

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MUNSIF, CUDDALORE

Present: Selvi.B.Phebe, B.A.,LLB.,
Additional District Munsif, Cuddalore.
Wednesday, the 29th day of April 2026.
O.S.No.148/2011

Maheswari

.....Plaintiff

-Vs-

1. Arulmigu Saravana Vinayagar and
Selvamuthu Mariamman Temple,
S.N.Chavadi rep. by its fit person.
2. The Assistant Commissioner
H.R & C.E, Cuddalore.
3. The Joint Commissioner,
H.R & C.E, Villupuram.

....Defendants

This suit came up for final hearing before this court on 18.04.2026 in the presence of learned Advocate Mr.S.Ram Mohan for plaintiff, learned Advocate Mr.K.Muthukumar for the 1st defendant, and D2 and D3 were set exparte and upon perusal of records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivers the following:

JUDGMENT

This Suit is filed for Permanent Injunction restraining the defendants, their

men or agents and any persons claiming under them from in any manner disturbing or interfering in the plaintiffs' peaceful Possession and enjoyment of the suit property and for costs.

2. The case of the plaintiffs in brief is as follows:

(i) The suit property in old S.No. 2669/4 and new S.No. 2580 is in possession and enjoyment of plaintiff and his ancestors for more than 80 years. The suit property is a Government Poramboke land. Originally the suit property was in possession and enjoyment of one Mottaiyan who put up a hut and was residing there before 80 years. After his death, his son namely Namachivayam took possession of the suit property. Namachivayam married Krishnammal. Due to their wedlock they had one son namely Siva (alias) Sivanandam who is none other than the husband of the plaintiff. After the Siva's death, plaintiff is in possession of suit property.

(ii) The house in the suit property is also subject to tax and has got an electricity service connection. In O.S.268/1961, the learned District Munsif by his Judgment dated 11.07.1963 had categorically held that the property in survey no: 2669/4 is a Government Poramboke and further held that it does not belong to either the 1st Defendant temple or to the plaintiffs therein. Appeal against the said Judgment in A.S.337/1963 was also dismissed on 18.11.1964. The judgment has

become final and a judgment in Rem.

(iii) While so, on 10.08.2010, the 3rd defendant herein served a notice to the plaintiff u/S. 78 of the H.R&C.E Act as though the plaintiff are the encroachers of the property belonging to the 1st defendant. The 1st defendant has no right or title over the suit property. The 1st defendant on 12.05.2011 came with a group of men and attempted to demolish the house. Hence the suit.

3. The Gist of Written statement filed by the 1st Defendant:

(i) The suit property and other adjoining property originally belonged to the Government. The Government for the support of Pillaiyar Koil and a Chavadi called Saravappa Naicken Dharma Chathiram being the defendant endowed the suit properties and other adjoining properties to one M.Abbai Naidu (Manager). The Inam Commissioner had granted the title on 13.09.1987 by virtue of T.D. No. 2310. The Inam Abolition Tribunal in I.A.T.A.No.88/1971 had categorically found that the suit property and other properties are the temple properties and no individual has a right to get the patta in his favour.

(ii) Dispute arose between the legal heirs of Abbai Naidu and trustees and hence a suit for declaration of title and for recovery of possession was filed in O.S.No.268/1961 wherein it was held that the suit properties are the religious endowments and the suit property is registered in the name of the temples only.

The said suit was dismissed with costs on 11.07.1963. Appeal against the same in A.S.No.337/1963 and S.A.No.1040/1965 was also dismissed on 18.11.1964 and 26.08.1969 respectively observing that the plaintiffs cannot claim individual title at all. The suit survey number and other adjoining numbers stand in the name of defendant Trust.

(iii) The defendant had filed a petition to remove the encroachment under Section 78 of the Act before the Joint Commissioner, H.R. & C.E, Villupuram who has passed an order of eviction on 19.04.2011. As on date there is a legal order of eviction passed against the plaintiffs by proper Forum and the remedy to the plaintiffs is only by way of appeal and not a civil suit. Hence sought to dismiss the suit.

4. Records were perused and the following issues were framed:

1. Whether the suit is maintainable?
 2. Whether the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the suit property?
 3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for Permanent Injunction as prayed for in the suit?
 4. What are the other reliefs that the plaintiff is entitled to?
5. Witness PW1 is examined and Ex.A1 to Ex.A16 were marked on the plaintiff's side and one more additional witnesses were examined as PW2. Witness DW1 is

examined, and ExB1 to ExB7 were marked on defendant's side and two more additional witness is examined as DW2 and DW3.

6. Arguments:

(i) a. **The learned counsel for the plaintiff reiterated the plaintiff averments and argued that** the suit property is a Government Poramboke property which was initially in possession of Mottayan nearly 80 years. Plaintiff is the wife of Mottayan's legal heir. After Siva's death, plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of suit property. The house tax receipts and service connection were in the name of plaintiff. It would prove the possession of the plaintiff. The defendants have not filed any rental receipts to show that the plaintiff is a tenant to the suit property. The defendants claim right through Inam register. However, it does not mention any Survey number. In A.S.No.337/1963, there is a specific observation that the suit property is a government porombokke property. Hence, the defendants have no right over the suit property.

b. The counsel for the plaintiff relied on the following Judgments to substantiate his case:

- The Judgment of the Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of ***Saradha Ammal v. E.Mani*** in **SA.No.302/2019** for the proposition that, the possession and enjoyment is said to have been clearly established when

the opposite party admits that the other party has been residing in suit property and has paid house tax and electricity bill for more than statutory period and the other party has also filed those documents.

- The Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Srinivasan & Ors v. Sri Madhyarjuneswaraswami* reported in **1998(1) CTC 630** for the proposition that, the Civil Court's jurisdiction to adjudicate title of the parties, is not barred by virtue of the provisions of Tamil Nadu Minor Inam (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1963.

(ii) a. The learned counsel for the defendants reiterated the averments in the written statement and argued that, the suit properties originally belonged to government. However, the government endowed the suit property along with other properties for support of Pillaiyar Koil and Chavadi called Saravappa Naicken Dharmachathiram under the grant in TD.No.2310, dated 13.09.1987. In O.S.No.268/1961, the Hon'ble Court observed that the suit properties are religious endowments. Plaintiff has not sought any permission before constructing in the suit property. No documents were filed by the plaintiff to prove that the suit property belongs to government. Revenue officers were also not examined to prove the nature of property. Not even a certificate from Taluk office is filed.

b. Further, Inam abolition tribunal in IATA.No.88/1971 held that, suit properties in S.No.2669/1 and 2669/5 and other properties are temple properties and no individual has right to get Patta in their favour. Further, joint Commissioner of HR & CE Villupuram has passed an order of eviction as against the plaintiff on 19.04.2011, against which the plaintiff is entitled only to prefer a revision and hence this civil suit is not maintainable.

7. Heard both sides. Perused the records.

8. Analysis:

(i) The case of the plaintiff is that, the suit property in S.No.2669/4 is the Government Porambokke property. It was in possession and enjoyment of Mottaiyan for nearly 80 years. After the death of Mottaiyan it came into the hands of his legal heirs and now the plaintiff is in possession of suit property. Plaintiff's husband built a RCC building in the suit property. The said house is subject to property tax and has EB connection. On 10.08.2010 the defendant sent notice u.S.78 of T.N. HR & CE Act stating that the plaintiff has encroached the suit property. On 12.05.2011 the defendants attempted to demolish the house in the suit property. To prove the plaintiff's case, she has relied on ExA1 to ExA16 and has examined herself as PW1.

(ii) **ExA1** is the Housewarming Ceremony Invitation dated 15.09.1994.

ExA2 is the Death Certificate of Siva dated 23.10.2006 which mentions the address of the deceased as 28C, SN Chavadi, Semmandalam, Cuddalore. **ExA3** is the Death Certificate dated 26.09.1994 of Krishnammal which again mentions the address of the deceased as 28C, SN Chavadi, Semmandalam, Cuddalore. **ExA4** to **ExA13** are the Tax receipts for tax assessment No.1083 in the name of Kannammal W/o.Mottaiyan, Siva, Krishnammal and Maheswari for the period 1976 to 2009. **ExA14** is the Hand Book for the property tax in the name of Krishnammal for tax assessment No.83, for Door No.26S. **ExA15** is the Electricity Bills for connection No.107 in the name of Krishnammal for the period 1995 to 2005. **ExA16** is the Family Card of the Plaintiff it shows the Door No.28C.

(iii) **Contrarily**, the case of the defendant is that, suit property and other adjoining property belong to government originally which was endowed to Saravappa Naickan Dharmachathiram as a Inam under T.D.No.2310 dated 13.09.1987 by Inam Commissioner. Plaintiff has encroached the temple property. Hence, the Joint Commissioner HR & CE Villupuram passed an eviction order against the plaintiff on 19.04.2011. When there is an eviction order by Joint Commissioner, the plaintiff's only remedy is to prefer a revision and the Civil suit is not maintainable. To prove their case, the defendants has examined the Thakkar of Temple as DW1 and DW2 and has examined an additional witness as DW3. Further the defendants have relied upon ExB1 to ExB7 to prove their case.

(iv) **ExB1** is the Decree in O.S.No.268/1961 dated 11.07.1963. **ExB2** is the Judgment in O.S.No.268/1961 dated 11.07.1963. **ExB3** is the Decree in A.S.No.337/1963 dated 18.11.1964. **ExB4** is the Judgment in A.S.No.337/1963 dated 18.11.1964. **ExB5** is the Register of Inam in the Village of Gondur which mentions acre 2.33 cents and acre 0.4 cents as religious and charitable property. Further it shows that certain conditions were imposed for Inam as it mentions “Confirmed as long as condition of grant are fulfilled” but the conditions of Inam were not in the register. **ExB6** is the Judgment in S.A.180/2021 and C.M.P.3712/2021 dated 15.02.2023. **ExB7** is the Decree in S.A.180/2021 dated 15.02.2023 which setted aside the Judgment and decree in AS.No.66/2016 and OS.No.134/2010 and directed the 1st respondent there in to deliver the suit property through court holding that the suit properties are Trust properties. Further Permanent Injunction was granted against the 1st respondent and Mandatory Injunction was granted against the 2nd respondent to cancel the Sale Deed. ExB6 and ExB7 pertains to properties in S.No.2669/1 and 2669/3 comprised in T.S.No.2577 and 2581 respectively.

9. Issue No.1:

➤ *Whether the suit is maintainable?*

(i) The defendants raise a specific plea that the civil suit is not maintainable in view of the eviction order by the Joint commissioner as against the

Plaintiff on 19.04.2011. However, it is pertinent to note that neither the defendants nor the plaintiff has filed the said eviction order. The plaintiff admits that a notice under S. 78 of T.N. H.R. & C.E Act was issued to her. However, she is not aware of the exparte eviction order passed against her. Since the issue is on maintainability of suit, it would be apt to refer to the relevant provisions of the T.N H.R. & C.E Act.

(ii) S. 78 of the T.N. H.R. & C.E. Act, 1959 deals with encroachment by persons on land or building belonging to charitable or religious institution or endowment and the eviction of encroachers. The said provision empowers the Joint Commissioner to pass orders to remove the encroachment and deliver possession of the property (land or building or space) after due inquiry.

(iii) S. 79 of the T.N. H.R. & C.E. Act deals with the mode of eviction on failure of removal of the encroachment as directed by the Joint Commissioner. This provision bars the civil court from granting injunction in respect of any proceeding taken or about to be taken by the Joint Commissioner under Section 78. However, it is pertinent to note that this provision, does not bar the aggrieved person to institute suit to establish that the religious institution or endowment has no title to the property. The proviso clause, states that such suit shall not be instituted by a person who is let into possession of the property or who is a lessee, licensee or mortgagee, of the religious institution or endowment.

(iv) S. 108 of the T.N. H.R. & C.E. Act bars suits in respect of administration or management of religious institutions or any other matter or dispute for determining or deciding which provision is made in the Act.

(v) S. 109 of the T.N. H.R. & C.E. Act provides that The Limitation Act, 1963 does not apply to any suit for possession of immovable property belonging to any religious institution or for possession of any interest in such property.

(vi) A conjoint reading of sections 78, 79, 108 and 109 of the Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1959 will make it clear that even if an eviction order is passed by the Joint Commissioner, the aggrieved persons are entitled to institute a suit contending that the suit temple has no right over the suit property.

(vii) Further it is a settled principle of law that, when the question is raised in any matter that the jurisdiction of a Civil Court to entertain a suit is barred, that question has to be examined bearing in mind the general presumption in favour of the jurisdiction of the Civil Court. It has often been stated that the proper Tribunal for determination of disputes as to rights and properties are Civil Courts and the right of a person to have recourse to a Civil Court should not be whittled down unless it is expressly or by necessary implication barred by a statute. The above proposition has been reiterated in the case of *Samba Nataraja Deekshitar v. Kalyana Sabesa Dikshidar* reported in **1968 (1) MLJ 153**.

(viii) In the light of all the above discussions and in view of S. 79(2) of the T.N.H.R.& C.E. Act, this court is of the view that the civil suit is maintainable.

Issue No. 1 is answered accordingly.

10. Issue No 2 & 3:

➤ *Whether the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the suit property?*

➤ *Whether the plaintiff is entitled for Permanent Injunction as prayed for in the suit?*

(i) As for the issue of possession, there is no dispute. Even the defendants admit that plaintiff is in possession of the suit property. However, the defendants claim that the plaintiff has encroached the suit property. The plaintiff has clearly established her possession to the suit property since 1976 vide **ExA4** to **ExA13** and **Ex. A15** which are the Tax receipts for tax assessment No.1083 in the name of Kannammal W/o.Mottaiyan, Siva, Krishnammal and Maheswari for the period 1976 to 2009 and Electricity Bills for connection No.107 in the name of Krishnammal for the period 1995 to 2005 respectively.

(ii) As the present case involves dispute as to the nature of property and the right of aggrieved, this court proceeds to decide the same, as there is a specific bar under T.N.H.R. & C.E Act to not pass any injunction as against

the order of the Joint Commissioner and also the Act exempts application of the Limitation Act to the Temple properties.

(iii) The plaintiff claim that the suit property belongs to the government. Contrarily, the defendants claim that the suit property belongs to the Temple. Surprisingly, both the parties rely on the same documents, i.e. Judgment and decree in O.S.No.298/1961, A.S.No.337/1963 to prove their respective claims as to ownership of the property. Firstly, it has to be ascertained as to whether the temple has right over the suit property in light of the Judgments in above suits. The suit in O.S.No.298/1961 was instituted by the Legal Heirs of Abbai Naidu for declaration of title and recovery of possession with mesne profit and for costs as against trustee of the Temple.

(iv) The Hon'ble District Munsif Court in its Judgment in O.S.No.268/1961 has observed that the suit properties therein (S.No. 2669/4) are Religious Endowments within the provisions of Sec.6 Clause 17. However, held that the deputy commissioner alone has to decide the dispute with regard to the property in dispute as the court had no jurisdiction to try this suit under Section 108 of the T.N.H.R.&C.E Act. Eventually the suit was dismissed.

(v) As against the above Judgment, appeal was preferred in A.S.No.337/1963 in which the Hon'ble Subordinate Judge of

Cuddalore has observed and held as follows:

“The Inam property lay to the east and south west of T.S.No.2669/4. The Inam land was part of chathiram property and the Inam property was not T.S.No.2669/4. Strangely enough, we find that T.S.No.2669/4 which is an extensive survey number is shown as Government property in ExA2. I find that ExA2 reads as though the suit property is still Government property.

In my opinion, the trustees for the perumal koil have been in possession of the property which, as yet, has not been assigned by Government in favour of the Perumal Koil. The possessory title has been with the trustees of perumal koil...”

(vi) As for the Judgment of Hon’ble Madras High Court in S.A.No.180/2021 is concerned, it pertains to another survey number 2577 (old No.2669/1) and 2581 (old No.2669/5) and hence irrelevant to the present case.

(vii) Combined reading of all the above Judgments leads to one conclusion that only the possession of the suit property was with the temple earlier. The Hon’ble Subordinate Judge of Cuddalore in A.S. No. 337/1963 has found that the suit property was not assigned by the government in favor of the temple. However, observed that the possessory title was with the trustees. Further the Hon’ble Court has found that the suit property in S.No.2669/4 was not given under Inam.

(viii) The above observation by the Hon'ble Courts corroborates with the evidence adduced in the present case. ExB5 is the Register of Inam in the Village of Gondur which mentions acre 2.33 cents and acre 0.4 cents as religious and charitable property. But fails to mention the survey number of the property given under Inam. Further the temple mentioned herein is "Saravana Vinayagar and Selvamuthu Mariamman Temple". However, the Inam Register specifies the temple only as Pillaiyar Temple.

(ix) The above facts are even admitted by the temple authorities. The relevant excerpt from the evidence of DW1 is as follows, (The following evidence was recorded in O.S.No.80/2010, in which the temple is the plaintiff, and the said suit was taken up for common trial along with the connected batch matters):

“வ.சா.7 தவிர வழக்குச் சொத்து கோயிலுக்கு பாத்தியப்பட்டது என்பதை காட்ட வேறு ஆவணங்கள் இல்லை என்றால் சரிதான். வா.த.சா.7-ல் சர்வே நம்பர் 2669/4 உள்ளதா என்றால் இல்லை. கோயிலுக்கு தாவா சொத்தின் மீது எந்த வித உரிமையும் இல்லாததால் தான் நாங்கள் போருரிமை கேட்கவில்லை என்றால் சரியல்ல. நாங்கள் தாக்கல் செய்துள்ள ஆட்சேபனையில் வாதிகளுக்கு சொத்தின் மீது Title இல்லை என எங்காவது சொல்லியுள்ளோமா என்றால் இல்லை.”

(x) Further in the Inam register submitted by the plaintiffs the Survey number and boundaries are not mentioned. Further the last page of the Inam register mentions “Submitted to the Inam Commissioner with the recommendation that a title deed be issued in the name of institution mentioned in col.11-20.” and “Confirmed as long as condition of grant are fulfilled”. However, it is not known whether any title deed was issued with respect to the suit property.

(xi) At this juncture it would be apt to refer to the Judgment of Hon’ble Madras High Court in the case of *Arulmighu Kallalagar Thirukoil, Alargarkoil by its Executive officer v. S.S.Rajaram* reported in **2026(2) CTC 874**. It is a case of similar nature where, the temple seeks mandatory injunction, recovery of possession and permanent injunction against private parties based on Inam register and Settlement register. The Hon’ble Court therein has held that Inam Fair Register is not a document of title. Further held that the temple has to file proper title deeds to prove their right and has to stand in its own leg. In light of all the above discussions, this court is of the view that ExB5 serves no useful purpose to prove the ownership of the plaintiffs.

(xi) Apart from the above, the DW1 have also admitted that no rental agreement existed between the plaintiff and the temple. The DW1 further admitted that no rents were received by the temple from the plaintiff. The relevant excerpt is as follows:

“03.04.2009 க்கு முன்பாக வாதிகள் தாவா சொத்தில் கோயிலின் வாடகை தாரராக இருந்தார்கள் என காட்டுவதற்கு ஆவணம் ஏதாவது தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளோமா என்றால் இல்லை. 03.04.2009-க்கு முன்பாக சொத்தை திரும்ப கேட்டு வாதிகளுக்கு அறிவிப்பு ஏதாவது கொடுத்தோமா என்றால் இல்லை.”

(xii) DW1 in her evidence further states that there is a house in the suit property aged about 20 years and no authorities from temple objected building the same.

“அந்த கட்டிடத்தின் வயது 20 ஆண்டுகள் இருக்குமா என்றால் இருக்கும். அந்த கட்டிடம் கட்டும்போது கோயிலில் நிர்வாகமோ அல்லது இந்து அறநிலை துறையோ எழுத்து பூர்வமான ஆட்சேபனை ஏதாவது தெரிவித்தா என்றால் இல்லை.”

(xiii) DW1 has also admitted that plaintiff is in possession of the suit property. The relevant excerpt is as follows:

“நமச்சிவாயம் இறந்தபின்பு, அவர் மனைபி கிருஷ்ணம்மாள் மற்றும் மசன் சிவா (எ) சிவானந்தம் ரூ.10 லட்சம் செலவு செய்து ஒரு கட்டிடம் கட்டினார்கள் என்றால் அதுபற்றி எனக்கு தெரியாது. அதில் கீழ்தளம் மட்டும் உள்ளது. அதில் வாதி குடியிருக்கிறார்.”

(xiv) Apart from the above evidence, DW2, again yet another Thakkar of the temple deposed that suit house was assessed of tax and those houses were there for nearly 50 years. She also admitted that no rents were

received from the 15 houses and no rental agreements were entered into between them. She even admitted that suit was not instituted against all the alleged encroachers.

“இந்த வீடுகளுக்கு நகராட்சி தனித்தனியாக வரி வசூலித்து வருகிறது என்றால் சரிதான். இந்த வீடுகள் சுமார் 50 ஆண்டு காலமாக இருக்கிறது என்றால் சரிதான். கோயிலில் இருந்து அந்த வீடுகளுக்கு வாடகை வாங்கப்பட்டதா என்றால் அந்த 15 வீடுகளில் இருந்தும் நாங்கள் வாடகை வாங்கவில்லை. அந்த 15 வீட்டுகாரர்களுக்கும் எங்களுக்கும் வாடகை ஒப்பந்தம் இல்லை என்றாலும் தற்போது 4 வீட்டு உரிமையாளர்கள் மீது மட்டும் தான் வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளோம் என்றாலும் சரிதான்.”

(xv) Further DW3 in his chief states that plaintiff is a defaulter. However, in his cross contradicts the same by stating that he has not seen any document regarding rent.

(xvi) As for the issue whether government should have been impleaded in the bare injunction suit, when one claims that the suit property is a government poromboke and sues for prohibitory injunction against the third party, answer is no more res integra and non-impleadment of government is not fatal to the case. The Hon'ble Madras High Court in the case of *Deivanai Vs. J.Masilamani Reddi and Kannammal* reported in 2016 (1) MWN (Civil) 471 has

held that Government is always at liberty to evict trespasser. But, the person who is in occupation of the Government land and has been paying penalty to the Government is certainly entitled to maintain a suit for permanent injunction against a third party by which he can protect his possession. In the present case, the plaintiffs are paying property taxes and have established their possession to the suit property which is even admitted by the defendants. That being the case, when the defendant has failed to establish their right to suit property, the plaintiff is entitled to protect his possession as against him. If the Government intends to take possession of the land in question, the Government is always at liberty to evict the plaintiff by following the procedure established by law.

(xvii) The above proposition has also been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rame Gowda (dead) by Lrs Vs. M.Varadappa Naidu (Dead) by Lrs., and Another*** reported in **2004 (1) SCC 769**, as follows:-

“If a person proved his settled possession in a property, which belongs to the government, he is entitled to avail the relief of injunction against the person, who attempted to trespass in the settled possession. No doubt, here it is a case the property belongs to the Government. Being the owner of the land, the Government, is entitled to take necessary action against the plaintiffs for recovering the possession, but the government has not initiated any steps for recovering the suit

schedule property, therefore, the defendant, being neighboring land owner, does not have any right to cause disturbance to the possession of the plaintiffs”.

(xviii) In light of all the above discussions this court is of the view that the plaintiff has clearly established her possession in the suit property. The defendants have failed to establish their right over the suit property. That being the case, the plaintiffs are entitled to protect their possessory right through injunction.

In fine, Issue No. 2 and 3 are answered in favor of the plaintiffs.

11. Issue No: 4:

➤ *What are the other reliefs that the plaintiff is entitled to?*

The plaintiffs are not entitled to any other reliefs. Issue No. 4 is answered accordingly.

In fine, Suit is decreed, Permanent Injunction is granted restraining the defendants, their men or agents and any persons claiming under them from in any manner disturbing or interfering in the plaintiffs' peaceful Possession and enjoyment of the suit property. No order as to costs.

Dictated by me and directly typed in the computer by Steno typist and

printed out by her and corrected and pronounced by me in open court, on this day, the 29th day of April 2026.

Additional District Munsif,
Cuddalore.

List of Witnesses on Plaintiffs' side:

PW1	Mrs.Maheswari, S/o.Sivanantham (Plaintiff)
------------	--

List of Documents on Plaintiffs' side:

ExA1	15.09.1994	Housewarming Invitation	Original
ExA2	26.09.1994	Death Certificate of Krishnammal	Copy
ExA3	23.10.2006	Death Certificate of Siva	Copy
ExA4	12.08.1976	Tax receipt in the name of Kannaiyan	Original
ExA5	-	Tax receipt in the name of Siva	Copy
ExA6	01.02.1995	Tax receipt in the name of Sivanantham	Original
ExA7	09.06.1995	Tax receipt in the name of Siva	Original
ExA8	08.01.1997	Tax receipt in the name of Siva	Original
ExA9	08.01.1998	Tax receipt in the name of Maheswari	Original
ExA10	05.01.1999	Tax receipt in the name of Maheswari	Original
ExA11	03.01.2000	Tax receipt in the name of	Original

		Sivanantham	
ExA12	27.03.2000	Tax receipt in the name of Siva	Original
ExA13	16.07.2009	Tax receipt in the name of Krishnammal	Original
ExA14	-	Hand Book for the property tax	Original
ExA15	-	Electricity Bills	Original
ExA16	-	Family Card of the Plaintiff	Copy

List of Witnesses on Defendant's side:

DW1	Mrs.Muthulakshmi, D/o.Paramasivam.
DW2	MrS.Devaki, D/o.Annappan. (Executive Officer - Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Department)
DW3	Mr.Murugan, S/o.Kuppusamy.

List of Documents on Defendants side:

ExB1	11.07.1963	Decree in O.S.No.268/1961 on the file of District Munsif Court, Cuddalore	Certified Copy
ExB2	11.07.1963	Judgment in O.S.No.268/1961 on the file of District Munsif Court, Cuddalore	Certified Copy

ExB3	18.11.1964	Decree in A.S.No.337/1963 on the file of Subordinate Judge of Cuddalore.	Certified Copy
ExB4	18.11.1964	Judgment in A.S.No.337/1963 on the file of Subordinate Judge of Cuddalore.	Certified Copy
ExB5	-	Register of Inams in the Village of Kondur (No.19)	Copy
ExB6	15.02.2023	Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in S.A.No.180/2021	Certified Copy
ExB7	15.02.2023	Decree of Hon'ble High Court of Madras in S.A.No.180/2021	Certified Copy

Additional District Munsif,
Cuddalore.

ADM Court, Cuddalore.
Fair Judgment
