

IN THE COURT OF THE MUNSIFF, PERUMBAVOOR

Present:- Smt. Alshari A., Civil Judge (Junior Division)

Tuesday, the 8th day of April, 2025 / 18th Chaithra, 1947.

I.A. No. 2/2024 & 6/2025
in
O.S. No. 337/2024

I.A.No.2/2024:-

Petitioners/Plaintiffs:-

1. Thomas, S/o. Pathrose, aged 70 years, Kakkadan House, Kumarapuram P.O., Morakkala Kara, Kunnathunadu Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Pin : 683562.
2. Joy K.T., S/o. Thomas, company employee, aged 40 years, Kakkadan House, Kumarapuram P.O., Morakkala Kara, Kunnathunadu Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Pin : 683562.

By Advs. K.M. Alias, P.V. Shiji & Lakshmi Raj.

Respondents/Defendants:-

1. Biju Thomas, S/o. P.P. Thomas, aged 44 years, business, Parayankudy House, Kumarapuram P.O., Morakkala Kara, Kunnathunadu Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Pin : 683562.
2. Eldho T.V., S/o. Varkey, aged 48 years, business, Thozhuthungaparambil House, Kumarapuram P.O., Morakkala Kara, Kunnathunadu Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Pin : 683562.

By Advs. Paul K. Varghese, A.R. Bejoy, Athira Augustine & Charles Devassy

I.A.No.6/2025:-

Petitioners/Defendants:-

1. Biju Thomas, S/o. Thomas, aged 45 years, Parayankudy House, Morakkala Kara, Kumarapuram P.O., Kunnathunadu Village, Ernakulam District.

2. Eldho T.V., S/o. Varkey, aged 48 years,
Thozhuthinkalparambil House, West Morakkala,
Kumarapuram P.O., Ernakulam District, Pin : 683565.

By Advs. Paul K. Varghese, A.R. Bejoy, Athira Augustine &
Charles Devassy

Respondents/Plaintiffs:-

1. Thomas, S/o. Pathrose, aged 70 years, Kakkadan House,
West Morakkala, Kumarapuram P.O., Kunnathunadu Taluk
Ernakulam District, Pin : 683565.
2. Joy, S/o. Thomas, aged 40 years, Kakkadan House,
West Morakkala, Kumarapuram P.O., Kunnathunadu Taluk
Ernakulam District, Pin : 683565.

By Advs. K.M. Alias, P.V. Shiji & Lakshmi Raj.

These petitions having been finally heard before me on 5.3.2025 and
the court on 8.4.2025 day delivered the following:-

COMMON ORDER

1. This is a petition filed seeking for temporary injunction.
2. Petition averments in brief:- Plaint A schedule property belonged to the 1st petitioner by virtue of documents bearing No. 1174/1980 and 1142/1980. 1st petitioner had assigned the property having an extent of 4.05 ares in favour of 2nd petitioner by virtue of a settlement deed bearing No. 1292/2014. Even then, the properties are lying within single boundary as a compact plot. No one else have any right over the plaint A schedule property. The brother of the 1st petitioner namely Mathai is having property on the western side of the plaint A schedule property, by virtue of partition deed. The property having an extent of 1.58 ares is lying on the western side of the property of the Mathai, that belonged to the 1st petitioner by virtue of document bearing No 2878/2002. The said property was assigned in favour of the 2nd petitioner by virtue of

settlement deed bearing No. 4630/2023. The said property is described in plaint B schedule. Panchayat road is lying on the southern side of plaint B schedule. No one else have any right over the plaint B schedule.

3. There is a way which starts from the Panchayat road proceeding towards north commencing from plaint B schedule property through the northern side of the property of one Chellappan and proceeds through the southern side of property of Mathai, which is being used to have access to plaint B schedule property. The said way is described in plaint C schedule property. There is no way of access to plaint A schedule property. The property of Mathai is lying at a height of about 1-2 feet from plaint C schedule. The way is lying demarcated from the property of Mathai. Mathai had never used the plaint B schedule property or plaint C schedule way to have access to the property. Petitioner is having right of easement by grant over plaint C schedule way. Even though, the right is not explained in the document, they are using the way as of right.
4. Tharavadu house is situated in the plaint A schedule property and there was no house that situate in the property of Mathai. There was an edavazhy that situated on the western side of the property of one Gopalakrishnan. The said way was purchased from the Karakkadan George in the year of 1983. Petitioner is having the right to use the way even now. Respondents are trying to annex the said edavazhy to their property by claiming right over plaint B schedule. Respondents are trying to sell the property by making in to plots. The respondents had threatened that, they will take vehicles through the plaint B schedule and will do transportation through the same and also had threatened that, they will close the C schedule way. Respondents or their predecessors have no right over plaint B schedule property. Petitioners were not given any right to do transportation through the plaint B schedule. When the attempt to use the B schedule was obstructed, they had threatened to close the C schedule way. Petitioners have no other

way to have access to plaint B schedule from A schedule. The respondents are to be restrained from entering forcefully into plaint B schedule property or do transportation through the same or close C schedule way or reduce the width of the same or eliminate the C schedule way or in any manner obstruct the C schedule way to have transportation or make any obstructions in the C schedule way or do any acts which affects the right of the petitioner over the plaint C schedule way. Petitioners are having a prima facie case in their favour. The balance of convenience and the question of irreparable injury in favour of the petitioners. Hence, the petition is to be allowed.

5. Respondents had filed counter affidavit by stating that, the petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts. It is true that, on the western side of the petitioners property, that is the B schedule to the partition deed was allotted to the brother of the 1st petitioner, Mathai. The respondents had purchased the property from Mathai by virtue of sale deed bearing No. 7717/2022. The petitioners are not having any right over the 3 meter width path way as alleged. Plaint B schedule is wrongly described and the petitioners does not have any right to prevent the right of way of the respondents over 3 meter width way which lie on the southern side of the property that belonged to respondents and that is starting from the PWD road on the south. There is no plaint C schedule way in existence as alleged.
6. Plaint B schedule pathway is the way which connects the property of the respondents from the PWD road on the south. Petitioners are claiming way to their property which is described as C schedule to the plaint, through the property of the respondents. On an understanding between the parties including the petitioners and respondents predecessor, the plaint B schedule pathway was formed and has been using the same by the respondent's predecessor as grant to reach the respondents property by doing periodical maintenance and repairs on incurring expenses by Mathai and thereafter by the respondents herein. The

rights of the respondents cannot be denied by the petitioners or any other person. There is no edavazhy as averred in the petition. The respondents had purchased the property from Mathai and Mani Vargheese by virtue of sale deed bearing No. 7717/2022. They were put in possession of the property and were enjoying the same by remitting tax and by effecting mutation.

7. The property of the petitioners are lying on the eastern side of the property of the respondents and there is a demarcation separating both properties. Earlier, it belonged to the common owner, from whom the 1st petitioner and Sri. Mathai had got their respective properties. The way to the respondent's property is through 12 feet width pathway, that starts from PWD road on the south, proceeds towards north and leads to the property of the respondents covered by document bearing No. 7717/2022. They got the right over the way as per the document. They started the construction of the building for their residence and to be let out for rent. On 11.11.2024, when their workers started to do cleaning works, it was obstructed by the 1st petitioner and his wife. They had also threatened the respondents.
8. The petitioners does not have any right in the property purchased by the respondents by way of a valid document. They had filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala seeking for police protection which is even now pending. The suit is filed as a counterblast to the same. In fact, the only way which leads to the property of the respondents is plaint B schedule pathway. The respondents and their predecessors were enjoying the way openly, peacefully continuously as of right for the last more than 100 years. The petitioners did not have any kind of right, title or interest over plaint B schedule way. The petitioners have no right to cause any kind of obstruction to the use of plaint B schedule way. Petitioners were intending to purchase the property, but they offered very low price and therefore, the Mathai did not give the property to the petitioners. The petitioners are having

enimty towards the respondents as they purchased the property. The present suit is filed with ulterior motive to snatch away the property at meager price. The petitioners had approached the court with unclean hands and they have not established a prima facie case. The balance of convenience is also in favour of the respondent. If the order of injunction is allowed, it will cause irreparable injury to the respondents. Hence, the petition is to be dismissed.

9. From the above rival contentions, the following points are settled for consideration:-
 1. Have the petitioners made out a prima facie case?
 2. Is the balance of convenience in favour of the petitioners?
 3. Will the petitioners be put to irreparable loss and injuries in the event of not granting the interim prohibitory injunction order?
 4. Order as to costs?
10. From the side of petitioners, Ext. A1 to A6 documents were marked. From the side of respondents, Ext. B1 to B3 documents were marked. Ext. C1, C1(a) documents were also marked.

I.A 6/2025:-

11. Petition averments in brief:- The suit is filed by the petitioners seeking for permanent prohibitory injunction restraining the respondents in using plaint B and C pathway to the suit. The petitioners had purchased the property having an extent of 9.20 ares along with the right of way through 12 feet width pathway by virtue of sale deed bearing No. 7717/2022 of SRO, Puthencruz. The said pathway is described as plaint B schedule by the petitioners. The said pathway start from the PWD road on the south proceeds towards north and reaches at the property of the petitioners. This is the only way which leads to their property. The

property identified as plaint C schedule in the sketch submitted by the Advocate commissioner is the property that belonged to the petitioners covered by the above sale deed. Plaint B schedule way is the only pathway enjoyed by the petitioners to enter into their property covered by the sale deed. Thus, the petitioners are having easement by grant over plaint B schedule pathway.

12. There is no way on the western side of Gopalan's property to reach the property of the petitioners and the area is a steep cutting. Property covered by sale deed bearing No. 7717/2022 and the plaint A schedule property originally belonged to Sri. Pathrose, the father of the 1st petitioner and the petitioner's vendor, Mathai. Plaint A schedule and the property of Mathai were allotted to their share by virtue of same partition deed bearing No. 1174/1980. Plaint B schedule way was in existence even during the lifetime of Mathai and it was being used by the Mathai to reach his property, that is B schedule to partition deed. Subsequently, the right over the said B schedule to partition deed was assigned in favour of the petitioners, by virtue of sale deed bearing No. 7717/2022. Therefore, the petitioners cannot prevent the respondents from using the above said plaint B schedule pathway.
13. On 30.01.2025, when the petitioners came to the property for cleaning, it was obstructed by the respondents and also, they threatened the petitioners. The respondents are preventing the petitioners from using the plaint B schedule pathway by using mussel power. Petitioners are unable to restrain the illegal acts of the petitioners/respondents. They are having a prima facie case, balance of convenience also in favour of the petitioner. Respondents/plaintiffs are to be restrained from causing any obstruction to the petitioners and their employees in using the plaint B schedule way or reducing its width or committing any act of waste. If the injunction is not granted, it will cause irreparable loss and hardships to the petitioners which cannot be compensated in any manner. Hence, the petition is to be allowed.

14. Respondents had filed objection by stating that, the petition is not maintainable either in law or on facts. Petition is filed without any bonafides with an intention to cause hardships to the plaintiffs/respondents. The predecessor in interest of the petitioners namely Mathai does not have any right over the pathway with a width of 12 feet, so as to assign the right of way in favour of the petitioners. The said Mathai was not having any right over the way. The property having an extent of 1.58 ares, which is stated as a pathway, belongs to the 1st respondent by virtue of document bearing No. 2878/2002. Subsequently, it was assigned in favour of the 2nd respondents, by virtue of document bearing No.4630/2023. Property which is shown as pathway stands in the exclusive possession of the respondents. No one else have any right over the property with an extent of 1.58 ares. The said property commencing from the Panchayat road on southern side and ends at the north-western corner of the property of the respondents. The said property is shown as the western boundary in the document bearing No. 7717/2022. Petitioners never given any right upon the said property. The said way was never used by the Mathai or their children at any point of time. The said Mathai or the petitioners herein are not vested with any right over the plaint B schedule property. Petitioners had never made any transportable way through the said property. The petitioners had purchased the property at the rate of 1 lakh per_cent only because that the property was not having any way. They had falsely created a right of way through the plaint B schedule in their document. The said Mathai was having access to their property to the 5 links way, which was in existence through the western side of the property of one Gopalakrishnan. The said way was purchased by the Mathai, 1st respondent and their brother Vargheese for adequate consideration from one Karikkadan George in the year of 1983. The said property that belonged to Mathai was not having any building or cultivation and therefore, he was not in need to have transportation through the same. The only way of access to the property of the Mathai

was the 5 links width way as above stated.

15. Respondents/plaintiffs have the right to obstruct the forceful transportation through the plaint B schedule property that belonged to the petitioners. Petitioners have no manner of right to have transportation through the plaint B schedule property. Respondents/plaintiffs have every right to obstruct the same. The petitioners were not vested with any right over the plaint B schedule property. The right of way and the right to have maintenance were falsely created in the document. When Mathai have no such right, then he cannot assign such right in favour of the petitioners. Plaint B schedule property was purchased from the original owner by the respondents/plaintiffs. Petitioners have no manner of right to get the injunction order against the true owner of the property. There is no prima facie case in favour of the petitioners. The balance of convenience is in favour of the respondents. If the injunction is not granted, no loss would be suffered by the petitioners and if allowed it will cause obstruction to the peaceful use of property by the respondents. Hence, the petition is to be dismissed.
16. From the above rival contentions, the following points are settled for consideration:-
 1. Have the petitioners made out a prima facie case?
 2. Is the balance of convenience in favour of the petitioners?
 3. Will the petitioners be put to irreparable loss and injuries in the event of not granting the interim prohibitory injunction order?
 4. Order as to costs?
17. Heard both sides. From the side of petitioners, Ext. A1 to A3 documents were marked. From the side of respondents, Ext. B1 to B6 documents

were marked. Ext. C1, C1(a) documents were also marked.

18. **Point Nos. 1 to 3 in both I.As:-** Plaintiffs had filed IA 2/2024 seeking for temporary injunction pertaining to plaint B and C schedule properties. Defendants had filed IA 6/2025 is seeking for temporary injunction pertaining to plaint B schedule property. For the convenience, petitioner in IA 2/2024, who is the respondents in IA 6/2025 is herein after referred as plaintiffs and the petitioners in IA 6/2025 who is the respondents in IA 2/2024 is herein after referred as defendants. According to plaintiffs, plaint A schedule belongs to 1st plaintiff, by virtue of documents bearing No. 1174/1980 and 1142/1980. Out of the properties covered by these documents, 1st plaintiff had assigned 4.05 ares in favour of 2nd plaintiff by virtue of settlement deed bearing No.1292/2014. Even after assignment, plaint A schedule is lying as a compact plot. The documents bearing No. 1174/1980, 1142/1980 and 1292/2014 pertaining to plaint A schedule is produced and marked as Ext. A1 to A3. Reliefs are sought for pertaining to plaint B and C scheduled properties.
19. As per Ext. A1 document, A schedule was allotted to Vargheese, B schedule was allotted to Mathai and C schedule was allotted to 1st plaintiff. As per the case of the defendants, they purchased the property allotted to the share of Mathai, as per Ext. A1 document. They purchased the property by virtue of document bearing No.7717/2022. The said document is produced and marked as Ext. B1. As per Ext. A1 document, the boundaries of all the schedules are shown to be same. On going through Ext. B1, it can be seen that, the B schedule to Ext. A1 was purchased by defendants from Mathai. As per the Ext. B1, the property of 1st plaintiff is shown as the eastern boundary of the property covered by Ext. B1 document. So, on the perusal of Ext. A1 and B1, it is clear that, the property of 1st plaintiff and the defendants are lying abutting to each other.

20. Plaintiffs are claiming exclusive possession over plaint B schedule property and according to plaintiff, plaint B schedule property was purchased by virtue of document bearing No. 2878/2002. This document is produced and marked as Ext. A6. 1st plaintiff assigned plaint B schedule property in favour of 2nd plaintiff by virtue of document bearing No.4630/2023, which is produced and marked as Ext. A4. Ext. A5 is the tax receipt. So, the plaintiffs are claiming exclusive right over plaint B schedule property on the strength of Ext. A6. As per Ext. A6, the northern boundary of plaint B schedule is shown as the property of Mayikkal Kunjan, whereas the northern boundary as per Ext. A1 is shown as Chonikkara vaka property. As per plaint schedule, northern boundary of plaint B schedule is shown as Idavazhi and Chonikkara vaka property. There is no reference to an Idavazhi in both Ext. A4 and A6 documents, by virtue of which the plaint B schedule was vested with the plaintiff.
21. Advocate commissioner inspected the properties and filed report along with rough sketch which is marked as Ext. C1 and C1(a). Advocate commissioner had reported that, plaint A schedule property is clearly lying demarcated in place. As per Ext. C1, report, the northern boundary is stated to be the Idavazhi and property of Chonikkara. But, in rough sketch, northern boundary of B schedule property is shown as the C schedule and the property of Chonikkara is not shown in the rough sketch. As per Ext. C1, plaint B schedule property is not having clear boundaries except on the eastern side of property of Chellappan. It is reported in Ext. C1 that, plaint B schedule is having a length of 15 meters and up to 25 meters, it is having a width of 3 meters and it is reported to be a mud way. Towards north, the way is not having any demarcating boundaries. There are heaps of soil noted and the plaint B schedule way is reported to be ending at the western side of the respondents property. As per Ext. C1, C1(a), plaint B schedule is a way which leads to plaint A schedule property. There is no clear way to enter

into the property of the respondents from plaint B schedule and it is also reported that, there is no clear boundaries and therefore, it is possible to take vehicles through C schedule to the property of the respondents. So, as per Ext. C1, C1(a), it is not possible to see that, the plaint B schedule property to be clearly demarcated in place.

22. The possession of the plaint B schedule by the petitioners is not at dispute. The respondents are claiming easement by grant through plaint B schedule way. According to the plaintiffs, the way which was being used by the Mathai, the predecessor in interest of defendants is the 5 links way on the western side of the property of Gopalakrishnan. According to plaintiffs, the defendants had never used the plaint B schedule way to have access to their property. Plaintiffs had not referred the plaint B schedule to be a way in the plaint. But, from Ext. C1 and C1(a) it can be seen that, plaint B schedule and C schedule is lying as a way which leads to the property of the plaintiffs. Even though, the commissioner had not clearly reported that, the plaint B schedule way is being used by the defendants also. It is reported that, it is possible to have access to the property of the defendants through the plaint B schedule through the north-western side of the C schedule. The 5 links way which is required to be noted by the plaintiffs was noted by the Adv. Commissioner and shown in Ext. C1 and C1(a). The said 5 links way was noted to be filled with bushes and it is seen to be broken at the north-western corner. So, on going through Ext. C1 and C1(a) it is not possible to see the 5 links way to be being used by the defendants to have access to their property. The way which is referred to in their document marked as Ext. B1 is plaint B schedule. As per the commission report, it can be seen that, plaint B schedule is capable of being used to have access to the property of the defendants.
23. Whether the said Mathai had any right to use the plaint B schedule way to have access to his property subsequently assigned in favour of defendants is a matter of evidence. The rights and liabilities of the

parties can only be decided at a later stage after elaborated trial. When the plaint B schedule is not lying demarcated in place without having any clear boundaries, it is not possible to see the plaint B schedule to be identifiable. When plaint B schedule property is not identifiable, the plaintiffs could not be found to be entitled for the relief of temporary injunction as sought for pertaining to plaint B schedule property. Also, it is clear that, plaint B schedule property is capable being used as a way. As per Ext.C1 & C1(a) it is not possible to see the 5 links way to be used by the defendants to have access to their property. So, it can only be discerned that, plaint B schedule way is being used to have access to the property of the defendants. In that scenario, when the plaint B schedule way is being used to have access to the property of the defendants and when it is so referred to in Ext. B1 document, we could see a strong prima facie case in favour of the defendants pertaining to plaint B schedule way. When it is found that, the plaint B schedule way is capable of being used to have access to defendants property and if the usage is restrained by way of temporary injunction, then it will cause irreparable injury to the defendants. On the other hand, if the plaintiffs are found to be having exclusive right over plaint B schedule, then the irreparable injury to be caused to the plaintiffs would be comparatively lesser than the injury to be caused to the defendants. Therefore, I am of the view that, the question of balance of convenience is in favour of the defendants pertaining to plaint B schedule property.

24. While considering the relief sought for pertaining to plaint C schedule by the plaintiffs, Adv. Commissioner had reported that, plaint B and C schedule properties are lying as a way and it is the only way of access to the property of the plaintiffs. It is also reported that, plaint B and C schedule way are being used to have access to the property of the plaintiffs. Defendants are claiming C schedule to be part of their property. But the C schedule is reported to be lying demarcated from the property of defendants with height difference and bushes. Whether

C schedule is the part of the defendants property is a matter of adjudication. At this juncture, it is clear from Ext. C1 and C1(a) that, plaintiffs are using plaint B and C schedule way to have access to their property which goes to show a prima facie case in favour of plaintiffs pertaining to plaint C schedule way. If the injunction is not allowed pertaining to C schedule and the way is obstructed would cause irreparable injury to the plaintiffs, when compared to the hardship that is to be caused to the defendants. So, pertaining to plaint C schedule way, the question of irreparable injury and balance of convenience is in favour of plaintiffs. From the earlier discussions, it is very clear that, pertaining to plaint B schedule property, the question of irreparable injury and balance of convenience is in favour of the defendants and also we have seen that, the defendants are having strong prima facie case in their favour pertaining to plaint B schedule property. Therefore, I could only find that, the plaintiffs are entitled for the relief of temporary injunction pertaining to C schedule way and they are not entitled for the relief of temporary injunction sought for pertaining to plaint B schedule property. Further, I find that, defendants are entitled for the relief of temporary injunction pertaining to plaint B schedule. Hence, I.A 2/24 is allowed in part and I.A 6/25 is allowed.

25. **Point No. 4 in both I.As:-** Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to allow the costs of the proceedings.

26. In the result, **I.A 2/24** is allowed in part as follows:-

Defendants are restrained from closing plaint C schedule way or reduce its width or destroy the plaint C schedule way or obstruct the vehicular transportation through plaint C schedule way or do any obstructions in the plaint C schedule way or do any act detrimental to the rights of the plaintiffs over plaint C schedule way, by way of temporary injunction.

27. In the result **I.A 6/24** is allowed as follows:-

Plaintiffs or their men or agents or anybody claiming under them are restrained from making obstructions to the defendants or their workers in using the plaint B schedule pathway and also from reducing its width or from committing any act of waste therein, by way of temporary injunction.

Dictated to the confdl. asstt., transcribed and typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court on this the 8th day of April, 2025.

Sd/-
ALSHARI A.,
Civil Judge (Junior Division)

APPENDIX

I.A.No.2/2024:-

Petitioners Exhibits:-

A1.	7.4.1980	Copy of the partition deed No. 1174/1980 of SRO, Puthencruz.
A2.	7.4.1980	Copy of the sale deed of SRO, Puthencruz. Kuruppampady.
A3.	19.2.2014	Copy of the settlement deed No.1292/2014 of SRO, Puthencruz.
A4.	17.8.2023	Copy of the settlement deed of SRO, Puthencruz.
A5.	7.11.2024	Land tax receipt of thandaper No.6343 of Kunnathunadu village.
A6.	2.8.2002	Copy of the sale deed No.2878/2002 of SRO, Puthencruz.

Respondents Exhibits:-

B1.	30.12.2022	Copy of the sale deed No. 7717/2022 of SRO, Puthencruz.
-----	------------	---

- B2. 5.11.2024 Copy of land tax receipt of thandaper No.11802 of Village Officer Kunnathunadu.
- B3. - Copy of the survey plan submitted on 1.1.2025

Court Exhibit:-

- C1 & 10.12.2024 Commission report and Rough sketch submitted by
C1(a) Adv. Nandu A.V.

Witness Exhibit:- Nil

Witness both sides:- Nil

I.A.No.6/2025:-

Petitioners Exhibits:-

- A1. 30.12.2022 Copy of the sale deed No. 7717/2022 of SRO, Puthencruz.
- A2. 5.11.2024 Copy of land tax receipt of thandaper No.11802 of Village Officer Kunnathunadu.
- A3. - Copy of the survey plan submitted on 1.1.2025

Respondents Exhibits:-

- B1. 7.4.1980 Copy of the partition deed No. 1174/1980 of SRO, Puthencruz.
- B2. 7.4.1980 Copy of the sale deed of SRO, Puthencruz. Kuruppampady.
- B3. 19.2.2014 Copy of the settlement deed No.1292/2014 of SRO, Puthencruz.
- B4. 17.8.2023 Copy of the settlement deed of SRO, Puthencruz.
- B5. 7.11.2024 Land tax receipt of thandaper No.6343 of Kunnathunadu village.
- B6. 2.8.2002 Copy of the sale deed No.2878/2002 of SRO, Puthencruz.

Court Exhibit:-

C1 & 10.12.2024 Commission report and Rough sketch submitted by
C1(a) Adv. Nandu A.V.

Witness Exhibit:- Nil

Witness both sides:- Nil

Id/-
Civil Judge (Junior Division)
(By Order)

// True Copy //

Sd/-
Junior Superintendent.

jpp/-
Compd.by : smn.

Copy of Common Order in
I.A. Nos. 2/2024 & 6/2025 in
O.S. No. 337/2024
Dated : 8.4.2025