

IN THE COURT OF THE MUNSIF, KOLLAM**Present : Smt. Ragi.S., Principal Munsiff**On Thursday, the 5th day of February, 2026/16th day of Magha, 1947.**IA.No. 02/2025, IA. 5/2025 & IA. 6/2025 in OS. No. 573/2025****IA. No.02/2025**BetweenPetitioners/Plaintiffs: -

1. Siyad, aged 52 years, S/o Abdul Karim, Aisha Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
2. Shemeemuth, aged 46 years, W/o Siyad, Aisha Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
3. Hayarunnissa, aged 52 years, W/o Noushad, Irshad Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
- 4 Remya, aged 39 years, D/o Retnamma, Vilayilazhikathu Vadakkathil, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
- 5 Ratheesh Chandran, aged 34 years, S/o Balachandran Pillai, Vilayilazhikathu Vadakkathil, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005
- 6 Mohanan, aged 64 years, S/o Sadanandan, Vilayilazhikathu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
- 7 Muhammed Anas, aged 44 years, Vilayilazhikathu Veedu, TKMC P O Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
- 8 Shehina, aged 38 years, W/o Muhammed Anas, Vilayilazhikathu Veedu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
- 9 Manuja, aged 49 years, W/o Muhammed Anshad, Vilayilazhikathu Veedu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.

By Adv. Smitha.R.Kallada.

And

Respondents/
Defendants:-

1. Vikraman, aged 76 years,
S/o Kunjuraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam
2. Anil @ Vinod, aged 54 years,
S/o Vikraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village , Kollam
3. Aju @ Santhosh, aged 52 years,
S/o Vikraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam

By Adv. Thomas Philip for D1 to D3.

IA. No. 05/2025

Between

Petitioners/Plaintiffs: -

1. Siyad, aged 52 years, S/o Abdul Karim,
Aisha Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
2. Shemeemuth, aged 46 years, W/o Siyad,
Aisha Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
3. Hayarunnissa, aged 52 years, W/o Noushad,
Irshad Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
- 4 Remya, aged 39 years, D/o Retnamma,
Vilayilazhikathu Vadakkathil, TKMC P.O,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
- 5 Ratheesh Chandran, aged 34 years,
S/o Balachandran Pillai, Vilayilazhikathu
Vadakkathil, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village,
Kollam 691 005
- 6 Mohanan, aged 64 years, S/o Sadanandan,
Vilayilazhikathu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor
Village, Kollam 691 005.

- 7 Muhammed Anas, aged 44 years,
Vilayilazhikathu Veedu, TKMC P O
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
 - 8 Shehina, aged 38 years,
W/o Muhammed Anas, Vilayilazhikathu
Veedu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village,
Kollam 691 005.
 - 9 Manuja, aged 49 years,
W/o Muhammed Anshad, Vilayilazhikathu
Veedu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village,
Kollam 691 005.
- By Adv. Smitha.R.Kallada.

And

Respondents/
Defendants:-

1. Vikraman, aged 76 years,
S/o Kunjuraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam
 2. Anil @ Vinod, aged 54 years,
S/o Vikraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village , Kollam
 3. Aju @ Santhosh, aged 52 years,
S/o Vikraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam
- By Adv. Thomas Philip for D1 to D3.

IA. 06/2025

Between

Petitioners/
Defendants:-

1. Vikraman, aged 76 years,
S/o Kunjuraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam.
2. Anil @ Vinod, aged 54 years,
S/o Vikraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village , Kollam.

3. Aju @ Santhosh, aged 52 years,
S/o Vikraman, Jonakazhikathu Veedu,
College Nagar, Karikodu,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam.

By Adv. Thomas Philip for D1 to D3.

And

Petitioners/Plaintiffs: -

1. Siyad, Aisha Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
2. SHEMEEMUTH, aged 46 years, W/o Siyad,
Aisha Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
3. HAYARUNNISSA, aged 52 years, W/o Noushad,
Irshad Manzil, Karikodu, TKMC P.O,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
4. Remya, aged 39 years, D/o Retnamma,
Vilayilazhikathu Vadakkathil, TKMC P.O,
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
5. Ratheesh Chandran, aged 34 years,
S/o Balachandran Pillai, Vilayilazhikathu
Vadakkathil, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village,
Kollam 691 005
6. Mohanan, aged 64 years, S/o Sadanandan,
Vilayilazhikathu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor
Village, Kollam 691 005.
7. Muhammed Anas, aged 44 years,
Vilayilazhikathu Veedu, TKMC P O
Kilikolloor Village, Kollam 691 005.
8. Shehina, aged 38 years,
W/o Muhammed Anas, Vilayilazhikathu
Veedu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village,
Kollam 691 005.
9. Manuja, aged 49 years,
W/o Muhammed Anshad, Vilayilazhikathu
Veedu, TKMC P.O, Kilikolloor Village,
Kollam 691 005.

By Adv. Smitha.R.Kallada.

IA 2/2025 is filed by the petitioners/plaintiffs for injunction under Order XXXIX Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure. IA.05/2025 is filed by the petitioners/Plaintiffs for extending an injunction order in IA. 2/25 dated 09/09/2025 under Sec.151 of Civil Procedure and IA 6/2025 has been filed by the respondents/defendants for injunction. These petitioners are coming on for final hearing before me on 29-01-2026 and the court on 05-02-2026 passed the following:-

COMMON ORDER

IA 2/2025 & IA 5/2025 have been filed by the petitioners/plaintiffs, and IA 6/2025 has been filed by the respondents/defendants. All the applications are filed under Order XXXIX Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure for seeking interim injunctions.

2. The plaintiffs instituted this suit seeking a declaration of an easement by prescription over the plaintiff H schedule pathway, along with a consequential decree of permanent prohibitory injunction. Plaintiffs 1 and 2 are the owners in possession and enjoyment of 1 Acre 82 sq.meters of property comprised in Block No. 15, Resurvey No. 505/6-5 of Kilikollur Village, obtained under Sale Deed No. 3296/2007 of Kilikollur SRO. The property has been duly mutated in their favour and is described in the plaint as the plaintiff A schedule property. The third plaintiff is the absolute owner in possession and enjoyment of 02 Ares and 63 sq. metres of property comprised in Block No. 15, Resurvey No. 505/6-5-2 of Kilikollur Village. She obtained title by virtue of Sale Deed No. 3295/2003 of Kilikollur SRO and the property has been mutated in her favour as per Thandapper No. 15624. The said

property is described as the plaint as plaint B schedule property. The fourth plaintiff, along with her husband and Mr. Radhakrishnapillai, are the absolute owners in possession and enjoyment of 3 Ares 4 sq. metres of property comprised in Block No. 15, Resurvey No. 505/30-1 of Kilikollur Village. They obtained title by virtue of Sale Deed No. 1462/2012 of Kilikollur SRO, and the property has been mutated in their favour as per Thandapper No. 30154. This property is described as the plaint C schedule property. The plaint D schedule property, having an extent of 3 Ares 23 sq. metre in Resurvey No. 505/30-2 of Kilikollur Village, was obtained by the 5th plaintiff under Sale Deed No. 800/2021 of Kilikollur Sub Registrar Office. The sixth plaintiff is the owner in possession of plaint E schedule property, having an extent of 2 Ares 2 sq. metre of property in Re-survey No. 505/6-4 of Kilikollur Village. The 7th and 8th plaintiffs are the owners in possession of 2 Ares 22 sq. metre of property in Resurvey No. 505/16-3-2 of Kilikollur Village by virtue of Sale Deed No. 296/2014 of Kilikollur SRO. The plaint G schedule property, having an extent of 1 Are 83 sq. metres in Resurvey No. 505/16-3 of Kilikollur Village, was obtained by the 9th plaintiff, under Sale Deed No. 4050/1996 of Kilikollur SRO. The plaint A to G schedule properties are duly mutated in favour of the plaintiffs 1 to 9, and they are in possession and enjoyment of the respective properties.

3. The defendants are the owners of the property, having an extent of 3 Ares 98 sq. metres comprised in Re-survey No. 505/7 in Block No. 15 of Kilikollur Village. The only access to the plaintiffs' properties is through the plaint H schedule pathway originating from the Kuttichara-Punnayathuvayal road. The pathway has a width of

about 2.20 metres and extends partly through and along the western boundary of the defendants' property for a length of about 22.50 metres. The said pathway has been in existence for over 50 years and has been used by the plaintiffs and their predecessors openly, peacefully, continuously, and as of right, without interruption, thereby perfecting an easement by prescription. There is no alternative access to the plaintiff A to G schedule properties.

4. The defendants, with the intention of obstructing the said use, have raised claims over a portion of the pathway and attempted to prevent its use. They contend that a portion of the H schedule pathway belongs to them and that they will not permit the plaintiffs to use the said portion as a pathway. It is further alleged that the defendants have attempted to obstruct the pathway by dumping waste and, on certain occasions in September 2025, attempted to physically block the pathway with the help of others. However, such attempts were resisted by the plaintiffs and local residents. In these circumstances, the plaintiffs reasonably apprehend further obstruction by the defendants. They assert that they have perfected an easement right by prescription over the plaintiff H schedule pathway and contend that the defendants have no right to interfere with its use. The balance of convenience lies in favour of the plaintiffs, and denial of interim relief would cause irreparable injury. Hence, IA No. 2/2025 has been filed seeking an order of interim injunction restraining the defendants and their men from causing any obstruction to the plaintiffs' use of the H schedule property or committing any acts detrimental to their enjoyment of the said

right, including dumping waste or causing mischief in the pathway, till the disposal of the suit.

5. The plaintiffs subsequently filed IA No.5/2025, submitting that this court had, on 09.09.2025, granted an ad interim injunction restraining the respondents and their men from obstructing the plaintiffs' use of the H Schedule pathway and from dumping waste therein, pending return of notice. The plaintiffs contend that it is necessary, in the interest of justice, to extend the said interim order, as failure to do so would defeat the very object of the suit and create a likelihood of obstruction to the pathway. They further submit that non extension of the injunction would result in irreparable loss and injury. Accordingly, the plaintiffs pray that this Court may be pleased to extend the ad interim order of injunction dated 09.09.2025, restraining the respondents from causing any obstruction to the use of the plaintiff H schedule pathway and from committing any waste therein, until further orders.

6. The defendants admit that a pathway exists on the western side of their property, however, they contend that the said pathway is less than 1 metre in width and not 2.20 metres as alleged by the plaintiffs. They further contend that the description of the pathway in the plaint and affidavit is incorrect and contrary to the revenue records, which, according to them, clearly support their contention. The claim that the pathway was formed about 50 years ago and has been used as of right is denied, particularly in view of the fact that several plaintiffs have acquired title to their properties only within the last 20 years. The defendants also allege that, for

more than a decade, the plaintiffs and nearby residents have been attempting to encroach upon the defendants' property by dismantling, fencing, and unlawfully widening the pathway, which attempts were resisted. Reference is made to an earlier suit, OS No. 328/2016, filed in similar circumstances, which was later withdrawn. It is contended that the present proceedings are a continuation of such attempts, with material facts suppressed before the court. The defendants further contend that, after obtaining an ex parte order of injunction, the plaintiffs carried out developments in the pathway and are attempting to widen it by encroaching upon the defendants' property under the guise of the said order. They deny the allegations of threats or obstruction on the dates mentioned in the affidavit and assert that no such incidents occurred. On the contrary, they contend that it is the plaintiffs who are attempting to trespass.

7. The defendants specifically deny that the plaintiffs have acquired any easement right by prescription, asserting that the essential ingredients of long, open, continuous and uninterrupted use for the statutory period have not been satisfied. They maintain that the plaintiffs can claim only such limited right, if any, as reflected in the revenue records and not beyond. In support of their contentions, the defendants rely on photographs showing alleged developments made by the plaintiffs after obtaining the injunction order, as well as a sketch prepared by the Assistant Engineer of the Kollam Corporation. In the above circumstances, it is contended that the plaintiffs have failed to establish a prima facie case and that the balance of

convenience lies in favour of the defendants. Accordingly, the defendants submit that the plaintiffs are not entitled to the relief of injunction as prayed in IA No. 2/2025.

8. The defendants have also filed objections in IA No. 5/2025, contending that the plaintiffs have not established any prescriptive easement right, as the essential requirements of long, open, continuous and uninterrupted use for the statutory period have not been satisfied. They deny the alleged incidents of threat or obstruction and contend that no such events occurred. On the contrary, they assert that the plaintiffs are attempting to trespass and have unlawfully widened the pathway. It is further contended that, if the interim order is extended, the plaintiffs would continue their encroachment, causing irreparable injury and hardship to the defendants. The defendants also alleged that the plaintiffs have approached this court without clean hands. In these circumstances, they submit that no prima facie case is made out and that the balance of convenience lies in their favour. They therefore pray that IA No. 5/2025 be dismissed with compensatory costs.

9. The defendants further assert that their property is clearly demarcated with well-defined boundaries and survey stones. However, taking advantage of the injunction order, the plaintiffs have allegedly encroached upon the eastern portion of the defendants' property and placed materials such as roofing tiles with the intention of widening and equalising the width of the pathway. In these circumstances, the defendants contend that, unless restrained, such unlawful acts will cause irreparable loss and hardship to them. Hence, they pray that this Court may be pleased to grant a

temporary injunction restraining the respondents/plaintiffs and their agents from trespassing into or altering the eastern boundary of the defendants' property, including the removal of survey stones, with the intention of widening the alleged pathway, pending disposal of the suit. Accordingly, IA No. 6/2025 is filed.

10. Based on the above rival contentions, the following points arise for consideration:

1. Whether the plaintiffs have established a prima facie case, balance of convenience, and irreparable injury for the extension of ad interim injunction Order dated 9/9/2025 as prayed for?
2. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to an order of interim injunction restraining the defendants from causing obstruction to the use of the H schedule pathway as sought for?
3. Whether the defendants are entitled to an interim injunction restraining the plaintiffs from trespassing into or altering the defendants' property, including removal of survey stones or widening the pathway?
4. Reliefs and costs?

11. For the purpose of these interlocutory applications, on the side of the plaintiffs, Exhibits A1 to A14 were marked. On the side of the defendants, Exhibits B1 and B2 were marked. The commission report was marked as Exhibit C1 series.

12. Heard the learned counsel for the plaintiffs and the learned counsel for the defendants.

13. **Point No's. 1 & 2:** In IA No. 2/2025, the plaintiffs seek an order of temporary injunction restraining the defendants and their men from causing any obstruction to the plaintiffs' use and enjoyment of the plaintiff H schedule pathway for ingress and egress to their respective properties, and from committing any waste or interference therein, pending disposal of the suit. In IA No. 5/2025 the Plaintiffs seek an order extending the ad interim injunction granted in IA No. 2/2025 on 09.09.2025 until further orders. The plaintiffs 1 to 9 have produced title deeds and tax receipts before this court, marked as Exhibits A1 to A14, to establish their title, possession, and enjoyment over the plaintiff A to G schedule properties. There is no substantial dispute raised by the defendants with respect to the rights of plaintiffs 1 to 9 over the plaintiff A to G schedule properties. The present IA's concern only the plaintiff H schedule property.

14. The plaintiff H schedule property is a defined pathway claimed by the plaintiffs as the sole means of ingress and ingress to the plaintiff A to G schedule properties owned and possessed by them. According to the plaintiffs, the said pathway originates from the Kuttichara-Punneyathuvayal Public road and proceeds inward, running partly along and through the western side of the defendant's property, having a width of about 2.20 metres and a length of approximately 22.50 metres. The plaintiffs assert that the pathway has been in existence for more than five decades and has been used by them and their predecessors in interest openly, peacefully, continuously, and as of right, without interruption, thereby perfecting an easement by prescription. It is further contended that there is no other alternative access to the

plaintiffs' properties and that the H schedule pathway is indispensable for their beneficial enjoyment. The plaintiffs also allege that the defendants have attempted to obstruct the said pathway and interfere with their lawful use, necessitating the institution of the suit and the interlocutory applications.

15. The defendants, while admitting the existence of a pathway on the western side of their property, dispute the nature, extent, and user claimed by the plaintiffs. They contend that the alleged H schedule pathway is, in fact, a narrow strip with a width of less than 1 metre and not 2.20 metres as claimed. According to the defendants, the description given in the plaint is incorrect and exaggerated, and the revenue records would substantiate their version. The defendants further deny that the plaintiffs or their predecessors have acquired any easement right by prescription, contenting that the essential ingredients of long, continuous, and uninterrupted use of right for the statutory period are not satisfied. It is also their case that several of the plaintiffs have acquired their properties only in recent years and therefore cannot claim prescriptive rights over the alleged pathway. Thus, while the plaintiffs claim the H schedule pathway as an established access perfected by prescription and essential for their enjoyment of the plaint A to G schedule properties, the defendants resist the claim by disputing its width, character, and the alleged prescriptive right, and by alleging encroachment and misuse of interim orders by the plaintiffs.

16. The Advocate Commissioner visited the property and he has filed a report along with mahazar and sketch. It is reported that the plaint A to G schedule

properties have well defined boundaries on all four sides and that the said properties are in the ownership, possession, and enjoyment of the plaintiffs. It is further reported that the plaintiffs are using, for ingress and egress to the said properties, a pathway running in a north south direction on the northern side of the road leading westward from Kuttichira road to Punneyathuvayal. The commissioner has also reported that a portion of the said pathway has been interlocked by the Kollam Corporation, while the middle portion of the pathway, namely the H schedule lying on the eastern side of the plaintiff A and B schedule properties for a length of about 22.50 metres, remain as an old pathway without any construction or interlocking. It is further noted that the pathway has a width of about 2.60 metres at its starting point and extends northwards for a length of about 55 metres, and that the pathway terminates in the plaintiff B schedule property. It is also reported that the defendants' property lies on the eastern side of the H schedule pathway. The commissioner has identified that the H schedule pathway has a width of about 2 metres, which increases to about 2.30 metres at the south western corner. The report further states that the said pathway is being used for access by more than 10 houses and that there is no other alternative access is available. Further, it is reported in the C1 series that electric posts have been installed along the pathway and that the plaintiffs have obtained electricity connections through the same. It is also noted that, at the south western corner of the defendants' property near the survey stone, small pits have been dug and pipes have been replaced and cemented, apparently for the purpose of erecting a fence extending towards the H schedule pathway.

17. The materials placed on record are prima facie establish that the plaintiffs are in ownership, possession, and enjoyment of the plaint A to G schedule properties, and that the plaint H schedule pathway is being used as the access thereto. The disputes regarding the width of H schedule pathway only can be determined after taking evidence at the trial stage. The Exhibit C1 series report prima facie indicates the existence of a defined pathway having a width of around 2 metres, used by multiple households, with no alternative access available. This lends support to the plaintiffs' contention regarding the necessity and long-standing use of the pathway.

18. The essential ingredients for the grant of temporary injunction, namely prima facie case, balance of convenience, and irreparable injury, stand satisfied. The plaintiffs have made out a strong prima facie case regarding their use of the pathway. The balance of convenience is in favour of the plaintiffs, as any obstruction would effectively deny access to their properties. Irreparable injury would be caused to the plaintiffs if such access is obstructed, whereas no comparable hardship would be caused to the defendants by maintaining status quo, especially when the pathway is already in use. With respect to the extension of the ad interim injunction, it is evident that the initial order was granted to preserve the subject matter and prevent obstruction pending consideration of the application. In the absence of any material change in circumstances, and in view of the continued apprehension of obstruction as well as the supporting commissioner's report, the plaintiffs are entitled to an order extending the ad interim injunction. Accordingly, both points are answered in favour of the plaintiffs, holding that they are entitled to a temporary injunction as prayed for

and also to the extension of the ad interim injunction order, pending disposal of the suit.

19. **Point No. 3:** The defendants allege that the plaintiffs, taking advantage of the interim injunction order, have attempted to trespass into the defendants' property and to widen the pathway by removing boundary demarcations and placing materials. They assert that the boundaries of their property are clearly demarcated with survey stones and that any attempt to alter the same would amount to encroachment. The defendants further contend that they have independent access to a public road on the eastern side of their property and, therefore, have no necessity to use the alleged pathway. According to them, the dispute is essentially confined to the H schedule pathway, and the present proceedings have been initiated by the plaintiffs with the intention of enlarging the width of the pathway and encroaching upon the defendants' property under the guise of claiming an easement right.

20. According to the defendants, after obtaining the ad interim injunction order in IA No. 2/2025, the plaintiffs' attempted to widen the H schedule pathway. In support of this allegation, the defendants have produced eight photographs, which have been marked as Exhibit B1. From the said materials, a prima facie case is made out that there exists a reasonable apprehension of encroachment and alteration of the boundary by the plaintiffs. It is also pertinent to note that the plaintiffs have not filed any objection to the said application.

21. The balance of convenience, insofar as the protection of the defendants' property is concerned, lies in maintaining the existing boundaries and preventing any unilateral alteration thereof pending adjudication. If such acts are not restrained, the defendants would suffer irreparable injury by way of loss of identifiable boundary and possible encroachment, which cannot be adequately compensated at a later stage. At the same time, the plaintiffs' right, if any, to use the existing pathway need not be disturbed. In the above circumstances, the defendants are entitled to an order of temporary injunction restraining the plaintiffs and persons claiming under them from trespassing into the defendants' property, from altering or destroying the eastern boundary, from removing survey stones, and from widening the plaint H schedule pathway by encroachment, pending disposal of the suit. However, such an order of injunction shall not obstruct the plaintiffs' use of the existing pathway identified by the commissioner in its present condition. Accordingly, this Point is found in favour of the defendants.

22. **Point No. 4:** In the result, IA No. 2/2025 and IA.No. 5/2025 are allowed.

1. The defendants and their men, agents, and all persons claiming under them are hereby restrained by an order of temporary injunction from causing any obstruction to the plaintiffs' use and enjoyment of the plaint H schedule pathway for ingress and egress to the plaint A to G schedule properties, and from committing any waste therein, pending disposal of the suit.

2. IA 6/2025 is allowed. The plaintiffs, their men, agents, and all persons claiming under them are restrained by an order of temporary injunction from trespassing into the defendants' property, from altering or destroying the eastern boundary, from removing survey stones, and from widening the plaintiff H schedule pathway by encroachment, pending disposal of the suit. It is made clear that this order shall not, in any manner restrict the plaintiffs' right to use the existing pathway in its present condition.
3. Both parties are directed to maintain status quo with respect to the nature, width, and the lie of the plaintiff H schedule pathway as on the date of this order. Both parties shall bear their respective costs.

(Directly typewritten in my personal laptop and pronounced by me in the open court on this, the 5th day of February, 2026).

Sd/-
Ragi.S.,
Principal Munsiff.

APPENDIX :-

Exhibits marked from the side of the Petitioners/Plaintiffs :-

A1	19-11-2007	Copy of Sale Deed No. 3296/2007 of Kilikolloor S.R.O.
A2	13-04-2023	Land Tax Receipt issued from Kilikolloor Village Office
A3	21-10-2003	Copy of Sale Deed No. 3295/2003 of Kilikolloor S.R.O.
A4	25-08-2025	Land Tax Receipt issued from Kilikolloor Village Office.
A5	19-05-2012	Copy of Sale Deed No. 1462/2012 of Kilikolloor S.R.O.

A6		Land Tax Receipt issued from Kilikolloor Village Office.
A7	17-06-2021	Copy of Settlement Deed No. 800/2021 of Kilikolloor S.R.O.
A8	06-06-2023	Land Tax Receipt issued from Kilikolloor Village Office.
A9	05-03-1996	Copy of Sale Deed No. 798/1996 of Kilikolloor S.R.O.
A10	05-07-2024	Copy of Land Tax Receipt issued from Kilikolloor Village Office.
A11	04-02-2014	Copy of Sale Deed No. 296/2014 of Kilikolloor S.R.O.
A12	25-08-2025	Copy of Land Tax Receipt issued from Kilikolloor Village Office.
A13	30-12-1996	Copy of Sale Deed No. 4050/96 of Kilikolloor S.R.O.
A14	25-08-2025	Copy of Land Tax Receipt issued from Kilikolloor Village Office.

Exhibits marked from the side of the Respondents/Defendants:-

B1	Photographs
B2	Location Sketch.

Court Exhibits : -

C1	07-11-2025	Commission report prepared and submitted by Advocate Commissioner Krishna.R.
C1(a)		Mahazar prepared and submitted by Advocate Commissioner Krishna.R.
C1(b)		Rough Sketch.

Id/-
Principal Munsiff

//True Copy//

Sd/-
Ragi.S.,
Principal Munsiff

Typed by : Marybindu. C.
Compared by : Sandhya.S.