

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, PALLAVARAM

PRESENT: Thiru.C.P.MULLAI VANAN, B.A.B.L.(Hon's),
District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Pallavaram

Monday, 23rd day of March 2026

OS No. 939/2023

CNR.No:TNCG10-005980-2023

Hasthinapuram Villagers

Admn.Association rep.by its President M. Nagarajan

.....Plaintiff

-Versus-

- 1) The Assistant Engineer, TNEB, Hasthinapuram,
- 2) The Thasildar, Pallavaram Taluk
- 3) The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tambaram Sub Division ...Defendants

This suit came up for final hearing on this day in the presence of advocate M/s.M. Thangadurai and S.Sasikala, learned counsel for the Plaintiff and Tr.D. Rajaraman, Government Pleader, appeared for the defendants. Upon perusing the entire case records, on hearing both sides arguments and having stood over for consideration till this date, this court delivers the following:-

JUDGMENT

1) Suit filed by the plaintiff seeking for the relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendants their men, agents, or officials from in any way interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property and for costs.

2) BRIEF AVERMENTS OF THE PLAINT IS AS FOLLOWS:-

2.1) The plaintiff submitted that the property to an extent of 64 cents which is classified as "Kalathumedu" in Survey No.52/9 and 54/9 in Paimash.No. 295 to 298 of Hasthinapuram Village is in the exclusive possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff sangam. This property is being in existence for

more than 70 years as public property utilized by the village people for their common use of agricultural paddy process as "Kalathumedu" in the olden days. Now the larger extent of 64 cents was under the maintenance and management of the plaintiff sangam.

2.2) The plaintiff submits that earlier there was a land used by the people of Hasthinapuram and subsequently when the people faced certain difficulties in using the land one Tr.Venkatarama Iyer s/o Krishna Shastri came forward to take that land and in lieu he gave the present suit property through a exchange deed dated 05.10.1948 document No. 1874 of 1948 on the file of SRO Pallavaram and from that date the present suit property is under the care and custody and under the maintenance of the plaintiff's sangam without anyone's obstruction or interruption whatsoever.

2.3) The plaintiff submits that since the suit property is to a larger extent and being in the public use under the management of the plaintiff's sangam government organizations are always have an eye over the property to take over the same without considering the welfare and traditional use by the villagers. Often when the government organizations such as revenue department and local body by the local people's objection and protest they left their attempt to acquire the property.

2.4) The plaintiff submits that however on one attempt made by the pallavaram municipality to take over the suit property the plaintiff sangam preferred a civil suit before the competent court i.e., before the District Munsif at Poonamallee by filing O.S.No. 1197 of 1987. Initially the District Munsif Poonamallee passed an interim order against the municipality and subsequently the same was made absolute through a permanent injunction decree passed through an order dated 18.08.1987. Till date either any appeal or any suit was not filed by the government officials. Hence the possession of the suit property

by the plaintiff sangam has become firm and unopposed by anybody.

2.5) The plaintiff's sangam is regularly paying the necessary tax to the local body without any default which would go to prove that the suit property is in the exclusive possession of the plaintiff sangam. It is pertinent to mention that before obtaining the property from the erstwhile owner Venkatarama Iyer through the above said exchange deed, the chitta, adangal and patta No. 1430 of 1984 were in the name of Venkataraman. Hence the suit property is not a government land or poramboke land. As such the government bodies/organizations have no right to claim the property as their property. Whenever the officials attempt to take over the land the plaintiff is vigilant and used to send representations requesting them to stop their illegal act. On the plaintiff sangam also sent such a letter to the revenue department not to indulge in taking any hasty action to acquire the suit property without the consent of the plaintiff sangam and village people.

2.6) The plaintiff submits that on 18.11.2019 the plaintiff noticed that the officials of 1st defendant (TNEB) visited the suit property and on interrogation it is understood that with the help of 2nd and 3rd defendants the 1st defendant is in the intention of setting up a mini power house by installing some transformers in the suit property which is illegal and against natural law of justice. The plaintiff sangam has not given any consent or willingness to the defendants to take the land for the above act. Hence the illegal act of the defendants cannot be curtailed unless by an order of permanent injunction by this court. Hence this suit.

3) BRIEF AVERMENTS OF THE WRITTEN STATEMENT FILED BY THE 1st DEFENDANT * ADOPTED BY 2nd and 3rd DEFENDANTS IS AS FOLLOWS:-

3.1) The defendant stated that as per the government record, the

above land in S.No.54/9 of Hasthinapuram village, pallavaram taluk of kancheepuram district measuring to an extent of 0.26.0 hectare comes under kalam porampoke, the revenue department exchanged the above property to TANGEDCO LTD for establishing proposed Hasthinapuram 33/11 KV substation.

3.2) As per the extract minutes of Hon'ble Chief Minister's of tamilnadu review meeting held on 01.06.2017, it is identified a government land kalam porampoke near mosque on Thirumalai Nagar main road, S.F.no.54/9, Hasthinapuram village, pallavaram taluk of hasthinapuram 33/11 KV substation to improve the voltage profile and maintain uninterrupted power supply in Hasthinapuram area and after the revenue land documents process, it was requesting to the district collector kancheepuram district, for enter upon permission on 29.05.2018. In the mean time the hasthinapuram village, Pallavaram taluk area merged on 31.08.2020 RDO Tambaram visit the site and advised to send an revised with chegalpattu district, on proposal, after that the taluk the Thasildar, Pallavaram taluk send a revised proposal on 25.09.2020 for the above land an extent of 0.0500 square meter land using for public path and balance an extent of 0.2100 square meter land for permitting to exchange for establishment of proposed 33/11 KV substation to TANGEDCO LTD., on 10.10.2020 RDO Chengalpattu district visited the site for giving the enter upon permission to the land for establishing proposed hasthinapuram 33/11 KV Substation.

3.3) The Hasthinapuram TANGEDCO LTD section having 17,000 nos domestic services 2000nos commercial services and 100 nos industrial services the supply extends from 230/11 KV kadaperi SS, 33/11 KV Ratha Nagar SS, 33/11 KV Rajakilpakkam and 33/11 KV Chitapakkam substation with distance of 6.0 KM 11 KV path, It cause more line loss and more

interruption. It becomes more essential for the establishment of the hasthinapuram 33/11 KV substation to meet out the power requirements of the increasing households in that area of nearly. Hence the TANGEDCO LTD chooses the above lands, available in the load centre. It is therefore prayed that this court may be pleased to dismiss the above suit with cost.

4) Upon consideration of the pleadings, documents produced and examination parties the following issues were framed by this court for proper and complete adjudication:-

1) Whether the 1st to 3rd defendants are interfering with plaintiffs peaceful possession over suit property without following due process of law?

2) Whether the suit for permanent injunction against the revenue authority (1st to 3rd defendant) is maintainable?

3) Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of permanent injunction against the 1st to 3rd defendants with respect to suit property?

4) what other relief the plaintiff is entitled for ?

5) On the side of the plaintiff, the plaintiff Tr.Nagarajan, was examined as PW1 and through him Exhibits A1 to A9 were marked and third party witnesses one Tr.Sekar was examined as PW2, Tr.Gajendran was examined as PW3 and Tr.Vilvamoorthy was examined as PW4. On the side of the defendants, the 1st defendant Tr.S.Mohammed Azharuddin was examined as DW1 and through him Ex.B1 to Ex.B7 were marked.

6) Heard Both sides arguments. Records Perused.

7) At this juncture it is important to refer the provisions postulated in Or XIV R 5 CPC. The provision is extracted hereunder:-

“5) Power to amend and strike out issues:- (1) The Court may at any time before passing a decree amend the issues or frame additional issues on such terms as it thinks fit, and all such amendments or additional issues as

may be necessary for determining the matters in controversy between the parties shall be so made or framed.

(2) The Court may also, at any time before passing a decree, strike out any issues that appear to it to be wrongly framed or introduced.”

7.1) Further, it is pertinent to note here that in K.N. Palaniswamy Gounder /Vs/ P. Subramanian, reported in [2005(1) L.W. 626], the Hon'ble Madras High Court Division Bench has held in para 9 as follows:- “... that the court is always competent and also entitled to recast an issue before Judgment and it is not necessary for the court to issue notice to the parties when proper issue was not framed...”

7.2) From a plain reading of the aforementioned provisions and precedent it is clear that this Court is amply empowered to amend, add or strikeout any issues that appear to be wrongly framed or introduced. As such, for proper adjudication of the matters in controversy, the issues are recast as follow.

8) The following issues were recasted by this court for proper and complete adjudication :-

1) Whether the plaintiff is having lawful possession over the suit property?

2) Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief of relief of permanent injunction as prayed for?

3) To what other relief the both parties are entitled?

9) Issue no.1) Whether the plaintiff is having lawful possession over the suit property??

9.1) The suit property in the plaint was described as “ All that piece and parcel of vacant land to an extent of 64 cents which is classified as "Kalathumedu" in Survey No.52/9 and 54/9 in Paimash No 295 to 298 of

Hasthinapuram Village, Pallavaram Taluk, Kancheepuram District bounded on the North by: Vandi Pattai (Road), South by: Venkatarama Iyer's land, East by Venkatarama Iyer's land West by: Ayyasamy's land within the limit of Pallavaram Municipalities, within the Sub Registration District of Pallavaram and within south Chennai Registration District.

9.2) The case of the plaintiff is that the suit property was originally belonged to Tr.Venkatarama Iyer and he had exchanged the suit property to the plaintiff society for the property belonged to plaintiff society through registered exchange deed dated 19.09.1948 and thereafter onwards the plaintiff villagers were having possession over the suit property and on 18.11.2019 the 1st defendant visited the suit property and understood that with the help 2nd and 3rd defendants the 1st defendant is trying to install power house. Therefore the plaintiff filed the suit for permanent injunction restraining the defendants their men, agents, or officials from in any way interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. Hence this suit.

9.3) In this case, the plaintiff Tr.Nagarajan was examined himself as PW1 and deposed to the plaint averments and exhibits Ex.A1 to A9 were marked on the side of the plaintiff. Ex.A1 which is the certified copy of registered Exchange Deed document.No.1874/1948 dated 19.09.1948 on the file of SRO Pallavaram, Ex.A2 which is the certified copy of Decree in O.S.No.1197/1987 of Hon'ble District Munsif Court Poonamallee dated 18.08.1987, Ex.A3 which is the photo copy of letter sent to Revenue Department along with three original postal receipts and postal acknowledgment card, Ex.A4 which is the original encumbrance certificate dated Nos., Ex.A5 which is the original photo Nos.4 and one C.D, Ex.A6 which is the original photo Nos.6 along with one C.D, Ex.A7 which is the true copy of adangal register extract for fasli 1396 dated 13.06.1987, Ex.A8 which is the

certified copy of Adangal register extract for fasli 1402 dated 25.07.1987, Ex.A9 which is the true copy of Adangal register extract for fasli 1397 dated 25.07.1987. On the side of plaintiff third party witness namely Tr. Sekar was examined as PW2 and Tr.Gajendran was examined as PW3 and Tr.Vilvamoorthy was examined as PW3.

9.4) The defendants contended that the suit property is government kalam poramboke land and the same was exchanged by the 2nd and 3rd defendants to the property of TANGEDCO limited to the 1st defendant for establishing electricity substation and no merits in this suit and prays to dismiss the suit. In this case, on the defendants side 1st defendant Tr.Mohammed Azharuddin was examined himself as DW1 and he deposed to the written statement averments and exhibits Ex.B1 to Ex.B7 were marked on the side of the defendants. Ex.B1 which is the original photo (marked through PW1 cross examination), Ex.B2 which is the certified copy of proceedings of District Collector of Chengalpattu District dated 20.02.2021, Ex.B3 which is the certified copy of 'A' Register Extract, Ex.B4 which is the certified copy of Rough Sketch, Ex.B5 which is the certified copy of Town Survey Register Extract, Ex.B6 which is the certified copy of Pallavaram Municipality Town Survey Register Extract, Ex.B7 which is the certified copy of Tamil nadu Power Distribution Corporation Ltd Abstract dated 05.03.2025.

9.5) On perusal of Ex.A1 which is the registered exchange deed shows that one Tr.Saravanan S/o. Gopal, being represented as President of Hasthinapuram Villagers and one Tr.Venkatrama Iyer S/o. Krishnan Sasthiry were entered into exchange deed thereby the said Saravanan exchanged the property comprised in Peimash No.147-0.8.0 Kani land to infavour of Venkatraman Iyer and in return the said Saravanan obtained the property comprised in Peimash No.295-0.2.4 and 298 – 0.5.2 Kani land from the said

Venkatrama Iyer by way exchange deed. Thus, Ex.A1 shows that the said Saravanan being represented as President of Hasthinapuram Villagers obtained the suit property through the said exchange deed. Further, Ex.A2 which is the certified copy of Decree in O.S.No.1197/1987 of Hon'ble District Munsif court Poonamallee shows that one Tr.Balan being represented as President of Hasthinapuram Village General public society filed the suit for permanent injunction as against the Commissioner of Pallvaram Municipality and obtained decree in his favour.

9.6) Further Ex.A3 shows that the plaintiff had sent objection letter to the 2nd and 3rd defendant and the same was also received by them which shows that the plaintiff had sent objection to the 2nd and 3rd defendant with regard to raising of objection for acquiring the suit property by the 2nd and 3rd defendant and Ex.A4 which is the encumbrance certificate for the suit property does not reveal any entries of encumbrance for the suit property except the entry Ex.A1. Further Ex.A5 and Ex.A6 are the photographs of the suit property and the same was also not disputed by the defendants and the plaintiff PW1 also admitted the photograph of suit property Ex.B1 in his cross examination and Ex.A7, Ex.A8, Ex.A9 are the adangal extract for the suit property which was shown as poramboke land and the same was not stands either in the name of plaintiff society or in the name of executor of Ex.A1 namely Tr. Venkatrama Iyer. Since the Ex.A7, Ex.A8, Ex.A9 adangal register extract does not contain the name of plaintiff society the same does not provide any benefit to the plaintiff case.

9.7) Upon perusal of documents the plaintiff claimed that originally the suit property was belonged to one Tr.Venkatrama Iyer but in order to establish the above assertion the plaintiff has not filed any single piece of documentary evidence to establish that the suit property was belonged to Tr.Venkatrama Iyer. Except the Ex.A1 the plaintiff has not filed any

documentary evidence to prove that the suit property was belonged to Tr.Venkatrama Iyer. Eventhough the plaintiff claimed that patta for the suit property was stands in the name of Venkatarama Iyer but the plaintiff has not filed the above patta and not proved that the suit property was earlier belonged to the said Venkatarama Iyer.

9.8) In this case the plaintiff society claimed that the suit property obtained through exchange deed Ex.A1 dated 19.09.1948 and thereafter to till filing of this suit the plaintiff society has not filed any patta for the suit property infavour of them to prove their lawful possession over the suit property. Whereas the plaintiff side document Ex.A8 which is the adangal register extract it was clearly mentioned as the suit property is kalam poramboke and the above document itself shows that the suit property was classified as kalam poramboke which belonged to the government and the same also shows that the plaintiff society has not obtained any patta for the suit property from the date of execution of Ex.A1 to till filing of this suit.

9.9) In this case even though the plaintiff claimed as President of Hasthinapuram Village General public society the plaintiff has not filed any document with regard to the registration of above society which shows that the plaintiff has not established the lawful existence of above society by way of producing any documentary evidence of registration of society. Moreover the plaintiff contended that he has filed the registration certificate of society but the plaintiff has not exhibited the registration certificate of society as document on their side and not mentioned any registration number of the society to show its existence before the filing of suit as well as to show its existence at the time of execution of Ex.A1 in the year 1948. Therefore, from the above discussion this court comes to the conclusion that the plaintiff has not proved the existence of society and not proved that he is the representative of the Hasthinapuram

villagers society.

9.10) Moreover, the plaintiff claimed that the above society had filed the suit with regard to the suit property and obtained decree in their favour and relied Ex.A2. Upon perusal of Ex.A2 which shows that a decree was granted with regard to the suit property but the plaintiff PW1 admitted in his cross examination that above two societies are different and the admitted portion as follows:- “ 1948 ஆம் ஆண்டு வெங்கட்ராம ஐயர் என்பவர் எற்படுத்திக் கொடுத்த தான பத்திரத்தில் சங்கத்தில் பெயரில் தானம் எழுதிக் கொடுக்கவில்லை என்றால் சரிதான்..... பூந்தமல்லி நீதிமன்றத்தில் தாவா சொத்து தொடர்பாக வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்த சங்கம் வேறு என்றாலும் தற்போது தாவா சொத்து தொடர்பாக வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்துள்ள சங்கம் வேறு என்றால் சரிதான். ” The above admission of PW1 shows that the plaintiff claiming as President of Society has failed to establish the existence of such society and failed to prove plaintiff society has obtained decree for the suit property.

9.11) Further in the earlier suit Ex.A2 the society has arrayed the Commissioner of Pallavaram Municipality as the sole defendant in the said suit and he was also set exparte. As the suit property was classified as kalam poramboke the revenue authorities alone has the custodian over the suit property and the Pallavaram Municipality which was established under the Tamil Nadu Urban Local Body Act, which has no custodian right over the suit property but the revenue authorities were not added as party to the former suit and the same was also admitted by the plaintiff in his cross examination that "இதற்கு முன்பாக பூந்தமல்லி நீதிமன்றத்தில் தாவா சொத்து தொடர்பாக நடைபெற்ற வழக்கில் மாவட்ட ஆட்சியர் மற்றும் வருவாய்

வட்டாட்சியர் ஆகியோரை தரப்பினராக சேர்த்துள்ளீரா என்றால் இல்லை".

9.12) At this juncture it is warranted to rely the following decision Our Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held in Anathula Sudhakar vs Buchi Reddy (dead) by lrs & ors in C.A.No:6191 of 2001 held that

17) To summarize, the position in regard to suits for prohibitory injunction relating to immovable property, is as under :

(a) Where a cloud is raised over plaintiff's title and he does not have possession, a suit for declaration and possession, with or without a consequential injunction, is the remedy. Where the plaintiff's title is not in dispute or under a cloud, but he is out of possession, he has to sue for possession with a consequential injunction. Where there is merely an interference with plaintiff's lawful possession or threat of dispossession, it is sufficient to sue for an injunction simpliciter.

(b) As a suit for injunction simpliciter is concerned only with possession, normally the issue of title will not be directly and substantially in issue. The prayer for injunction will be decided with reference to the finding on possession. But in cases where de jure possession has to be established on the basis of title to the property, as in the case of vacant sites, the issue of title may directly and substantially arise for consideration, as without a finding thereon, it will not be possible to decide the issue of possession.

(c) But a finding on title cannot be recorded in a suit for injunction, unless there are necessary pleadings and appropriate issue regarding title [either specific, or implied as noticed in Annaimuthu Thevar (supra)]. Where the averments regarding title are absent in a plaint and where there is no issue relating to title, the court will not investigate or examine or render a finding on

a question of title, in a suit for injunction. Even where there are necessary pleadings and issue, if the matter involves complicated questions of fact and law relating to title, the court will relegate the parties to the remedy by way of comprehensive suit for declaration of title, instead of deciding the issue in a suit for mere injunction.

(d) Where there are necessary pleadings regarding title, and appropriate issue relating to title on which parties lead evidence, if the matter involved is simple and straight-forward, the court may decide upon the issue regarding title, even in a suit for injunction. But such cases, are the exception to the normal rule that question of title will not be decided in suits for injunction. But persons having clear title and possession suing for injunction, should not be driven to the costlier and more cumbersome remedy of a suit for declaration, merely because some meddler vexatiously or wrongfully makes a claim or tries to encroach upon his property. The court should use its discretion carefully to identify cases where it will enquire into title and cases where it will refer to plaintiff to a more comprehensive declaratory suit, depending upon the facts of the case.

9.13) The above decision is squarely applies to this case wherein if the matter involves complicated questions of fact and law relating to title, the court will relegate the parties to the remedy by way of comprehensive suit for declaration of title, instead of deciding the issue in a suit for mere injunction. In this suit, the defendants are strongly denied the title of the plaintiff whereas that the excutor of Ex.A1 has no alienable right to alienate the suit property as the suit property is government kalam poramboke land and relied Ex. B3 which is the A register for the suit property shows that the suit property was mentioned as kalam and Ex.B5 which is the town survey register where as the suit property was mentioned as kalam plaintiff also admitted in his cross examination that “

தாவா சொத்தானது அரசுக்கு சொந்தமான சொத்து என்பதால் தான் நான் தாக்கல் செய்த வில்லங்க சான்றிதழில் எனது சங்கத்தின் பெயரில் பதிவு ஏற்பட்டுள்ளதாக எவ்வித பதிவுகளும் அதில் இடம் பெறவில்லை என்றால் சரிதான். வா.சா.ஆ 8 ஆவணத்தில் தாவா சொத்தானது அரசு புறம்போக்கு என குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான் " and the above admission of PW1 and Ex.B3 and Ex.B5 are shows that the suit property is government kalam poramboke land were as the plaintiff contended that above property is private kalam patta land but to that effect the plaintiff has not filed any patta document infavour of the executor of Ex.A1 whereas the above defence raised by the defendants are valid defence to deny the title of the plaintiff and in those circumstances the dispute with regard to the title cannot be decided in the suit for injunction simplicitor.

9.14) Therefore, in the above mentioned circumstances it is inevitable to seek the relief of declaration of title with regard to decide the de jure possession over the suit property but the plaintiff failed to do so. In the above circumstances also the plaintiff has not choosen to seek the relief of declaration of title and not seeked the relief of declaration of title also even after the defendants denied the title of the plaintiff in the written statement filed by the defendants. When the title of the plaintiff is highly disputed and denied by the defendants the plaintiff ought to seek the comprehensive relief of declaration of title but the plaintiff has failed to seek the relief of declaration of title. Therefore, from the above discussion the defendants have been specifically raised the dispute and title of the plaintiff over the suit property and the plaintiff has failed to prove his case. Therefore, the title of the plaintiff over the suit property cannot be determined in the suit for permanent injunction.

9.15) Having regard to the discussions made above for the above issues, this court hold that the plaintiff does not come forward to prove her title over the suit property and to that effect the dejure lawful possession cannot be decided in this suit for permanent injunction. Accordingly, the issue No.1 is answered in negative and decided against the plaintiff.

10) Issue No.2:- Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction for the suit property?

From the foregoing discussion, the Issue No.1 is decided against the plaintiff and to that consequence the plaintiff is not entitled for the relief of permanent injunction. Hence, this issue. no. 2 is decided against the plaintiff.

11) Issue No. 3:- To what other relief the parties are entitled?

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, both parties are not entitled to any other relief.

12) Result:

(i) In result, this suit is dismissed without cost.

(ii) Considering the facts and circumstance of this case this court orders that both parties shall bear their own cost.

Dictated to the Steno-Typist, directly typed by him in computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, this the 23rd day of March 2026.

Sd/-Tr.C.P. Mullai Vanan,
District Munsif cum
Judicial Magistrate
Pallavaram.

I) PLAINTIFF SIDE WITNESSES:

S.No	Witness No.	Name
1	PW1	Tr. Nagarajan
2	PW2	Tr. Sekar
3	PW3	Tr.Gajendran

4	PW4	Tr.Vilvamoorthy
---	-----	-----------------

II) PLAINTIFF SIDE EXHIBITS:

S.No.	Exhibit	Date	Documents	Remarks
1.	Ex.A1	19.09.1948	Registered Exchange Deed document.No.1874/1948	Certified copy
2.	Ex.A2	18.08.1987	Decree in O.S.No.1197/1987 of Hon'ble District Munsif Court, Poonamallee	Certified copy
3.	Ex.A3		Letter sent to Revenue Department by plaintiff and along with acknowledgment card	Original
4.	Ex.A 4		Encumbrance certificate	Original
5.	Ex.A5		Photo Nos.4 and one C.D,	Original
6.	Ex.A6		Photo Nos.6 and along with one C.D,	Original
7.	Ex.A7	13.06.1987	Adangal register extract	Certified copy
8.	Ex.A8	25.07.1987	Adangal register extract	Certified copy
9.	Ex.A9		Adangal register extract	Certified copy

IV) DEFENDANTS SIDE WITNESS :

S.No	Witness No.	Name
1	DW1	Tr. Mohammed Azharuddin

IV) DEFENDANTS SIDE EXHIBITS :- NIL

S.No.	Exhibit	Date	Documents	Remarks
1.	Ex.B1		Photo (PW1 cross),	Original
2	Ex.B2	20.02.2021	Proceedings of Chengalpattu District	certified copy
3	Ex.B3	-	'A' Register Extract	certified copy
4	Ex.B4	-	Rough Sketch	certified copy
5	Ex.B5	-	Town Survey Register	certified copy
6	Ex.B6	-	Pallavaram Municipality Town Survey Register	certified copy
7	Ex.B7	05.03.2025	Tamil nadu Power Distribution Corporation Ltd Abstract	certified copy

Sd/-Tr.C.P. Mullai Vanan,
District Munsif cum
Judicial Magistrate
Pallavaram.

// True Copy //

District Munsif cum
Judicial Magistrate
Pallavaram.

**I THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM
JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, PALLAVARAM**

Date:23.03.2026.

O.S.No.939/2023

Judgment Pronounced in open court

(i) In result, this suit is dismissed without cost.

(ii) Considering the facts and circumstance of this case this court orders that both parties shall bear their own cost. Detailed judgment vide in separate sheet

DM cum JM
Pallavaram.

In