

IN THE COURT OF THE MUNSIFF, THIRUVALLA.**Present: Sri. Aravind S.J, Munsiff****Tuesday the 31st day of March, 2026/ 10th day of Chaithram, 1948 S.E****OS. No.429/2015.****BETWEEN:**

- | | | |
|--|---|------------|
| <p>1. Chacko Joseph, aged 79 years, S/o.Joseph, Orethumalayilaya Theverkattil Memuriyil, Kuriyannoor Muri, Thottappuzhasserry Village, Thiruvalla Taluk. (Died)</p> <p>2. Eliyamma George, aged 69 years, D/o.Thomas Joseph, Orethumalayilaya Theverkattil Memuriyil, Kuriyannoor Muri, Thottappuzhasserry Village, Thiruvalla Taluk. Now residing at: B.N.287-Jeya Villayil, M.S.Lane, Babauji Nagar Road, Medical College P.O, Thiruvananthapuram.</p> <p>Addl.P3 Gracy Chacko, aged 86 years, W/o.Chacko Joseph, Orethumalayilaya Theverkattil Memuriyil, Kuriyannoor Muri, Thottappuzhasserry Village, Thiruvalla Taluk.</p> <p>Addl.P4 Jose George, aged 60 years, S/o.Chacko Joseph, Orethumalayilaya Theverkattil Memuriyil, Kuriyannoor Muri, Thottappuzhasserry Village, Thiruvalla Taluk.</p> <p>Addl.P5 Jaya George, aged 56 years, S/o.Chacko Joseph, Orethumalayilaya Theverkattil Memuriyil, Kuriyannoor Muri, Thottappuzhasserry Village, Thiruvalla Taluk.</p> | } | Plaintiffs |
|--|---|------------|

(Additional P3 to P5 impleaded as per order in IA.4/2025 dated 24.10.2025.)

(By Adv.Siby James for P2.)

(By Adv.Siby James & Adv.Manoj Mathew for Additional P3 & P4)

(No Vakkalath is seen filed for Additional P5.)

AND:

- | | | |
|--|---|------------|
| <p>1. Village Officer, Thottappuzhasserry Village, Village Office, Thottappuzhasserry.</p> <p>2. Additional Tahsildar, Thiruvalla, Taluk Office, Thiruvalla P.O.</p> | } | Defendants |
|--|---|------------|

3. Assistant Director, Re-survey,
Re-survey Office, Pathanamthitta P.O.
4. Survey Superintendent, Survey Office,
No.II, Pathanamthitta P.O. Defendants
5. State of Kerala represented by
District Collector, Collectorate,
Pathanamthitta P.O.

(By Adv.Manoj Mathew, Additional Government Pleader and
Public Prosecutor for D1 to D5.

This Suit having been finally heard on 28-03-2026 and stood over for consideration on 31-03-2026 and on the same day the court delivered the following:

J U D G M E N T

The suit is for declaration of title and perpetual prohibitory injunction.

2. The plaint averments in brief are as follows: The plaint schedule Item No. 1 property belongs to the 1st plaintiff by virtue of deed No. 1801/1967 of the Aranmula SRO as per B schedule to the said document. The plaint schedule Item No. 1 property is in old Survey No. 164/1A having an extent of 70.50 cents and in 164/1 F7 having an extent of 4 cents and the 1st plaintiff was paying tax under Thandaper account No. 4494. The plaint schedule Item No. 2 property belongs to the 2nd plaintiff as D schedule to the aforesaid partition deed. The plaint schedule Item No. 2 property has an extent of 25 cents in old Survey No. 164/1 F4 and the 2nd plaintiff was paying tax under thandapper account No. 4511. The plaint schedule Item No. 1 and 2 properties are lying contiguously and the plaintiffs who are siblings are cultivating rubber in the plaint schedule Item No. 1 and 2 properties. The plaint schedule Item No. 1 and 2 properties are within well defined boundaries as a single compact plot. After resurvey, the properties belonging to third persons at the northern side of Paruthimukku-Kuriyannoor School Panchayath Road was shown as

part of resurvey No. 78/19 having an extent of 44 ares and was shown in thandapper account No. 204. The property in resurvey no. 78/19 includes the property of the plaintiffs and the property of third parties. One Esho son of Mathai had 8.09 ares of property and the said property was reduced from the said thandapper account. The property in resurvey No. 78/19 was shown to have an extent of 31.46 ares. After reduction of extent of 8.09 ares, the plaintiffs are shown to have an extent of only 23.37 ares in resurvey No. 78/19. The Plaint schedule item No. 1 and 2 properties have a total extent of 99.50 cents and is still in the possession of the plaintiffs. The northern portion of the said property is shown to be in resurvey No. 78/18 in the resurvey records and is shown to be government purambokku. The same is only a mistake committed by the revenue officials and the property in Re-survey No. 78/18 is also part of the plaint schedule Item No. 1 and 2 properties. The property in Re-survey No. 78/18 is scheduled as Item No. 3. There are no rocks in the plaint schedule Item No. 3 property even though the same is shown as "Parapurambokku" in the resurvey records. The plaintiffs had preferred complaints before the District Collector and resurvey authorities to rectify the mistakes in the revenue records. However, they have not rectified the mistakes so far. Moreover the Government is now attempting to alienate plaint schedule Item No. 3 to third persons. The plaintiffs are entitled to decree declaring their title over the plaint schedule properties. Considering the urgent nature of the suit, a separate petition is filed seeking leave of this Court to institute the suit without statutory notice to the Government. Hence, the suit.

3. The 2nd defendant filed written statement contending as follows: The suit is not maintainable either under law or facts. The plaintiff is put to proof regarding their title over the plaint schedule properties. As per old survey records, one Joseph Chacko was paying

tax for the property having an extent of 70.50 ares in old Survey No. 164/1A and 4 cents of property in old Survey No. 164/1 FA under Thandaper account No. 4494. One Joseph Eliyamma was paying tax for 25 cents of property in old Survey No. 164/1FA having an extent of 25 cents in thandapper account No. 4511. As per the resurvey records, the property having an extent of 44 ares in resurvey No. 78/19 of Thottapuzhashery Village is shown to belong to the aforesaid Joseph Chacko and Smt. Eliyamma. 4.05 ares of property was reduced from the said thandapper account as per the proceedings of the Thiruvalla Tahasildar as No. 2635/98/10 dated 08.12.1998 and the said property was transferred to thandapper account No. 3492. Property was also transferred from the said resurvey number to another person as per proceeding No. 2749/98/2010 dated 19.12.1998. The thandapper account holders have an extent of 31.46 are of property in their name in the resurvey records. The Property having an extent of 17.20 ares in Re-survey No. 78/18 is shown as "parapurambokku" in Re-survey records. It is false to address that the same was included as purambokku only during Re-survey. The property in old survey No. 164/1F1 was a "para purambokku" and the same was retained as such in the resurvey records. The plaintiffs have not preferred any petition to rectify the mistakes in the resurvey records so far. Even if there is any mistake in the resurvey records, the plaintiffs could file application before the resurvey authorities. The plaintiffs are not entitled to any reliefs as sought for. The cause of action stated is false. There is no cause of action to institute the suit. Hence, the suit is liable to be dismissed.

4. Based on the aforesaid pleadings and contentions put forth by the parties, the following issues are framed:-

1. Whether the suit is maintainable?

2. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get cancelled the resurvey proceedings as prayed for?
3. Whether the plaintiffs have acquired right and title over the plaint schedule properties?
4. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get a decree of declaration as prayed for?
5. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get a decree of perpetual prohibitory injunction?
6. Relief and costs?

5. The 1st plaintiff died during the pendency of the suit and his legal representatives were impleaded as additional plaintiffs 3 to 5 as per the order of this Court in IA No. 4/2025. With the aforesaid pleadings, the parties went to trial. The plaintiffs examined PW1 to PW3 and Ext A1 to A3 were marked. The 2nd defendant was examined as DW1 and Ext B1 to B3 were marked. The commission report and survey plans in the case were marked as Ext C1 and C1(a). The plaintiffs had filed IA No. 2/2023 for remitting the said commission report and plan. The said petition was allowed and Ext C1 and Ext C1(a) were remitted to the Advocate Commissioner and surveyor to identify and measure the plaint schedule properties based on the old survey records as well. The Advocate Commissioner thereafter filed Ext C2 report and C2(a) plan.

6. Heard the learned counsel for both sides.

7. **Issue no 1:** The case of the plaintiffs is that the plaint schedule Item No. 1 and 2 properties belongs to them and that they were paying tax for the property as per the old survey records. It is contended that after a portion of the plaint schedule Item No. 1 and 2 properties scheduled as Item No. 3 is shown in Re-survey No. 78/18

and is shown to be a government purambokku by the defendants after finalization of resurvey. The suit is thus filed to declare the title of the plaintiffs over the plaint schedule properties and to make necessary corrections in the revenue records. Per contra, the defendants had contended that the property in Re-survey No. 78/18 was a Government purambokku even from the period of old survey and that the plaintiffs have title only over the property in Re-survey No. 78/19.

8. The first question to be considered is if the suit as filed is maintainable. The plaintiffs had instituted the suit after obtaining leave of this court under Section 80(2) CPC as per the order in IA No. 2470/2015. The defendants also did not raise any dispute regarding the non maintainability of the suit under Section 80(1) CPC. Therefore it can only be concluded that the suit filed without notice under Section 80(1) CPC is maintainable. It is pertinent to consider section 14 of the Surveys and Boundaries Act and the same is reproduced hereunder. *"Any person deeming himself aggrieved by the determination of any boundary under section 9, section 10 or section 11 may, subject to the provisions of the law of limitation in force for the time being, institute a suit within one year from the date of the notification under section 13 to set aside or modify the said determination and the survey shall, if necessary, be altered in accordance with the final decree in the suit and the alteration, if any, shall be noted in the record."*

9. The same pertains to the institution of a suit for the purpose of setting aside or modifying the survey conducted and the boundary fixed under s. 9, 10 or 11 of the Act. A close perusal of the pleadings in the present case would show that there is dispute regarding the title of the plaintiff over the plaint schedule Item No. 3 property. It is now well settled that the resurvey authorities cannot consider the

question of title over the properties and the same can be adjudicated only by a competent Court of law. In fact with regard to the question as to the title to the property and nomenclature of the property, the issue was considered in the decisions reported in **Kannan v. Kannan** (1964 K.L.T. 228), **Ibrahim v. Saythumammed** (2013(4) K.L.T. 435) and **Venugopalan Nair v Saraswathy Amma** (2013(4) K.L.T. 717). In all these decisions, it was held that when the matter relates to the title to the suit property or nature of the property, the decision of the survey authorities cannot be treated as final and Section 14 of the Act has no bearing to a suit by the person concerned who is aggrieved by the determination of the nature of the property by the re-survey authorities.

10. It was also held by the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in **Cheriyamad Grama Panchayat v. State of Kerala and others** (2019 (5) KHC 699) that *"Necessarily, we should understand why the legislature has incorporated one year period for instituting a suit for rectification of survey by saving the provisions of limitation for the time being in force - the provisions contained in the Indian Limitation Act, 1908 and the new Act, the Limitation Act, 1963. In fact, by saving the provisions of limitation for the time being in force, the legislature has intended to maintain the period of limitation available to the suits governed by the provisions of limitation for the time being in force (the Indian Limitation Act, 1908 and the new Act, the Limitation Act, 1963) and to restrict the period of limitation to one year for a suit which would squarely come under the purview of S.14 of the Act. A conjoint reading of S.10 and S.14 of the Act would abundantly make it clear that the power vested with the survey officer to determine and record a disputed boundary with reasons confined only to the determination of the disputes regarding fixation of boundary between the owners / sharers out of a large extent*

comprised in a particular survey so as to effect divisions based on ownership within that survey (any particular survey number or sub-division number). It really amounts to drawing a dividing line based on ownership within a particular survey. Necessarily, the survey officer empowered under S.10 of the Act will not have any authority to re - define the boundary lines of a particular survey already settled by old survey records. A right of appeal provided under S.11 of the Act should be understood in reference to the matters which would come under the purview of S.9 and S.10 of the Act so as to have an understanding of the real impact and the power vested under S.9 and S.10 of the Act with the survey officer. The decisions under S.6 and S.7 also brought under the purview of S.11 of the Act for the purpose of appeal, but neither in S.6 nor in S.7 of the Act any power was vested with the survey officer to re - define any boundary line of a particular survey which was already settled and finalised in an earlier survey, except for the purpose of S.5 of the Act. S.5 of the Act deals with the situation wherein certain area was taken away by sea erosion or action of river and the registered holder of the property can apply for a survey of his land which is available after the sea erosion or action of river. S.4 of the Act also permits a survey of the land, but its purpose should be understood in relation to the necessity to have a resurvey, certainly, not for altering the earlier survey records, but for recording the further divisions of property out of a large extent within a particular survey, besides the purpose to be served under S.5 of the Act. The one year period enumerated under S.14 of the Act can only be applied in a suit challenging the determination which would come under the purview of either S.9 or S.10 of the Act, besides S.6 and S.7 of the Act and insofar as S.9 and S.10 are concerned, the determination should be only with respect to the internal arrangement of a particular survey based on ownership

and there is no scope for re - defining the boundary line of a particular survey except for the purpose of S.5 of the Act. If it is with respect to any re - defining of boundary line of a particular survey other than the one under S.5 of the Act, it is without any authority and a suit for rectification of mistake crept in the resurvey re - defining the boundary already settled earlier would stand outside the purview of S.14 of the Act and hence, governed by the provisions of Indian Limitation Act, 1908 and the new Act, Limitation Act, 1963 as well, wherein there will not be any application of one year period provided under S.14 of the Act."

11. Therefore the present suit would not come within the ambit of Section 14 of the Act and is essentially a dispute regarding the title of the plaintiffs over the plaint schedule properties. Therefore, the period of limitation specified in s 14 of the Act would also not apply. The Honourable Apex Court in **Daya Singh and another v. Gurudev Singh (dead) by L.rs and others** (AIR 2010 SC 3240) had held that *"the cause of action for the purposes of Art.58 of the Act accrues only when the right asserted in the suit is infringed or there is atleast a clear and unequivocal threat to infringe that right. Therefore, the mere existence of an adverse entry into the revenue record cannot give rise to cause of action."* Therefore, it cannot be said that the suit for declaration of title would be barred by limitation merely because there is adverse entry in the revenue records and the plaintiff did not file any suit within 3 years of the said entries in the revenue records. The plaint averments would show that the cause of action for instituting the suit arose when the defendants attempted to transfer the plaint schedule Item No. 3 property to third parties and when the information was received by them on 30.07.2015. Therefore it cannot be said that the suit is barred by limitation. It also cannot be said that a civil suit in the facts of the present case is not

maintainable. The upshot of the above discussion is that the suit is maintainable. Hence Issue No. 1 is found in favour of the plaintiffs.

12. **Issue Nos. 2 to 4:** These issues are considered together for brevity and for the sake of convenience. As already stated, the case of the plaintiffs is that the plaint schedule properties belong to them by virtue of Partition Deed No. 1801/1967 of the Aranmula SRO and that they are in possession of the plaint schedule properties. The grievance of the plaintiffs is that a portion of the plaint schedule Properties which is scheduled as Item No. 3 is shown to be a Government Purambokku in resurvey No. 78/18 and that portions of property belonging to third persons were included as the property of the plaintiffs in the resurvey records. The defendants per contra had contended that the property of the plaintiffs is only in Re-survey No. 78/19 and that the property in Re-survey No. 78/18 was part of old Survey No. 164/1F1 and that the same is para purambokku even in the old survey records.

13. In order to substantiate their contentions, the Additional 5th plaintiff in the case was examined as PW1. She filed affidavit in lieu of examination in chief reiterating the plaint averments. Ext A1 is the Power of Attorney executed by additional plaintiffs 3 and no. 4 in favour of PW1. Ext A2 is the partition deed No. 1801/1967 of the Aranmula SRO. Ext A2 would show that the 1st plaintiff had obtained 74 1/2 cents in old Survey No. 164/1A and the 2nd plaintiff obtained 25 cents of property situated at its eastern side. Thus, the plaintiffs together obtained 99.50 cents and the said properties were lying adjacent to each other. The plaintiffs had averred that 70.50 cents out of Item No. 1 property is in old Survey No. 164/1A and 4 cents is in old Survey No. 164/1F7 and 25 cents of and the plaint schedule Item No. 2 property is in old Survey No. 164/1F4. The 2nd defendant in his written statement had also admitted the fact that the plaintiffs

were paying tax for the said extent of properties in the said old survey numbers and the said properties were mutated in the name of the plaintiffs as per the old survey records.

14. The 2nd defendant in the case was examined as DW1. He filed affidavit in lieu of examination in chief reiterating the averments in the written statement. The defendants have not challenged the validity of Ext A2 document. They do not have any case that the plaintiffs did not get any title over the extent of properties as per Ext A2 document. The dispute in the present case pertains to the identity of the plaint schedule properties and whether the property in resurvey No. 78/18 is also part of the properties specified in Ext A2 document. Ext B1 is the resurvey plan with respect to the property in Field No. 78. Ext B2 is the Purambokku register which would show that the property in resurvey No. 78/18 is having an extent of 17.20 ares and is shown as purambokku property in the resurvey records. Ext B3 is the thandapper account No. 204 pertaining to the plaintiffs, which would show that their properties is in resurvey No. 78/19 and is shown to have an extent of 44 ares. It would also show that 4.05 ares and 8.49 ares of property from the same were transferred from the said thandapper account and that the plaintiffs have 31.46 ares of property remaining in the said thandapper account

15. As already stated, the Government has no contention that the plaintiffs have not obtained title over the properties as specified in Ext. A2 document. They are also admitting the fact that 99.50 cents of property as per the old survey records was in the name of the plaintiffs. They had no contention that the same is not based on Ext A2 document. Therefore, it can only be concluded that the plaintiffs have obtained 99.50 cents of property as per Ext A2. The mere fact that the property in old survey no. 164/1F is not stated in Ext A2 is no ground to state that the plaintiffs have not obtained 99.50 cents.

16. The only dispute is regarding the question whether the property in old resurvey no. 78/18 would come within the properties specified in Ext. A2 document. For this said purpose, it is necessary to consider the commission reports and plans filed by PW2 and PW3 who are the Advocate commissioner and surveyor respectively. The properties in resurvey No. 78/18 and 78/19 were identified in Ext. C1 and C1(a). The entire property in old Sy No. 164/1 was also identified in Ext C2 and C2(a) and the same is shown within "A1B1C1D1E1F1G1H1I1J1K1A1" letters it is reported in Ext. C2 that the property shown within "FQPONMLKJIHGF" letters has an extent of 41.35 Ares and said extent of property is the properties specified in Ext. A2 document. It is also reported that the said property comes within re Survey No. 78/18 and 78/19.

17. PW2 had also deposed that the plaint scheduled properties is the specified in Ext. A2 document and that the property shown in Re Sy No. 78/19 also belongs to 3rd parties. It is also reported that the properties in Re Sy No 78/18 and 78/19 are the properties he properties specified in Ext A2 document and the same tallies with the boundary description. PW3 has also deposed that the properties in Re Sy No. 78/18 and 78/19 are lying contiguously and that there are no boundaries separating the said properties. It is also interesting to note that the defendants have also not denied the contention of the plaintiffs that the plaint schedule properties are lying contiguously and are in the possession of the plaintiffs.

18. The resurvey records would show that the property in resurvey is 78/18 is a "Parapurambokku". Ext C2 would shows that there are no rocks in the plaint scheduled in the plaint schedule properties and there are Rubber trees in the plaint schedule properties. PW1 during the course of her cross examination had also denied the suggestion that the property in Re Sy no. 78/18 is a Government purambokku. It

is also deposed by PW1 that the property which contains rocks are situated at western side of the plaint schedule properties and there is a road separating the said properties. When the properties were identified based on the tilted documents in the commission report and plan, and the same would show that the property is Re Sy No 78/18 is also part of the properties specified in Ext. A2 documents, the mere entry in the resurvey records that the property in re sy no. 78/18 is a purambokku property would not nullify the title of the plaintiffs over the said extent of property.

19. PW1 had the deposed during the course of her cross examination had deposed that a portion of the property in resurvey no. 78/19 was transferred to thandapper account number of 2 other persons. Ext. B3 would show that the property is re sy no. 78/19 originally had an extent of 44 ares and that an extent of 4.05 ares was reduced by virtue of the proceedings in 1998 and extent of 8.49 ares was also reduced from the said extent by virtue of proceedings dated 19.12.1998. However Ext B3 does not show that the same was based on any transfer by virtue of a registered document. The defendants also did not produce any document to show that the entries in Ext B3 were made due the execution of some title documents wherein a portion of the properties obtained by the plaintiffs were transferred to 3rd parties due to the execution of some documents by them. The specific case of plaintiffs is that the properties belonging to 3rd persons were also shown as part of the property in resurvey no. 78/19 whereby the actual property of the plaintiffs in resurvey no. 78/18 was not shown as thier property in the resurvey records. A portion of the property of the plaintiffs along with properties of third persons were shown as the property in re sy no. 78/19 and that the same was mutated in favour of the plaintiffs in the re survey records as if the same was the property as per Ext A1

document. The discussion made above would also show that there were mistakes in the resurvey records and that portions of property belonging to 3rd persons were also mutated in favour of the plaintiff in re sy No. 78/19 and the plaint schedule item no 3 property was shown as purambokku property in the resurvey plan.

20. The above discussions would show that the plaintiffs are entitled to get declared in title over the plaint scheduled properties shown within "FQPONMLKJIHGF" letters property in re sy no. 78/18 and 78/19. The resurvey records pertaining the same are erroneous and the entries in the revenue records regarding the same would not effect the title of the plaintiffs over the plaint scheduled properties. When it is found that the entries in the revenue records are found to be erroneous, it is well within the authority of the revenue officials to rectify the mistakes and to make necessary changes in the revenue records. Hence Issue no. 2 to 4 are found accordingly.

21. **Issue No 5:** The plaintiffs have also sought for a decree of perpetual prohibitory injunction restraining the defendants from taking any actions with respect to the plaint scheduled properties based on the re survey records and from doing any actions in the resurvey records affecting the enjoyment of the property. It is already found that the plaintiffs have title over the plaint scheduled properties and that the entries in re sy records are erroneous. It is not in dispute that the plaintiffs are in possession of the plaint schedule properties. The very fact that the defendants denied the right of the plaintiffs over a portion of the plaint schedule properties would itself show that the apprehension of the plaintiffs are well founded. When the entries in the resurvey records are found to be erroneous, the defendants cannot do any actions based on the said erroneous entries with respect to the plaint schedule properties. Therefore, this court is of the opinion that the plaintiffs are also entitled to a decree

of perpetual prohibitory injunction as well. Thus Issue no. 5 is also found in favour of the plaintiffs.

22. **Issue no. 6:** Based on the discussion made above, the suit is liable to be decreed. The general rule is that the costs shall follow the event. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the parties are directed to bear their respective costs.

In the result the suit is decreed as are follows:-

- 1. The title of the plaintiffs over the plaint schedule properties shown within “FQPONMLKJIHGF” letters as shown in Ext C2(a) plan is hereby declared. It is further declared that the entries in the revenue records with respect to the plaint schedule properties would not affect the right of the plaintiffs over the plaint schedule properties.**
- 2. The defendants are restrained by decree of perpetual prohibitory injunction from taking any actions with respect to the plaint scheduled properties based on the re survey records and from being any actions based on the resurvey records affecting the enjoyment of the properties by the plaintiffs.**
- 3. Ext C2(a) shall form part of the record.**
- 4. Parties are directed to bear their respective costs.**

Dictated to the Confidential Assistant, transcribed and typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court on this the 31st day of March, 2026

Sd/-
ARAVIND S.J.,
MUNSIFF

APPENDIX

Exhibits marked for the Plaintiff:

1. Ext.A1 18-01-2024 Original Power of Attorney executed by Additional P3.
2. Ext.A2 10-07-1967 Copy of partition deed No.1801/1967 of Sub Registrar Office, Aranmula.
3. Ext.A3 --- Certified copy of Survey Plan of Field No.176 of Thiruvalla Taluk.

Exhibits marked for the Defendants:

1. Ext.B1 --- Certified copy of Resurvey Plan of Field No.78 of Thiruvalla Village.
2. Ext.B2 --- Copy of Purambokku Register of Field No.78/18 of Thottappuzhasserry Village.
3. ExtB3 --- Copy of Thandapper A/c.No.204 of Thottappuzhasserry Village.

Court Exhibits:

1. Ext.C1 05-09-2023 Commission report prepared and submitted by Advocate Commissioner Adv. P. Harikrishnan.
2. Ext.C1(a) 05-09-2023 Survey Plan prepared by Dinil Divakar, Court Panel Surveyor and submitted by the Advocate Commissioner Adv.P.Harikrishnan.
3. Ext.C2 19-05-2025 Commission report prepared and submitted by the Advocate Commissioner Adv.P.Harikrishnan.
4. Ext.C2(a) 19-05-2025 Survey Plan prepared and submitted by Dinil Divakar, Court Panel Surveyor and submitted by the Advocate Commissioner Adv.P.Harikrishnan.

Witnesses Examined for Plaintiff:

PW1 - Jaya George
 PW2 - P.Harikrishnan
 PW3 - Dinil Divakar

Witnesses Examined for the Defendants:

DW1 - Joji Joseph

Id/-
MUNSIFF

Copied by:Ajith.G
Compared by:

Copy of Judgment in
OS. No.429/2015.

Dated 31-03-2026.