bi W/o Mohammed Gouse, Age: 35 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o: Yadgiri, now residing at Masar Galli, Tq: Shahapur, Dist: Yadgiri.</p>
--	---

KAYG030011692013



10. G.Nagabhushanam S/o G.Chanchaiah,
Age: 27 years, Occ:Tailor, R/o Yagiri,
Tq: & Dist: Yadgiri.
11. Mohammed Ibrahim S/o Abdul Khader Gogi,
Age: 65 years, Occ: Agriculture & Business,
R/o: Chakkarkatta area, Yadgiri, Tq &
Dist: Yadgiri.
- 12.Subhash S/o Raghunathrao Dhadange,
Age: 68 years, Occ: Agriculture & Business,
R/o: Yadgiri, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.
13. Vithal Rao S/o Raghunathrao Dhadange,
Age: 65 years, Occ: Agriculture & Business,
R/o: Near Veerashaiva Kalyana Mantap,
Yadgiri, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.
- 14.Manik Rao S/o Raghunath Rao Dhadange,
Age: 65 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o: Near
Veerashaiva Kalyana Mantap, Yadgiri,
Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.
- 15.Dayanand S/o Raghunath Rao Dhadange,
Age: 61 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o: Near
Veerashaiva Kalyana Mantap, Yadgiri,
Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.

KAYG030011692013



	<p>16. Dasharathrao S/o Raghunath Rao Dhandange, Age: 55 years, Occ:Agriculture, R/o: Near Veerashaiva Kalyana Mantap, Yadgiri, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>17.Chandrakant s/o Raghunathrao Dhadange, Age: 53 years, Occ: Agriculture & Business, R/o: Yadgiri, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.</p> <p>18.Rajkumar S/o Raghunathrao Dhadange, Age: 51 years, Occ: Agriculturist & Business, R/o: Yadgiri, Tq & Dist: Yadgiri.</p>		
	<p>(D-1(a), 2 to 9 are placed <i>ex parte</i>) (D-10 & 11 By Shri.N.R.K Advocate) (D-12 to 18 By Shri.I.M.R Advocate)</p>		
Date of Institution of suit	:	13.09.2013	
Nature of suit	:	Partition and Separate Possession.	
Date of commencement of recording of evidence	:	16.08.2025	
Date of pronouncement of judgment	:	07.03.2026	
Total Duration	:	<u>Year/s</u>	<u>Month/s</u>
		12	05
			25

KAYG030011692013



J U D G M E N T

The plaintiff has filed the present suit seeking the relief of partition and separate possession claiming 1/9th share in the suit properties and declaration that the sale deeds bearing document Nos.2/1995-96 and 247/1995-96 dated 07.04.1995, No.1000/1997-98 dated 26.09.1997 and No.1555/2007-08 dated 01.09.2007 are not binding upon the plaintiff.

SCHEDULE OF SUIT PROPERTY

Sl.No	Sy.No.	Measuring Acre-Gunta	Situated
1.	128	00-04	Village Mundergi, Tq: Yadgiri
2.	505/3	04-37	Village Mundergi, Tq: Yadgiri
3.	610-611/2	01-22	Village Mundergi, Tq: Yadgiri

4. House bearing Panchayat No.1-45, situated Mundergi village, Tq: & Dist: Yadgiri commonly bounded as under:

North : House of Noorasing.
 South : House of Ramu.
 East : Road.

KAYG030011692013

West : Property of Shankar Rathod.

2. The case of the plaintiff is that, himself and defendants No.2 to 8 are the children of defendant No.1. That, grandfather of the plaintiff by name Ganya S/o Hanmantha Rathod died somewhere in the 1990's leaving behind his 3 sons by names Banya(defendant No.1), Thavarya and Shankar. The defendant No.1 and his brothers got divided the properties left behind by their father Ganya and the suit properties are ancestral properties inherited by the defendant No.1. That, the plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 8 are in joint possession of the suit properties. However, the defendant No.8 trespassed over the suit land and stopped the plaintiff from cleaning the bunds of suit land Sy.No.610-611/A claiming that he has purchased property from defendant No.9. Thereafter, the plaintiff enquired with the defendant No.1 who denied execution of sale deed in favour of defendant No.9 or any other persons. The plaintiff made further enquiry with the revenue authorities and came to know that names of some others persons were appearing in the RTC and there were two more sale deeds one executed in favour of defendant No.11 and another in the name of

KAYG030011692013

mother of defendants No.12 to 18 by name Chandamma. It is alleged that the defendant No.1 did not have exclusive right to alienate the property and there was no family necessity. Moreover, the suit lands are still in possession of the plaintiff. That, the sale deeds alleged to have been executed by defendant No.1 in favour of defendant No.11, mother of defendants No.12 to 18 and husband of defendant No.9 are without any consideration and possession is also not delivered to the purchasers. As such, the sale deeds are not binding upon the plaintiff. However, defendants No.10 to 18 taking undue advantage of the sale deeds are illegally trespassing over the suit property and threatening to dispossess the plaintiff therefrom. That, the plaintiff demanded his share in the suit properties but the defendant No.1 refused to give his share. Hence, the plaintiff was constrained to file the present suit.

3. On receipt of suit summons, defendants No.12 to 18 appeared through their counsel and filed written statement contending that the defendant No.1 being the karta of the family has executed the sale deed for welfare of the family and his

KAYG030011692013



minor children. The defendant No.1 has also delivered possession of the property to the purchasers on the date of sale deed. Accordingly, the defendants No.12 to 18, after the death of their mother, are in possession of the property. It is contended that the plaintiff has not approached to this court with clean hands. Since the suit properties are situated abutting the Yadgiri Town and there is huge hike in its market value, the plaintiff and the defendants colluding with each other have filed the present false suit with a dishonest intention of making unlawful gain. That, after purchase of property by their mother under registered sale deed, the defendants No.12 to 18 have brought the land under cultivation by spending lakhs of rupees. On these grounds, defendants No.12 to 18 sought to dismiss the suit with costs of Rs.10,000/-.

4. On the basis of above pleadings, my learned predecessor-in-office framed the following:

ISSUES

- 1) Whether the plaintiff proves that, himself and defendants are the members of

KAYG030011692013



joint family & suit schedule properties are the joint family properties of HUF?

2) Whether the defendants prove that, partition has already taken place in their family?

3) Whether the defendants further prove that, Def.No.1 sold his property through Reg. Sale deed bearing No.1000/1997-98, dated 26.09.1997 on behalf of plaintiff and minor Def.No.2 to 8 in favour of the elders of Def.No.12 to 18?

4) Whether the plaintiff is entitle for the relief as sought for?

5) What order or decree?

5. Thereafter, matter was posted for evidence of the plaintiff. However, the plaintiff did not lead his evidence in spite of giving sufficient time and opportunities. Hence, by an order dated 16.09.2016, the suit came to be dismissed for non-prosecution.

KAYG030011692013

6. Thereafter, plaintiff filed Civil Misc.No.20/2016 on the file of this court seeking restoration of the suit, which came to be allowed by an order dated 12.08.2024 and the suit was restored to its original stage.

7. Thereafter, defendants No.10 and 11 having appeared through their counsel filed written statement denying the case of the plaintiff contending that the defendant No.1 has sold suit item No.3 bearing Sy.No.610-611 measuring 01 acre 22 guntas to meet his family necessities. That, he has sold southern 20 guntas of land in favour of defendant No.9 under registered sale deed bearing document No.28/1995-96 dated 07.04.1995 and northern 20 guntas of land in favour of defendant No.11 under registered sale deed dated 07.04.1995. Thereafter, the defendant No.9 has sold her 20 guntas of land in favour of defendant No.10 under registered sale deed bearing document No.1555/2007-08 dated 01.08.2007. It is contended that the purchasers are in possession of property purchased by them by getting their names mutated in the revenue records and the same was within

KAYG030011692013

the knowledge of the plaintiff and other defendants. As such, the suit is hopelessly barred by time. It is further contended that suit item No.2 land bearing Sy.No.505/3 measuring 04 acres 37 guntas is a self-acquired property of defendant No.1 who had purchased the same from one Mallappa S/o Yallappa under registered sale deed and he has sold the same in favour of defendant No.9. As such, the plaintiff has no right or share in the suit land. It is further contended that lands bearing Sy.No.171/Aa measuring 02 acres 29 guntas standing in the name of defendant No.1 and his brother, Sy.No.610-611/Uu measuring 04 guntas standing in the name of the plaintiff, house No.2-50 standing in the name of the plaintiff and house No.2-15 standing in the name of defendant No.3 all situated at Ashok Nagar (Munderagi) are joint family properties of the plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 8. However, the plaintiff has not included the said properties in the suit. Hence, the suit is bad for non-inclusion of all the family properties. On these grounds, the defendants No.10 and 11 sought to dismiss the suit with costs.

KAYG030011692013



8. Meanwhile, the defendant No.1 died and his wife defendant No.1(a) was brought on record. However, as the defendant No.1(a) did not appear before the court in spite service of suit summons, she is placed *ex parte*. Similarly, defendants No.2 to 9 have also remained *ex parte*.

9. Thereafter, having regard to pleadings of defendants No.10 and 11, following additional issues are framed:

ADDL.ISSUES

- 1) Whether the suit is barred by limitation?
- 2) Whether the defendants No.10 and 11 prove that item No.2 bearing Sy.No.505/3 is a self-acquired property of deceased defendant No.1?
- 3) Whether the suit is bad for non-inclusion of other family properties?

10. Thereafter, in order to prove his case, the plaintiff got examined himself as Pw.1 and produced Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-15 documents. The plaintiff got examined a witness on his behalf as

KAYG030011692013



Pw.2 and closed his side evidence. On the other hand, the defendants No.10 to 12 got examined the defendant No.11 as Dw.1, got marked Ex.D-1 and 2 documents. The defendants No.12 to 18 got examined defendant No.14 as Dw.2, produced Ex.D-3 to 14 documents and closed their side evidence.

11. Thereafter, I have heard arguments of learned counsel for both parties and perused the records. Learned counsel for defendants No.10 and 11 is relying upon following 2 rulings:

i. Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru rendered in the case of Smt.K.C. Leelavathi and Smt.Ramanjanamma and Others decided on 08.08.2023.

ii. Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru rendered in the case of H.M.Rudraradhya Vs. Uma and Others reported in AIR 2014 Karnataka 2.

12. Having regard to the material placed on record, the above issues are answered as under:

ISSUE NO.1: In the Negative.

ISSUE NO.2: In the Negative.

ISSUE NO.3: In the Affirmative.

KAYG030011692013



ISSUE NO.4: In the Negative.
ADDL.ISSUE NO.1: Partly in the Affirmative.
ADDL.ISSUE NO.2: In the Negative.
ADDL.ISSUE NO.3: In the Affirmative.
ISSUE NO.5: As per final order
for the following;

REASONS

13. **ISSUES NO.1** : The plaintiff has filed the present suit seeking the relief of partition and separate possession claiming 1/9th share in the suit properties and declaration that the sale deeds bearing document Nos.2/1995-96 and 247/1995-96 dated 07.04.1995, No.1000/1997-98 dated 26.09.1997 and No.1555/2007-08 dated 01.09.2007 are not binding upon the plaintiff.

13.1 The deceased defendant No.1 was the father of the plaintiff and defendants No.2 to 8. The plaintiff claims that the suit properties were inherited by his father defendant No.1 and his brothers by names Thavarya and Shankar from their father by name Ganya S/o Hanmantha. Further case of the plaintiff is that his father defendant No.1 and his brothers got divided the

KAYG030011692013

properties left behind by their father Ganya, whereby the suit properties were fallen to the share of defendant No.1. Therefore, the plaintiff claims that suit properties are ancestral properties of himself and defendants No.1 to 8 and they are in join possession of the same.

13.2 The plaintiff has produced Ex.P-1 to Ex.P-15 documents. Ex.P-5 and 6 are the RTCs pertaining to suit items No.2 and 3 respectively and Ex.P-8 is the extract of tax demand register pertaining to suit item No.4 house property. As per Ex.P-5 RTC, suit item No.2 bearing Sy.No.505/3 belonged to the defendant No.1. Ex.P-8 extract of tax demand register shows that suit item No.4 house property also belonged to the defendant No.1. Ex.P-1 and 2 certified copies of sale deeds dated 07.04.1995 show that the defendant No.1 has sold 20 guntas of each, out of suit item No.3 totally measuring 01 acre 22 guntas, in favour of defendant No.11 and husband of defendant No.9. Ex.P-3 certified copy of sale deed dated 26.09.1997 shows that defendant No.1 has sold remaining 22 guntas, out of suit item

KAYG030011692013



No.3, in favour of mother of defendant No.12 to 18 by name Chandamma. These RTCs, tax demand register and the sale deeds suggest that suit item Nos.2 to 4 belonged to the deceased defendant No.1. However, there is no material on record to substantiate the claim of the plaintiff that the suit properties belonged to his grandfather Ganya and the same were fallen to the share of defendant No.1 in a partition between himself and his brothers. Insofar as suit item No.1 land bearing Sy.No.128 is concerned, the plaintiff has not produced any document. As such, this court is of the opinion that the plaintiff has failed to prove that suit properties are ancestral properties of himself and defendants No.1 to 8. Hence, Issue No.1 is answered in the Negative.

14. ISSUE NO.2 : The defendants have not produced any record to show that a partition has taken place between the plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 8. Moreover, there is no specific contention in the written statement as to the date, month or year of the alleged partition. There is no averment in the written

KAYG030011692013



statement regarding the manner in which partition was held in the family of plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 8. Thus, this court is of the opinion that, the defendants have failed to prove that a partition has been held between the plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 8. Hence, Issue No.2 is answered in the Negative.

15. ISSUE NO.3 : The plaintiff in para 5 of the plaint alleges that his father defendant No.1 is said to have stated that he has not executed any sale deed in favour of defendant No.9 or any other person. In para 7 of the plaint the plaintiff alleges that, as there was no family legal necessity, the defendant No.1 had no authority to execute sale deed in favour of defendant No.11, mother of defendants No.12 to 18 and husband of defendant No.9. On the other hand, defendants No.12 to 18 in their written statement contend that the plaintiff and defendants No.2 to 8 were minors and the defendant No.1 being the karta of the family has executed registered sale deed bearing document No.1000/1997-98 dated 26.09.1997 for family necessity and welfare of his children.

KAYG030011692013

15.1 The defendants No.12 to 18 have produced Ex.D-3 sale deed dated 26.09.1997, which show that the defendant No.1 has sold 22 guntas of land, out of suit item No.3 bearing Sy.No.610-611/A, in favour of mother of defendants No.12 to 18 by name Chandamma W/o Raghunathrao. As already noted above, the defendant No.1 has sold 01 acre of land out of suit item No.3 in favour of defendant No.10 and husband of defendant No.9 under Ex.P-1 and 2 sale deeds. Thereby, the defendant No.1 during his lifetime alienated entire suit item No.3.

15.2 At this stage, it is relevant to note that Ex.P-1 and 2 sale deeds are executed in the year 1995 and Ex.D-3 sale deed is executed in the year 1997. The entries in the RTCs show that names of purchasers are duly recorded in the RTCs as per the sale deeds. Thereafter, the defendant No.1 died in the year 05.05.2021. However, the defendant No.1 did not challenge the said sale deeds either before the court or any other forum during his lifetime. He did not even appear before the court during his

KAYG030011692013

lifetime. As the defendant No.1 himself being the vendor did not chose to challenge the sale deeds either on the ground of fraud or any other ground, this court is of the opinion that, the plaintiff has no *locus standi* to challenge the sale deeds or to deny execution thereof by the defendant No.1. The registered sale deeds clearly show that defendant No.1 has sold the suit item No.3 in favour of defendant No.11, mother of defendants No.12 to 18 and husband of defendant No.9. Ex.P-4 certified copy of sale deed dated 01.09.2007 show that the defendant No.9 has sold the 20 guntas of land in suit item No.3, which was purchased by her husband from defendant No.1, in favour of defendant No.10.

15.3 Further, this court is of the opinion that, as the plaintiff has failed to prove that suit properties are his ancestral properties, there is no burden upon the defendants to prove that the sale deeds were executed for family necessity or on behalf and for the benefit of plaintiff and defendants No.2 to 8. Hence, issue No.3 is answered in the affirmative holding that defendant

KAYG030011692013

No.1 has sold 22 guntas of land in suit item No.3 in favour of mother of defendants No.12 to 18 under registered sale deed dated 26.09.1997.

16. ADDL.ISSUE NO.1 : Admittedly, the sale deeds are executed in the year 1995 and 1997. However, the present suit is filed in the year 2013. Thereby, it is clear that the suit is filed after lapse of 12 years from the date of execution of sale deeds. At this stage, it is relevant to note that in the judgment of K.C. Leelavathi's case (supra) relied upon by the defendants No.10 and 11, Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka has held that Article 109 of the Limitation Act would apply to the cases of present nature. As per Article 109 a suit by a Hindu to set aside his father's alienation of ancestral property has to be filed within 12 years from the date of purchaser taking possession of the property. The present suit has been filed in the year 2013 whereas the sale deeds were executed in the year 1995 and 1997. As such, suit in respect of suit item No.3 is barred by limitation. Hence, Addl.Issue No.1 is answered in the partly in the Affirmative.

KAYG030011692013



17. ADDL.ISSUE NO.2 : The defendants No.10 and 11 in their written statement contend that suit item No.2 bearing Sy.No.505/3 is a self-acquired property of defendant No.1 as the same was purchased by him under a sale deed. However, the defendants No.10 and 11 have not produced either the sale deed or any other document to show that suit item No.2 was purchased by the defendant No.1. Similarly, there is no material produced by the said defendants to show that the defendant No.1 has sold suit item No.2 in favour of defendant No.9. Hence, Addl.Issue No.2 is answered in the Negative.

18. ADDL.ISSUE NO.3 : The defendants No.10 and 11 in their written statement contend that the suit is bad for non-inclusion of land and house properties which are also properties of the family of the plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 8. The said defendants have also produced Ex.D-7 to Ex.D-12 RTCs and Ex.D-14 certified copy of mutation order to prove the said contention. Ex.D-7 and 8 RTCs show that land bearing Sy.No.610-611/೮೩ measuring 04 guntas situated at Mundarga

KAYG030011692013

village is standing in the name of the plaintiff. Ex.D-9 RTC show that 02 acres 29 guntas of land in Sy.No.171/౪ of Ashok Nagar is standing in the joint names of defendant No.1 and his brothers by names Thavarya and Shankar. Ex.D-10 RTC shows that 30 guntas of land in Sy.No.171/౩ of Ashok Nagar is standing in the name of the plaintiff. Ex.D-11 RTC shows that 02 acres 09 guntas in Sy.No.171/1 of Ashok Nagar is standing in the joint names of defendant No.1 and his brother Thavarya and wife of his brother Shankar by name Soortibai. Ex.D-12 RTC shows that land bearing Sy.No.69/3 measuring 04 acres 37 guntas of Ashok Nagar is standing in the name of defendant No.2.

18.1 The above revenue entries show that the family of plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 8 is also having various other properties which are not included in the suit. Further, the Pw.1 himself in his cross-examination dated 14.11.2025 admits that land bearing Sy.No.171/౪ measuring 02 acres 29 guntas situated at Ashok Nagar is an ancestral property. The relevant portion of cross-examination of Pw.1 is extracted below:

KAYG030011692013



ಅಶೋಕ ನಗರದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.171/ಆ ರಲ್ಲಿನ 02 ಎಕರೆ 29 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನು ನಮ್ಮ ಕುಟುಂಬದ ಹಿರಿಯರ ಆಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಮುಂದುವರೆದು ಅದು ನನ್ನ ತಂದೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಆತನ ಇಬ್ಬರು ಸಹೋದರರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನುಡಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ.

18.2 The above discussion clearly show that the plaintiff has not included all the family properties in the suit. Therefore, the present suit for partial partition is not maintainable. Hence, issue under consideration is answered in the Affirmative.

19. ISSUE NO.4 : This court has come to the conclusion that the plaintiff has failed to prove that suit properties are ancestral properties of himself and defendants No.1 to 8. This court has further concluded that the suit is bad for non-inclusion of other family properties. Hence, the plaintiff is not entitled for the relief sought in the plaint. Further, the material on record shows that this is a collusive suit between the plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 8. Hence, the plaintiff is liable to pay costs to the contesting defendants No.10 to 18. Accordingly, Issue No.4 is answered in the Negative.

20. ISSUE NO.5: In view of the above discussion, this Court proceeds to pass the following;

KAYG030011692013

**ORDER**

The suit of the plaintiff is hereby dismissed with costs of Rs.3,000/- each payable to defendants No.10 to 18 by the plaintiff.

Office to draw decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the stenographer, transcribed and typed by him, corrected and then pronounced by me in the open Court on this **07th Day of March-2026**).

(ARUN CHOUGULE)
PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
YADGIRI

ANNEXURE**I. Witnesses examined for the plaintiff:**

Pw.1 : Hanamantha S/o Banya Rathod.

Pw.2 : Rumya S/o Hunya Rathod.

II. Documents marked for the plaintiff:

Ex.P-1 & 2 : Certified copies of sale deeds dated 07.04.1995.

Ex.P-3 : Certified copy of sale deed dated 26.09.1997.

Ex.P-4 : Certified copy of sale deed dated 01.08.2007.

Ex.P-5 & 6 : RTCs.

Ex.P-7 : Tax paid receipt.

KAYG030011692013



Ex.P-8 : Certified copy of Tax Demand register.

Ex.P-10 to 13 : Photographs.

Ex.P-14 : C.D.

Ex.P-15 : Prajavaani daily newspaper dated 16.07.2025.

III. Witnesses examined for the defendants:

Dw.1: Mohd.Ibrahim S/o Abdul Khadar Gogi.

Dw.2: Manik Rao S/o Raghunathrao Dhadange.

IV. Documents marked for the defendants:

Ex.D-1 : Original sale deed dated 07.04.1995.

Ex.D-2 : RTC.

Ex.D-3 : Sale deed dated 26.09.1997.

Ex.D-4 : Mutation register.

Ex.D-5 to 12 : RTCs.

Ex.D-13 & 14: Certified copies of Mutation register
Nos.H20/2020-21 and H5/2021-22.

(ARUN CHOUGULE)
PRL. CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
YADGIRI