

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF OF SULUR

PRESENT: Tmt.M.Santhosham., B.Sc., B.L.,

District Munsif, Sulur.

Tuesday the 21th day of April 2026

Original Suit No.234/2022

(CNR.No.170002762022)

Mrs. Deivasigamani

.. Plaintiffs

Vs.

1) Sivagami

2) Leelavathi

3) Maheswari

4) Kamalraj

5) Gopalakrishnan

6) Maragatham

7)/ Marathal

8) Ramasamy

9) Easwaramoorthy

10) Chenniappan

11) Saraswathi

12) Gokilamani

13) Shanmugasundaram

14) Maratthal

15) Nataraj

- 16) Suganthi
- 17) Suresh
- 18) Sundrambal
- 19) Ambigavathi
- 20) Yuvaraj
- 21) Bagyalakshmi
- 22) Thulasiammal
- 23) Rajkumar
- 24) D.Gopalsamy
- 25) R.Saraswathi
- 26) J.Shanthamani
- 27) S.Vijayalakshmi
- 28) R.Azhagammal
- 29) V.Srinivasan

..Defendants

This is suit coming on final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.R.Ramalingam Advocate for the plaintiff, and Thiru.M.Ganesh Kumar Advocate for D3 to D5, and Thiru.P.K.Prabhuram Advocate for D25 to D29 and D1, D2, D6 to D24 called absent set to exparte and this court delivered the following

JUDGMENT

Suit for declaring the alleged Sale Deed, dated 04.09.2006 in respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No.9472/2008 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by the defendants No. 1 and 2 herein and their father Ganapathiappan in favour of one P.Sundramoorthy, is null and void, invalid

and not binding on the plaintiff and the alleged Power of Attorney, dated 18.03.2008 in respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No.332/2008/2008 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by Kaliappa Gounder, Subramanian, Senniappan, Rangasamy, Nataraj the defendants 7 to 9 herein In favour of one Rangasamy, is null and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and the alleged sale deed, dated 05.06.2008 in respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No.5391/2008 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by Rangasamy in favour of the defendant No.20 is null and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and the alleged sale deed, dated 10.06.2008 in respect of a portion of the sult property vide document No. No.5674/2008 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by Rangasamy in favour of the defendant No.24 is null and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and the alleged sale deed, dated 20.06.2008 in respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No. 6109/2008 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by Rangasamy in favour of the defendant No.20 is null and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and the alleged sale deed, dated 24.10.2008 in respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No. No. 11116/2008 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by the defendants 20 and 24 in favour of the defendant No.25 is null and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and the alleged sale deed, dated 24.10.2008 in respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No. 11117/2008 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by the defendants 20 and 24 in favour of the defendant No.26 is null and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and declaring the alleged sale deed, dated 03.07.2017 In respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No. No.4499/2017 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by the defendant No. In favour of the defendant No.27 is null and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and declaring the alleged sale deed, dated 03.07.2017 in respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No. No.4500/2017 on the file of the SRO, Sular, which is purportedly executed by the defendant No. in favour of the defendant No.28 is null

and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and the alleged sale deed, dated 03.07.2017 in respect of a portion of the suit property vide document No. No.4501/2017 on on the file of the SRO, Sulur, which is purportedly executed by the defendant No. in favour of the defendant No.29 is null and void, invalid and not binding on the plaintiff; and the plaintiff is the absolute owner of the suit property and for a consequential relief of injunction restraining the defendants from in any manner disturbing the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property and Permanent Injunction to restraining the defendants No. 29 to 31 their agents, servants and any persons claiming under them from in any manner whatsoever encumbering or alienating the suit properties and cost of the suit.

Amendment Carried out. Suit value is Exceed beyond the pecuniary Jurisdiction of this court. Hence this plaint is Returned. The plaintiff is directed to file before Appropriate Jurisdictional Court.

Pronounced by me of this open court this the 21th day of April 2026.

Sd./M.Santhosham
District Munsif,
Sulur.