

**IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
CHENGALPATTU DISTRICT.**

Present : **Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,**
Principal District Judge, Chengalpattu.

Tuesday the 12th day of August, 2025

Original Suit No.43 of 2014

CNR.No.TNCG01-000103-2014

Lakshmi Ammal

. . . Plaintiff.

/Vs/

1. Sivagami
2. Jayanthi
3. Kanniammal
4. Lokesh
5. Anandhi
6. The Sub Registrar,
Velachery.
7. The District Registrar,
Chennai South.

. . . Defendants.

This suit came up before me for final hearing on 19.7.2025, in the presence of Tvl.N.K.Sankaranarayanan and R.Sivachandran, Advocates for the plaintiff, Thiru.V.Rajkumar, Advocate for the 1st and 2nd defendants, Thiru.C.Russel Raj, Advocate for the 3rd to 5th defendants, Thiru.K.S.Anbazhagan, Government Pleader for the 6th and 7th

defendants, *thereafter the 6th and 7th defendants set exparte*, upon hearing the arguments of both side counsels, perusing the entire case records and having stood over the matter for consideration till this day, this court delivers the following,

JUDGMENT

This suit is filed by the plaintiff under Order 7 Rule 1 CPC, (i) to pass a preliminary decree and judgment for partition of suit property into 16 shares and to allot 5/16 shares to the plaintiff, 4/16 separate shares to each of the 1st and 2nd defendants and 3/16 shares to the defendants 3 to 5 jointly, (ii) to pass a final decree by allotting the separate shares of plaintiff and the defendants with metes and bounds, (iii) for declaration declaring the settlement deed dated 28.3.2002 bearing document No.1424/2002 executed by the deceased Sekar in favour of the 3rd defendant as null and void and not binding on the plaintiff and (iv) for cost of the suit.

2. The averments set out in the plaint filed by the plaintiff in brief read as follows :

The suit property is a house site and hut thereon situated at Puzhuthivakkam Village, erstwhile Tambaram, Kancheepuram District, comprised in Paimash No.952/7 and survey No.10/11 of an extent of 3690 square feet. Originally the part of the suit property about an extent of 1710 square feet was owned, possessed and enjoyed by one Govinda Naicker who is the husband of the plaintiff, father of the 1st and 2nd defendants,

father-in-law of 3rd defendant and grand-father of the 4th and 5th defendants. The said Govinda Naicker had purchased adjacent property to an extent of 1980 square feet from and out of his own funds under a sale deed dated 30.5.1974 vide document No.920/1974 in the name of his minor son Sekar who was 7 years old at that time. Even though the property was purchased in the name of minor son, the entire extent of the property was held as joint family property and all the joint family members were in absolute possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The said Govinda Naicker, husband of plaintiff died intestate in the year 1986 leaving behind his wife, the plaintiff, two daughters, the 1st and 2nd defendants and a son Sekar. After the death of Govinda Naicker, the said legal heirs had inherited the suit property for their respective undivided share of 1/4th share each and continued to possess and enjoy the suit property as a joint family property. The original sale deed dated 30.5.1974, death certificate and legal heirship certificate of deceased Govinda Naicker are in the hands of the 3rd defendant. In the said circumstances, one of the legal heirs of the deceased Govinda Naicker viz., Sekar died on 22.7.2007 leaving behind his mother, the plaintiff, his wife the 3rd defendant and his children the 4th and 5th defendants as his legal heirs. The death certificate and legal heir certificate of deceased Sekar are in the hands of 3rd defendant. The plaintiff is residing in a thatched hut erected in the suit property till now. Nobody is taking care of the plaintiff and she is struggling to lead her life. Though the

plaintiff's daughters may come once in a month to visit the plaintiff, they had not chosen to take the plaintiff with them. Further in the year of 2007, the 3rd defendant had disconnected the electricity service connection provided to the suit property and the plaintiff is now residing there without having electricity power. In the said circumstances, the plaintiff had demanded to divide the suit property amicably. Even though the 1st and 2nd defendants are willing to divide, there were no effective reply from the defendants 3 to 5. Finally in the last week of January 2014, when the plaintiff had demanded for a partition, the 3rd defendant had refused to divide the suit property and further informed that her husband had settled the suit property in her favour. Immediately when the plaintiff had applied for encumbrance certificate, she found that her son Sekar had executed a settlement deed dated 28.3.2002 vide document No.1424/2002 in favour of 3rd defendant. The recital of the settlement deed shows that the executant Sekar had purchased the suit property out of his own fund. However, the deceased Sekar was 7 years old at the time of purchase of part of the suit property. Thereby the said deed was illegally executed. The plaintiff is not a party to the said settlement deed. Thereby the settlement deed has to be declared as null and void. The act of the 3rd defendant is nothing but an attempt to defeat other co-sharers' right and interest over the suit property. The 6th defendant who is the authority to register the documents should have look into the contents of the documents but failed to do so. Now the

defendants 3 to 5 are making attempts to defeat the plaintiff's right over the suit property by attempting to evict the plaintiff from the suit property with a view to alienate the same. The 3rd defendant and her husband had played fraud. After the death of her husband Govinda Naicker, the plaintiff had inherited 1/4th right over the entire extent of the suit property. Further after the death of her son Sekar, she had inherited 1/4th right over the property derived by deceased Sekar. Thereby the plaintiff is entitled to 5/16th right and interest over the suit property. Further the 1st and 2nd defendants are each entitled to have 4/16 shares over the suit property. The defendants 3 to 5 are jointly entitled to have 3/16 shares over the suit property. Being registering authorities, the 6th and 7th defendants are added as parties to the proceedings. Pending the suit on 13.10.2021 the 3rd defendant has mutated the revenue records in her name vide patta No.22003f and thereby a new survey No.10/11B has been allotted to the suit property. Hence, the suit. *(Plaint amended as per Order dated 30.2.2024 in I.A.No.11/2024.)*

3. The averments set out in the written statement filed by the 1st and 2nd defendants in brief read as follows :

The 1st and 2nd defendants admit that the suit property is the joint family property of the plaintiff and the defendants 1 to 5 and they are in joint possession and enjoyment of the suit property as co-parceners and co-sharers. The 1st and 2nd defendant are entitled for 8/16th share over the suit property and they are willing to divide the suit property. However, the

defendants 3 to 5 are not co-operating though the defendants 1 and 2 had approached them for partition of the suit property. Having aware of the hiked value of the land in the locality, the defendants 3 to 5 are making all their attempts and threatening these defendants from being getting their share in the suit property by conducting katta panchayat through local elements on several occasions. The defendants 3 to 5 have pressurized the 1st and 2nd defendants to receive meager amount instead of their share over the suit property. Hence, prayed to decree the suit for their respective shares.

4. The averments set out in the written statement filed by the defendants 3 to 5 in brief read as follows :

The plaintiff and the defendants 1 and 2 have colluded and filed the suit. It is the fact that Late.Govinda Naicker spent a huge amount of money for the marriage and other welfare of the defendants 1 and 2. As there is no other property left for his tender age child Late.Sekar, his father Govinda Naicker purchased the 1980 sq.ft., property for his son. The defendants 1 and 2 were married very long back and even at the death of their father Late.Govinda Naicker, they have not come for his funeral. The plaintiff has been under the care and control of Late.Sekar. After the death of Late.Sekar, the plaintiff has been living with the defendants 3 to 5. Only 2 years back the defendants 1 and 2 met the plaintiff and poisoned her mind by way of ill talk and taken their mother in their custody. The said act is

only to grab money from the defendants 3 to 5. The alleged thatched hut in the suit property has been kept unused and no one can live in the said building and the electricity connection was disconnected by the concerned authorities as there was no utility for the electricity service connection. The defendants 1 and 2 have no right over the suit property. The property other than the 1980 sq.ft., was a neighboring property which was purchased in the name of the 3rd defendant by her father's money. All together the entire property was settled through document No.142/2002 in favour of 3rd defendant by her husband Late.Sekar and the defendants 3 to 5 are enjoying the suit property. The defendants 3 to 5 are ready to give food and shelter to the plaintiff and they have no idea to leave alone the plaintiff and the plaintiff is also having good relationship with the defendants 3 to 5. Only by the mislead of defendants 1 and 2, the plaintiff has filed this suit. Hence, prayed for dismissal of suit.

5. Upon the averments in the plaint and written statements, this court has framed the following issues :

- 1) Whether the plaintiff is entitled to 5/16th share in the suit schedule property?
- 2) Whether the suit has been filed by the plaintiff in collusion with defendants 1 and 2?
- 3) To what other relief the plaintiff is entitled?

6. On the side of the plaintiff, the plaintiff has examined herself as PW1 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A17 have been marked. On the side of the defendants, the 3rd defendant has examined herself as DW1 and Ex.B1 to Ex.B4 have been marked through her.

6. The crux of the written arguments filed by the plaintiff in brief reads as follows :

The boundaries described in the schedule of Ex.A1 i.e., the sale deed in Doc.No.920/1974 itself is evident for the suit claim. The boundaries are shown as follows:

"சக்பந்தி விவரம் - அதாவது கோவிந்த நாயக்கர் வீட்டுக்கு மேற்கு, சி.குப்பன் வீட்டுக்கு கிழக்கு, ரோட்டுக்கு வடக்கு, கோவிந்த நாயக்கர் நிலத்துக்கு தெற்கு."

According to the boundaries of the above said document, Govinda Naicker had property on the Western and Northern side of the property. The 3rd defendant in her cross examination dated 5.9.2022 deposed as under.

“என்னுடைய கணவரின் இறப்பு சான்றிதழ், வாரிசு சான்றிதழ் என் வசம் உள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். வாரிசு சான்றிதழில் என்னுடைய பெயர் கன்னியம்மாள், என்னுடைய மகன் பெயர் லோகேஷ், என்னுடைய மகள் ஆனந்தி மற்றும் என்னுடைய மாமியார் லட்சுமியம்மாள் பெயரும் உள்ளது.”

The plaintiff is residing in a thatched hut which is erected in the suit property even till now. The plaintiff's bank passbook marked as Ex.A2, adhaar card of the plaintiff marked as Ex.A9 and voter ID of the plaintiff

marked as Ex.A10 contain the address of the suit property. On 13.11.2013 the hut in the suit property got afire and thereafter the plaintiff again thatched the hut. The CSR has been marked as Ex.A3, the certificate issued by Tahsildhar has been marked as Ex.A4 and the photographs with compact disc has been marked as Ex.A12. The encumbrance certificates series 1 to 3 have been marked as Ex.A5 to Ex.A7 and the settlement deed executed by Late.Sekar in favour of 3rd defendant has been marked as Ex.A8. The recital of Ex.A8 shows as to the age of the executant Sekar as "திரு.கோவிந்தன் நாயக்கர் அவர்களின் குமாரர் சுமார் 35 வயதுள்ள திரு.G.சேகர் ஆகிய நான் மனப்பூர்வமாய் சம்மதித்து கீழ்க்கண்ட சாட்சிகள் முன்னிலையில் எழுதிக்கொடுத்த"

If it was so, his age was 7 years on 30.5.1974 when Ex.A1 was executed. Thereby it proves that the recitals of the deed itself are concocted. The plaintiff came to know the illegal act of the 3rd defendant very recently i.e., last week of January 2014 that without the consent from the plaintiff and other co-sharers, she and her husband Late.Sekar had created the illegal settlement deed. The 3rd defendant / DW1 in her cross examination dated 5.9.2022 has deliberately denied the possession of suit property to an extent of 1,710 sq.ft., by plaintiff's husband Govinda Naicker. The age of the deceased Sekar has been admitted by the 3rd defendant. However, the 3rd defendant / DW1 has deliberately denied the same in her cross examination dated 5.9.2022. In fact, the defendants 1 and

2 were with their father Govinda Naicker till his death and the 3rd defendant has no knowledge as to the fact and the same has been admitted by the 3rd defendant / DW1 in her cross examination dated 5.9.2022. The 3rd defendant did not choose to produce any documentary evidence before this court that the 1,980 sq.ft., was a neighboring property which was purchased in the name of the 3rd defendant by her father's money. The property purchased in the name of a minor is always a family property and it cannot be treated as his exclusive property. Each and every member of the family is entitled to have their respective shares in the property. Thereby the plaintiff is entitled for the reliefs sought for in the present original suit. The plaintiff is relying on the Judgement rendered by the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh (Gwalior Bench) in the case of ***Ramnaresh jain Vs. Haresh Jain and Others*** reported in **2013 CJ(MP) (8) 128**. She also is relying upon a judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Vinod Kumar Dhali Vs. Dharampal Dhali (deceased) and others*** reported in **2018 CJ(SC) (4) 140, 2018 AIR(SC) (0) 3470, 2018 AIR (SCW) (0) 3470, 2018 ALD(SC) (3) 196, 2018 CCC(SC) (3) 1, 2018 CJ(SC) (0) 647, 2018 Supreme (5) 698, 2019 ALLSCR (0) 465, 2019 CLT (127) 377**. Further the plaintiff is also relying upon the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Surendra Kumar Vs. Phoolchand*** which reported in **1996 CJ(SC) (2) 23, 1996 CCC (1) 18602, 1996 CCC (1) 186, 1996 CLT (1) 492, 1996**

SCJ (2) 282, 1996 SCJ (2) 282, 1996 SCR (2) 15 1996, AIRSC (0) 1148, 1996 CurrCivCases SC (1) 186, 1996 ICC (1) 811, 1996 LJR (1) 318, 1996 AHICJ (2) 761, 1996 SCJ (2) 282, 1996 Supreme (2) 558, 1996 SCC (2) 491, 1996 AIR(SC) (0) 1148, 1996 SCALE (1) 644, 1996 JT (2) 127, 1996 AIR (SCW) (0) 695, 1996 Supreme (1) 777, 1996 CCC (1) 186B, 1996 CutLT (81) 492, 1996 CiviLJ 92) 190, 1996 ALLCJ (0) 671, 1996 JabLJ (0) 477, 1996 RRR (2) 59. The plaintiff proved her case in all aspects by producing oral and documentary evidences before this court and therefore the plaintiff prays to pass a decree and judgment in favour of the plaintiff in the suit.

7. The crux of the written arguments filed by the defendants

1 and 2 read as follows :

The entire property in the present case is the Hindu Joint Family property of the plaintiff and the defendants 1 to 5. The defendants 1 & 2 are always ready for amicable partition of the suit property and they are always co-operative with other co-sharers to divide the suit property amicably. The document produced by the 3rd defendant herself is evident to prove that the suit property is a joint family property. Further the 3rd defendant who has deposed as DW1 has answered contradictory to her written statement in her cross examination. The written statement filed by the 3rd defendant is contradictory to the proof affidavit filed by herself as DW1. The recital of the Ex.A1 itself is evident to show the entire suit

property as joint family property. Therefore, the defendants 1 to 2 pray to pass a decree and judgment in their favour for partition of suit property and for separate possession of their shares in the suit property.

8. The crux of the written arguments filed by the defendants

3 to 5 read as follows:

The plaintiff has admitted the fact that a part of schedule property was purchased in the name of Late.Sekar out of his father's own earned money in para 4 of the plaint and para 2 of proof affidavit filed by the plaintiff. Though the said Sekar was a minor at the time of purchase, he became absolute owner of the said property. Hence, there is question of joint family property. The said Sekar settled the schedule property in favour of his wife, 3rd defendant on 28.3.2002 and the suit was filed after that in the year 2014. The said Late.Sekar was not the owner of the property at the time of his death. Hence, there is no question of intestate succession. The plaintiff has not filed even a single document to show that the property is a joint family property. The burden of proof lies on the part of the plaintiff. The plaintiff has marked 10 documents on her side and most of the documents are in favour of the 3rd defendant which shows that 3rd defendant is the absolute owner of the suit property. The suit is filed at the instigation of the defendants 1 and 2 with an intention to grab money from the defendants 3 to 5. The plaintiff has not at all established the suit either

through the averments or through documents marked or in any other manner. Hence, prayed to dismiss the suit.

9. Issues No.1 to 3 :

The suit is one for partition. The relationship of the parties to each other is not in disputed. There is no confrontation among the parties in respect of the existence of the suit property. The resistance from the defendants 3 to 5 would be that Late.Govinda Naicker spent a huge amount of money for the marriage and other welfare of the defendants 1 and 2; as there is no other property left for his tender age child Late.Sekar, his father Govinda Naicker purchased the 1980 sq.ft., property for his son; the plaintiff had been under the care and control of Late.Sekar; the defendants 1 and 2 have no right over the suit property; the property other than the 1980 sq.ft., was a neighboring property which was purchased in the name of the 3rd defendant by her father's money; all together the entire property was settled through document No.142/2002 in favour of 3rd defendant by her husband Late.Sekar and the defendants 3 to 5 are enjoying the suit property.

10. Coming to the documents filed on the side of the plaintiff, the Ex.A1 vide document No.920/1974 dated 30-05-1974 had been executed in favour of Sekar, S/o. Govinda Naicker and as harped much on the side of the plaintiff Sekar who was hardly 7 years old at that time. There is no question of Sekar purchased the property from his own income or earnings

being the child of tender age. The Ex.A3 and Ex.A4 are evidencing the hut of the plaintiff got ablaze and gutted into flames due to fire accident and consequently her original possession along with family.

11. Of course, Ex.A5 encumbrance certificate reveals the fact that the property purchased under Ex.A1 stood in the name of the son of the plaintiff G.Sekar and the Northern side boundary is stated to be the land of Govinda Naicker. The encumbrance certificate for the whole extent of 3690 sq.ft., obtained by the plaintiff is marked as Ex.A6. However the one more encumbrance certificate Ex.A7 obtained by the plaintiff obviously discloses the entire extent of 3690 sq.ft settled by Sekar in favour of his wife, the 3rd defendant herein. The certified copy of settlement deed dated 28-03-2002 is marked as Ex.A8. Notwithstanding the fact that the executant G.Sekar was only the name lender in respect of Ex.A1 and the remaining property was belonging to Late. Govinda Naicker as his absolute property, the settlement deed has been executed by G.Sekar as if he was the owner of the properties which cannot be accepted in law. As such the unilateral execution of settlement deed Ex.A8 cannot have any legal force thereby not binding upon the plaintiff and the defendant 1 and 2.

12. The Ex.A9 to Ex.A12 are making out the case of the plaintiff that she is still in physical possession of the suit schedule property and the contention of the defendants 3 to 5 that they are ready to give food and shelter to the plaintiff, they have no idea to leave alone the plaintiff and the

plaintiff is also having good relationship with the defendants 3 to 5 cannot be countenanced in law. If it is really so there need not be any intention or overact on the part of the 3rd defendant to execute General Power of Attorney in favour of one Tr.A.Sundaramurthy marked as Ex.A13 attempting to alienate the suit schedule property which ultimately propelled the plaintiff to issue legal notice dated 18-07-22 Ex.A14 to them. Since the notice issued to Tr.A.Sundaramurthy returned as “left”, one more notice Ex.A16 dated 8-8-2022 has been issued by the plaintiff to him and the same has been duly served upon him vide Ex.A17 acknowledgment.

13. Per contra, on the side of defendants 3 to 5 the sale deed is marked as Ex.B1 which is nothing but the Ex.A1 marked on the side of the plaintiff. Like wise the settlement deed executed in favour of 3rd defendant by her husband is marked as Ex.B2 which is nothing but the Ex.A8 marked by the plaintiff in the course of her examination. The Ex.B3 is the patta issued in favour of 3rd defendant in pursuance to Ex.B2. The Ex.B4 is property tax bill issued in the name of late G.Sekar for the period 2014 to 2022.

14. It is reiterated in the cross examination of P.W.1 that the Ex.A1 vide document No.920/1974 dated 30-05-1974 had been purchased in the name of Sekar, S/o. Govinda Naicker, at that time Sekar who was hardly 7 years old and the property was enjoyed by the whole family. She deposed

that she was not invited for the marriage of her grand daughter and refuted the suggestion that she filed the suit at the instigation of her daughters D1 and D2 as false and untrue.

15. The D.W.1 fairly admitted in her cross examination that after her marriage with G.Sekar, she was residing with the plaintiff in the suit schedule property, the settlement deed has been executed in respect of the whole extent of 3690 sq.ft., contrary to the extent shown in Ex.A1 and Ex.B1. Going diametrically opposite to the averment made in the written statement that the property other than the 1980 sq.ft., was a neighboring property which was purchased in the name of the 3rd defendant by her father's money, the D.W.1 fairly conceded in her cross examination that she did not state so in her pleadings. More so contrary to the documents pressed into service on the side of the defendants 3 to 5, the D.W.1 deposed in her further cross examination that she did not execute General Power of Attorney in favour of Tr.Sundaramoorthy and she executed mortgage deed only. She also admitted the fact that the plaintiff is one of the legal heirs of the deceased G.Sekar.

16. From the comprehensive reading of the pleadings and the meticulous perusal of the exhibits pressed into service on both sides, it is only the evidence of the P.W.1 fortified by documentary proof are inspiring the confidence of this court and the defendants in the facts and

circumstances of the case cannot claim title and ownership over the suit schedule property by excluding the plaintiff and the defendants 1 and 2. In a significant development in Indian property law, the Supreme Court of India recently clarified a long-standing misconception regarding registered sale deeds and ownership rights. In the case of *Mahnoor Fatima Imran & Ors. vs. M/S Viswesara Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.*, the Hon'ble apex court categorically held that a registered sale deed **does not by itself establish ownership** if the seller lacks legal title to the property. At no stretch of imagination, the Ex.B2 settlement deed could be held to be valid in the eye of law.

17. Thus the balance of convenience lies with the plaintiff and the defendants 1 and 2. It goes without saying that in a suit for partition, the plaintiff is the defendant and the defendant is the plaintiff. Therefore, there is no impediment for this court to grant preliminary decree for partition of suit property into 16 shares and to allot 5/16 shares to the plaintiff, 4/16 separate shares to each of the 1st and 2nd defendants and 3/16 shares to the defendants 3 to 5 jointly. The interest of justice requires this court to pass preliminary decree accordingly.

18. **In the result a preliminary decree is passed for partition of suit property into 16 shares and to allot 5/16 shares to the plaintiff, 4/16 separate shares to each of the 1st and 2nd defendants and 3/16**

shares to the defendants 3 to 5 jointly. Time 2 months. The parties should bear their own costs.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, on this the 12th day of August, 2025.

Principal District Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Plaintiff's side witness :

PW1 Tmt.Lakshmi ammal (plaintiff).

Plaintiff's side exhibits :

Ex.A1	30.05.1974	Certified xerox copy of sale deed executed by Kuppan in favour of Sekar.
Ex.A2	---	Xerox copy of bank pass book of plaintiff.
Ex.A3	14.11.2013	CSR receipt issued to Lakshmi ammal.
Ex.A4	18.12.2013	Certificate issued by the Tahsildhar of Sozhinganallur to th plaintiff.
Ex.A5	31.01.2014	Encumbrance certificate.
Ex.A6	31.01.2014	Online encumbrance certificate.
Ex.A7	03.02.2014	Online encumbrance certificate.
Ex.A8	28.03.2002	Certified xerox copy of settlement deed executed by G.Sekar in favour of Kanniammal, his wife.
Ex.A9	---	Xerox copy of adhaar card of plaintiff.
Ex.A10	---	Xerox copy of voter ID of plaintiff.
Ex.A11	29.01.2014	Xerox copy of Proceedings of the Special Tahsildhar, Sozhinganallur, for senior citizen pension.
Ex.A12	---	Photographs with CD player.

- Ex.A13 12.01.2022 Certified xerox copy of general power of attorney deed executed by Kanniammal in favour of A.Sundaramoorthy.
- Ex.A14 18.07.2022 Legal notice issued by the counsel for plaintiff to Kanniammal and Sundaramoorthy.
- Ex.A15 --- Returned cover.
- Ex.A16 08.08.2022 Legal notice issued to Sundaramurthy by the plaintiff's counsel.
- Ex.A17 --- Postal acknowledgement card.

Defendants' side witness :

DW1 Tmt.Kanniammal (3rd defendant).

Defendants' side exhibits :

- Ex.B1 30.05.1974 Certified xerox copy of sale deed executed by Kuppan in favour of Sekar.
- Ex.B2 28.03.2002 Certified xerox copy of settlement deed executed by G.Sekar in favour of Kanniammal, his wife.
- Ex.B3 06.06.2022 Online patta in the name of Kanniammal.
- Ex.B4 30.09.2021 Property tax receipt in the name of Sekar.

Principal District Judge,
Chengalpattu.