

IN THE COURT OF THE MUNSIFF, KOTTARAKKARA
Present :- Sri.Fazil Rahiman., Civil Judge (Junior Division)
Tuesday, 11th day of November, 2025/ 20th day of Karthika, 1947

IA 3/2025 in OS.316/1984

Between

Petitioners/Plaintiffs:-

1. Karthyayani (Late), D/o. Kurumba,
Siva Mandiram, Muttra Muri from Poikavila Veedu,
Muttra Muri, Veliyam Village
- Addl.2. Sadasivan (Late), S/o. Karthyayani,
Sivamandiram, Muttra Muri from Poikavila Veedu,
Muttra Muri, Veliyam Village
- Addl.3 Raveendran, S/o. Karthyayani,
Ravivilasom, Muttara P.O, Odanavattom
- Addl.4 Prabhakaran, S/o. Karthyayani,
Pratheesh Nivas, Muttra P.O
Odanavattom
- Addl.5 Sumeena, D/o. Thamarakshi,
Kailasam, Choorapoyka,
Kazhanikkodu P.O, Kollam
- Addl.6 Sunil, S/o. Thamarakshi,
Sunil Mandiram, Choorapoyka,
Kazhanikkodu P.O, Kollam
- Addl.7 Anilkumar, aged 59 years,
S/o. Sadasivan, Siva Mandiram,
Muttara P.O, Odanavattom Village
- Addl.8 Lathakumary, aged 57 years,
D/o. Sadasivan, Aswathy Bhavanam,
Muttra P.O, Odanavattom Village

By. Adv. T. Unnikrishnan Nair

And

Respondents/Defendants:-

1. Nani (Late), D/o. Kurumba,
Kalarivila Veedu, Padinjattinkara Muri,
Muthupilakkadu, Poruvazhi Village
2. Ayyappan Kesavan (Late), Poikavila Veedu,
Thudanthala Muri, Ummannoor Village
- Addl.3. Omana, D/o. Nani,
Poikavila Veedu, Thudanthala Muri,
Ummannoor Village
- Addl.4 Nandakini, (Late), W/o.(Late) Ayyappan Kesavan,
Poikavila Veedu, Thudanthala Muri,
Ummannoor Village
- Addl.5 Sadanandan , S/o.(Late) Ayyappan Kesavan,
Poikavila Veedu, Thudanthala Muri,
Ummanoor Village
- Addl.6 Sulochana, D/o. (Late)Ayyappan Kesavan,
Poikavila Veedu, Thudanthala Muri,
Ummanoor Village
- Addl.7 Thulasibhai, D/o. Late Ayyappan Kesavan,
Poikavila Veedu, Thudanthala Muri,
Ummanoor Village
- Addl.8 Leelamany, D/o. Late Ayyappan Kesavan,
Poikavila Veedu, Thudanthala Muri,
Ummanoor Village
- Addl.9 Sathi Bai, D/o. Late Ayyappan Kesavan,
Poikavila Veedu, Thudanthala Muri,
Ummanoor Village

By. Adv. D Anilkumar

This petition filed by the counsel for the 3rd Petitioner under order 6 Rule 17 of CPC 1908 for amendment. This IA have been finally heard on 11.11.2025 and on the same day the court passed the following:-

ORDER

Both represented. Heard both sides. The defendant objected the application. The plaintiff contended that in order to establish the identity of the plaint schedule property, the amendment is highly necessary. The perusal of the order of the Hon'ble High Court shows that the Hon'ble High Court observed that the identity of the A schedule property with the title deed is not established. The commission reports are conflicting to each other. The perusal of the title deed of the plaintiff establishing that the plaint schedule description is not in conformity with the title deed. This court is of the considered opinion that the amendment sought is highly necessary to determine the real questions in controversy between the parties. Hence IA allowed in the interest of justice. Carry out the amendment within two days.

Pronounced by me in open court on this the 11th day of November, 2025

Sd/-
FAZIL RAHIMAN
Civil Judge (Junior Division)

APPENDIX :- NIL

Id/-
 Civil Judge (Junior Division)

// True Copy //

Typed by : Sibi Sreekumar
 Compared by :

Civil Judge (Junior Division)