

**IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
CHEYYUR.**

Present: Tmt. C.M. Amaravathi., ML.,
District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate,
Cheyyur.

Tuesday the 28th day of July 2026

O.S. NO.19/2020

(MKM OLD O.S.NO.190/2009)

CNR.No.TNCG16-000442-2020

1. M. Arumugham *** (died)

** 2. Saraswathy

3. Kalpana Plaintiffs.

(They are impleaded as per order in I.A.No.149/2021 dated 22.11.2021 and amended as per order in I.A.No. 401/2021 dated 08.09.2022).

//VS//

1.Varadharajan

2. Balaji

3. Ramalingam

4. Ananth

*** 5. Sheela Devi

6. Sangeetha

*** (They are impleaded as per order passed in I.A.No. 625/2010 dated 02.08.2010 and amended as per order passed in I.A.No.2537/2010 dated 21.02.2011.)

... Defendants..

This suit coming before me for final hearing on 17.07.2026 in the presence of Thiru.S.Subramanian, learned counsels for plaintiffs and Thiru. R.Rajasekar, counsel for the 1 to 4th Defendants and Thiru. E. Elango, counsel for the 5 and 6th Defendants. Upon perusal of documents and hearing arguments on both side and having stood over for consideration till this date, this court delivers the following;-

JUDGMENT

1. (I) Suit for declare the plaintiff's title to the suit 'B' Schedule property and for consequential Permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their men, agents, representatives, legal heirs, from any way interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit 'B' Schedule property and for costs.

2. The crux of the plaint would run thus:

2.1. The plaintiff is the absolute and exclusive owner of the suit property. The plaintiff purchased the same from D. Shoeledovi under a registered sale deed dated 27.01.2000. The vendor of the plaintiff purchased the same a registered sale deed dated 29.04.1991 from Sivanathan. Patta has been transferred in the name of plaintiff. The entire property has been described as 'A' Schedule. The plaintiff and his vendor and pre-deceassore in title have been in possession and enjoyment for more than statutory period and prescribed title by adverse possession sale. The 1st defendant has attested the sale deed executed by Sheela devi. There is a house on the front side (ie.,) western side and the plaintiff is residing in A schedule house. The defendants are estopped from challenging the title of plaintiff in respect of 'A' Schedule. Further, there is a vacant space on the west of the terraced house (i.e.,) 8 feet. The vacant site has been described as "B' Schedule which is form part of 'A' Schedule.

2.2. The defendant are always had an eye on the suit 'B' Schedule and to grab the same. On 28.07.2009 the defendant unlawfully attempted to put up septic tank in the

‘B’ Schedule property. The plaintiff successfully averted, but the defendants are powerful in men and money and they may renew their attempt at any point of time.

2.3. Hence this suit is filed for declaration of plaintiff’s title to the suit ‘B’ Schedule property and for permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their men, agents from any way interfering with the plaintiff’s peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit ‘B’ schedule property. Unless the decree of declaration and injunction is granted, the plaintiff will be put to great loss and hardship. Even on the ground of the equity and as per principles of natural justice, the plaintiff’s peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit ‘B’ Schedule has to be safeguarded. No prejudice or hardship caused to the defendants, as they are attempting to grab the suit ‘B’ Schedule. Hence this suit.

******* (5. (a) The plaintiff submits after filing suit the defendants 1 to 4 set up the plaintiffs vendor 5th defendant and her daughter 6th defendant denying the plaintiff’s title. As the vendor the 5th defendant is bound to protect the plaintiff title.**

***** 5(b) During the pending suit the plaintiff Arumugam was died on 11.08.2020 when he was in sound state of mind executed a will bequeathing the suit property to be enjoyed by 2nd of us till her life time without any power of alienation and after death of 2nd of us the 3rd plaintiff as to take absolutely. Hence the plaintiff have got right to continue the suit for proper better adjudication.**

3. The averments in written statement filed by the 1st defendant in brief:

3.1. The 1st Defendant denies all the allegations in the plaint as unjust unwarranted illegal against the facts and circumstances of the case. The 1st defendant they are in exclusive possession and enjoyment of 180 sq. feet situated in Kamarajar Street, Chunambedu Village, Cheyyur Taluk, Kancheepuram District which is fully described in the Advocate Commissioner application filed by them.

3.2. The 1st Defendant submits that his grand father and father Govindasamy had Gramanatham 796 sq feet situated in Kamarajar Street, Chunambedu Village and Taluk, Kancheepuram District. The defendant father and grand father also in exclusive possession and enjoyment of 180 sq feet on the southern side of there property as stated above that the patta also granted for the 796 sq. feet. On 15.12.2008 that the 1st defendant had purchased the shares of his brothers Sabapathi and Rajan in the said property since they are in Pondichery. The defendant alone is in enjoyment and possession of 180 sq. feet as the back yard of his house and house site that they also constructed bathroom. They planted planten trees and coconut trees in the said property of 180 sq feet. That the defendants are utilizing the said portion for washing there vessels and they are alone having access from there house to the 180 sq. feet. That there continuous possession has been recognized and they also perfected the title by way of adverse possession for more than 60 years that no adjacent house site owners claimed any right towards the said 180 sq. feet at any time.

3.3. The plaintiff nor there predecessors never claimed any right or possession and never enjoyed the said 180 sq. feet as described in the Advocate Commissioner application. That the plaintiff only purchased 788 sq. feet and the house within 788 sq. feet as described in the sale deed. The alleged 'B' Schedule never forms part of 'A' Schedule as stated in the plaint by the plaintiff. They erected pucca platform in order to have clear way to approach there bathroom. The present suit is filed in order to grab the property of defendant. The plaintiff signed in the sale deed dated 27.01.2007 since the plaintiff is confined about the 788 sq. feet and the house constructed in the said property.

3.4. There is the existence of 50 years old bathroom, coconut trees planten trees in the said 180 sq. feet. That there is no septic tank as alleged in the plaint. Hence, this suit is dismissed with cost.

4. The averments in written statement filed by the 5th defendant adopted by 6th- Defendant in brief:

4.1. The suit is incorrect and not maintainable under law and on facts.

4.2. The suit S.No.762/2 to an extent of 0.01 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents. The said property has purchased by this defendant from one Sivanandham by means of registered sale deed dated 29.04.91 under document No.281/91 before Sub - Registrar Office, Chithamur. From the date of purchase this defendant was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property 5th defendant sold the same to the plaintiff. This defendant had never purchase any extent as mentioned in the plaint i.e., 'B' schedule property and the 5th defendant never enjoy the above said 'B' schedule property and the 5th defendant has not sold 'B'

Schedule property to the plaintiff as mentioned in the plaint. This defendant is unnecessary party to this suit. The plaintiff is wantonly impleaded this defendants for dragging this defendant. The plaintiff is not entitle any relief as against this defendant. Absolutely there is no merits in the suit. Hence this suit is dismissed with exemplary cost U/s. 35 (a) C.P.C.

5. Considering all facts this court formulated the following issues for consideration:-

1. Whether the plaint 'B' Schedule property is a part and parcel of the plaint 'A' Schedule property?
 2. Whether the plaintiff has right and title over the plaint 'B' Schedule property?
 3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration and consequential relief of permanent injunction?
 4. To what other relief is the plaintiff entitled?
5. On the side of plaintiff, the plaintiff herein deposed as Pw1, One Tr.Balakrishnan and One Tr. Gnanprakasam are examined as Pw2 & Pw3, Ex.A1 to Ex.A4 were marked and the 1st Defendant herein deposed as DW1, one Palani and 5th Defendant Sheeladevi are examined as Dw2 & Dw3, Ex.B1 to Ex.B.5 marked and Ex.C1 to C3 were marked.

6. Issue No.1 and 2:-

1. Whether the plaint 'B' Schedule property is a part and parcel of the plaint 'A' Schedule property?

2. Whether the plaintiff has right and title over the plaint 'B' Schedule property?

6.1. The case of the plaintiff is that he is the absolute and exclusive owner of the suit property and that he purchased the same from one Sheeladevi through a registered

Sale Deed dated 27.01.2000. The vendor of the plaintiff purchased the said property through a registered Sale Deed dated 29.04.1991 from Sivananthan. The patta was subsequently transferred in the name of the plaintiff, and the entire property was described as 'A' Schedule property. The plaintiff further contended that he, his vendor, and their predecessors-in-title were having title, possession, and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. It is also stated that the 1st defendant attested the Sale Deed executed by Sheeladevi in favour of the plaintiff.

6.2. According to the plaintiff, there is a house situated on the western side of the 'A' Schedule property, in which the plaintiff is residing. The defendants are estopped from challenging the title of the plaintiff in respect of the 'A' Schedule property. Further, there is a vacant space measuring 8 feet on the western side of the terraced house, which has been described as the 'B' Schedule property and forms part of the 'A' Schedule property. On 28.07.2009, the defendants unlawfully attempted to put up a septic tank in the 'B' Schedule property. After filing of the suit, Defendants 1 to 4 set up the 5th defendant, who is the vendor of the plaintiff, and the 6th defendant, and denied the title of the plaintiff.

6.3. During the pendency of the suit, the plaintiff Arumugam died on 11.08.2020. It is alleged that, while he was in a sound state of mind, he executed a Will bequeathing the suit property, permitting the 2nd plaintiff to enjoy the same during her lifetime without any power of alienation and thereafter the 2nd and 3rd plaintiffs shall take the

property absolutely. Hence, the suit has been filed for declaration of the plaintiff's title over the 'B' Schedule property and for permanent injunction.

6.4. Per contra, the 1st defendant contended that his grandfather and father, namely Govindasamy, were in possession and enjoyment of Gramanatham property measuring 796 sq.ft. situated at Chunnambedu Village, Kanchipuram Taluk. The defendant further contended that his father and grandfather were also in exclusive possession and enjoyment of 180 sq.ft. situated on the southern side of the said property and that patta was also granted for the said extent of 796 sq.ft.

6.5. It is further submitted that, on 15.12.2008, the 1st defendant purchased the shares of his brothers, Sabapathi and Rajan, in the said property, as they were residing at Pondicherry. The 1st defendant alone is in possession and enjoyment of the said 180 sq.ft. as a backyard of his house and house site. He has also constructed a bathroom and planted banana and coconut trees in the said property. The continuous possession of the defendants has been recognized, and they have perfected title by way of adverse possession for more than 60 years. No adjacent house site owner had ever claimed any right over the said 180 sq.ft. The plaintiff or his predecessors never claimed any right, possession, or enjoyment over the said extent.

6.6. The 1st defendant further contended that the plaintiff purchased only 788 sq.ft. along with the house constructed thereon, and the alleged 'B' Schedule property forms part of the defendant's property. The plaintiff erected a pucca platform only for the

purpose of having access to his bathroom. The 1st defendant admitted that he signed the Sale Deed dated 27.01.2000, but only in respect of the 788 sq.ft. property and the house constructed therein. He denied the allegation regarding the attempted construction of a septic tank in the suit property.

6.7. The 5th defendant, in her written statement, denied all the allegations contained in the plaint. She contended that she purchased the suit property through a registered Sale Deed dated 29.04.1991, bearing Document No.281 of 1991, from Sivananthan, in respect of Survey No.762/2, measuring an extent of 1¾ cents. From the date of purchase, she has been in possession and enjoyment of the property. She further stated that she never purchased the 'B' Schedule property and never sold the same to the plaintiff as alleged in the plaint. Therefore, the 5th defendant is an unnecessary party to the suit, and the suit is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

6.8. On perusal of the records, it is seen that Ex-A1 is the registered Sale Deed dated 27.01.2000, bearing Document No.215/2000, executed by Sheeladevi in favour of the plaintiff Aarumugam, in respect of Survey No.762/2, measuring an extent of 0.01 ¾ cents. However, though the survey number and extent mentioned in Ex-A1 correspond with the schedule property, the boundaries mentioned therein do not correspond with the boundaries of the 'A' and 'B' Schedule properties.

6.9. Ex-C1 Advocate Commission report shows that, the boundaries are correct in the schedule mentioned property. Further commission report reveals that, there is a one

bathroom plaintain tree and coconut trees found out in the A schedule property. Ex- A1 and Ex-C1 correlation with regard to the boundaries of the suit property. Ex-C2 rough sketch filed by the Advocate commissioner with regard to the suit A and B schedule property. Ex- C3 shows that, FMB Sketch, with regard to survey number 986.

Pw1 cross examined he deposed that, "நீதிமன்றத்தில் வழக்கறிஞர் ஆணையர் நியமனம் செய்யப்பட்டு தாவா சொத்தினை அளந்து அவர் தாக்கல் செய்துள்ள அறிக்கையில் தாவா சொத்தின் விஸ்தீரணம் சரியாக உள்ளது என்று குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளார் என்றால் சரியல்ல. பி அட்டவணை சொத்து எனக்கு தான் சொந்தம் ஆகும். நீதிமன்ற ஆணையர் தாக்கல் செய்துள்ள அறிக்கையில் பி அட்டவணை சொத்து எனது அனுபவத்தில் இல்லை என்று குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளார் என்றால் சரியல்ல".

6.10. Even though there are discrepancies in the boundaries mentioned in the suit schedule property and the Sale Deed, the plaintiff and the defendants have admitted the extent of 0.01 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents. The flow of title from Sivananthan to the plaintiff contains the same survey number and the same extent. However, the boundaries alone differ from the suit schedule property.

6.11. The general principle of law is that, in case of conflict between extent and boundaries, the boundaries shall prevail over the extent. In the present case, though there are discrepancies in the boundaries mentioned in the Sale Deed and the suit schedule property, the plaintiff has to establish his title and identity of the suit property. In order to prove the case of the plaintiff, PW-2 and PW-3 were examined in accordance with the facts stated in their proof affidavits. Ex-A4 establishes that the plaintiff is in

possession of the 'A' Schedule property. The plaintiff is bound to prove his title in respect of the suit property.

6.12. On a perusal of Ex-A1 and Ex-A2, this Court comes to the conclusion that the plaintiff has derived title through a valid chain of documents. Further, Ex-A3 and Ex-A4 support the plaintiff's case regarding his title and possession over the property. Ex-A2 is the registered Sale Deed dated 26.04.1991, bearing Document No.1520, executed by Sivananthan in favour of Sheeladevi (5th defendant), in respect of Survey No.762/2, measuring an extent of 0.01 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents out of 50.66 cents. However, the boundaries mentioned in Ex-A2 also do not correspond with the 'A' and 'B' Schedule properties.

PW2 cross examined has deposed that, “அவர் தாவா சொத்தை 2000 ம் ஆண்டு கிரையம் பெற்றார். அதன் சர்வே எண். 762/2 ஆகும். ஆறுமுகம் வழக்கில் உள்ள எ- அட்டவணை சொத்தை கிரையம் பெற்றார் என்றால் ஜக்குபந்தி உட்பட்ட சொத்தை கிரையம் பெற்றார். அந்த 1,3/4 செண்டை தான் ஷீலா தேவியும், அவர் மகள் சங்கீதாவும் ஆறுமுகத்திற்கு கிரையம் கொடுத்தார்கள் என்றால் ஷீலா தேவி கிரையம் கொடுத்தார். அந்த பத்திரத்தில் நான் சாட்சி கையொப்பம் செய்துள்ளேன் என்றால் சரிதான்.”

6.13. Ex-A3 is the Natham Patta No.677 standing in the name of the plaintiff Aarumugam in respect of Survey No.982/18 measuring 0.191 cents and Survey No.986/11 measuring 0.79 cents. Ex-A4 is the property tax receipt standing in the name of the plaintiff Aarumugam. Ex-B1 is the certified copy of the Natham Sale Deed dated 15.12.2008, bearing Document No.5168/2008, executed by Sabapathi in favour of

Varatharajan, in respect of Survey No.986/10, measuring 0.74 sq. metre (530 sq.ft.) out of 796 sq.ft. Ex-B2 is the property tax receipt standing in the name of Varatharajan. Ex-B4 consists of EB bills standing in the names of Govindasamy and Varatharajan. Ex-B5 is the Encumbrance Certificate relating to Survey No.762/2 measuring 530 sq. ft., which also reflects the new Survey No.980/10.

6.14. During the pendency of the suit, the plaintiff Arumugam died on 11.08.2020.

Though it is stated in the plaint that the deceased plaintiff executed a Will in favour of the 2nd and 3rd plaintiffs, no such Will has been produced before this Court. Mere pleadings in the plaint cannot be treated as proof of execution of a Will. In the absence of production and proof of the alleged Will in accordance with law, this Court cannot come to the conclusion that the deceased plaintiff executed a Will in favour of the 2nd and 3rd plaintiffs.

DW-1 cross examined has deposed that, “1வது வாதி ஆறுமுகம் தாவா வழக்கில் 2 இன சொத்துக்களுக்காக தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளார் என்றால் சரிதான். அ அட்டவணை சொத்து 1-3/4 என்றால் சரிதான். ஆ அட்டவணை சொத்து 180 சதுர அடி என்றால் சரிதான். தாவா அ அட்டவணை சொத்தின் 1-3/4 செண்டை சிவானந்தம் என்பவரிடமிருந்து 5 வது பிரதிவாதி கிரையம் பெற்றார் என்றால் சரிதான். என்னுடைய பூர்வீகம் சூனாம்பேடு என்றால் சரிதான். வாதி ஆறுமுகம், விழுப்புரம் மாவட்டம் திண்டிவனம் வட்டம், முட்டியூர் கிராமத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர் என்றால் சரிதான். வாதி 27.01.2000 ல் தாவா சொத்துக்களை ஷீலாதேவி அவரது குமாரத்தி சங்கீதா, சுரேஷ் ஆகியோர்களிடம் இருந்து கிரையம் பெற்றார் என்றால் தாவா "ஏ" அட்டவணை சொத்துக்களை கிரையம் பெற்றார். எனக்கு அவர் கிரையம் பெற்ற விவரம் தெரியுமா என்றால் நான் தான் உடனிருந்து வாங்கி கொடுத்தேன்.”

DW-2 cross examined has deposed that, "நீதிமன்றத்தில் இருந்து சாட்சியம் அளிக்க சம்மன் ஏதாவது கிடைக்கப்பெற்றதா என்றால் இல்லை. என்னை இந்த நீதிமன்றத்திற்கு சாட்சியம் அளிக்க வரதராஜ் என்பவர் அழைத்து வந்தார். வா.சா.ஆ.1ல் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ள சொத்து விவரத்தில் கண்ட ஜக்குபந்தியில் சர்வே எண்.762/2 - 1-3/4 செண்ட்டுக்கு ஜக்குபந்தி கடை வீதிக்கு செல்லும் தார் ரோடுக்கு மேற்கு, வரதராஜன் வீட்டுக்கு தெற்கு, மாசிலாமணி ஆசிரியர் வீட்டுக்கு வடக்கு, வேலாயுதம் வீட்டிற்கு கிழக்கு என்று கண்டுள்ள சொத்தை தான் வாதி ஆறுமுகம் கிரையம் பெற்றுள்ளார் என்றால் அந்த சொத்தை தான் வாங்கியுள்ளார். ஆனால், பத்திரத்தில் ஜக்குபந்தி தவறாக குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது. வரதராஜன் வீட்டிற்கு தெற்கில் தான் ஆறுமுகம் வீடு உள்ளதா என்றால் உள்ளது. அது சரியான ஜக்குபந்தி என்றால் சரிதான்."

DW-3 cross examined has deposed that, "நான் தாவா சொத்தினை கிரையம் வாங்கும்போது அது காலிமனை என்றால் சரிதான். தாவா சொத்தின் சர்வே எண்.762/2 என்றால் சரிதான். அதன் மொத்த விஸ்தீரணம் 50.66 செண்ட் என்றாலும் அதில் நான் 1-3/4 செண்ட் கிரையம் வாங்கினைன் என்றாலும் சரிதான். 1வது வாதிக்கும் நான் கிரையம் கொடுக்கவில்லை."

6.15. The aforesaid deposition of DW1 to DW3 it is hereby proved plaintiff and defendant admitted as in respect of 0.01 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents of the suit property.

Accordingly, from the evidence of the plaintiff and defendant this court shall presumed as plaintiff is A schedule property is a part and parcel of the 'B' Schedule property and also plaintiff has right over the 'B' Schedule property.

Accordingly issue no 1 & 2 answered in favour of the plaintiff.

7. Issue No. 3 :-**3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration and consequential relief of permanent injunction?**

7.1. On the contrary, the evidence available on record establishes that the parties have been referring to the same survey number and the same extent of property. The defendant relies upon Ex-B1 Sale Deed dated 15.12.2008 and the connected revenue and electricity records to contend that he is in possession of a different extent of property. However, the defendant has not established, by clear and cogent evidence, that the specific 'B' Schedule property forms part of the property covered under Ex-B1 or that the property conveyed under Ex-A1 is situated elsewhere.

7.2. The mere production of revenue records or electricity bills cannot, by itself, establish title over the specific property in dispute. The defendant's claim of adverse possession also cannot be accepted merely on the basis of a plea of long possession. The defendant must establish the commencement, continuity, exclusivity and hostile nature of possession against the true owner. In the present case, the defendant has failed to establish the ingredients necessary to prove title by adverse possession.

A latin maxim is, necvi, nec clam, nec precario which means a right claimed by long usage must generally have been proved peacefully, openly and as of right without force.

7.3. As already discussed, the plaintiff has established his title through the registered Sale Deeds marked as Ex.A1 and Ex.A2. Though there is a discrepancy in the boundary recitals, the same survey number and extent have continued throughout the chain of title. The identity of the property has further been established through the Advocate Commissioner's report, rough sketch and the other documentary and oral evidence available on record.

Tejla & Another Vs. Pragyana & Another, S.A. No. 1987 of 2022, decided on 31.01.2023, High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur, before Hon'ble Shri Justice Gurpal Singh Ahluwalia,

It is well established principle of law that when there is a discrepancy with regard to identity of the land, then the boundaries mentioned in the sale deed would prevail. If the defendants were of the view that wrong boundaries have been mentioned in the sale deed, then they should have executed a rectification deed. Admittedly, in the present case, no rectification deeds has been executed.

7.4. The plaintiff has also established his possession over the 'A' Schedule property through Ex-A3 Natham Patta and Ex-A4 property tax receipt, supported by the evidence of the witnesses and the physical features noted by the Advocate Commissioner. The plaintiff's title having been established, and the 'B' Schedule property having been found to form part of the property conveyed under Ex-A1, the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration. The defendants have not established any better title over the 'B' Schedule property. The plea of adverse possession raised by the 1st defendant has also not been established in accordance with law.

Accordingly issue no.3 answered in favour of the plaintiff.

8. Issue No. 4

(I) To what other relief?

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case on hand, there will not be any other relief on either sides.

9. In the result, the suit is decreed in respect of declaration that he has title over the plaint 'B' Schedule property and is also entitled to consequential permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their men, agents or anybody claiming through them from interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaint 'B' Schedule property, in respect of sale deed dated 27.01.2000 registered as document No.215/2000 on the file of SRO, Cheyyur. No costs.

Dictated to the Steno typist, typed by her in the Computer directly, printed, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court this the 28th day of July 2026.

District Munsif-Cum-Judicial Magistrate,
Cheyyur.

PLAINTIFFS SIDE WITNESSES :

PW1 – Tr. Arumugam

PW2 – Balakrishnan

PW3- Gnanaprakasam

PLAINTIFF SIDE EXHIBITS :

Exhibits	Dated	Description	Nature of documents
Ex.A1	27.01.2000	Registered Sale deed executed by Sheeladevi infavour of plaintiff.	Original

Ex.A2	29.04.1991	Registered Sale deed executed by Sivananthan infavour of Sheeladevi	Original
Ex.A3	-	Patta No. 677 in the name of plaintiff	Original
Ex.A4	24.07.2009	House Tax Receipt in the name of plaintiff	Original

DEFENDANTS SIDE WITNESS :-

DW1- Tr. Varadharajan

DW2- Tr. Pazhani

DW3 – Tmt. Sheeladevi

DEFENDANTS SIDE EXHIBITS:

Exhibits	Dated	Description	Nature of documents
Ex.B1	15.12.2008	The Sale Deed dated 15.12.2008, bearing Document No.5168, executed by Sabapathi in favour of Varatharajan.	Certified Copy
Ex.B2	22.11.2022	Property tax receipt standing in the name of Varatharajan.	Original
Ex.B3	22.11.2022	Miscellaneous Receipt	Original
Ex.B4	-	Electricity Bill Receipts (16 Series)	Original
Ex.B5	21.06.2023	Encumbrance Certificate	Online Copy

COURT SIDE WITNESS:- NIL

COURT EXHIBITS:-

Exhibits	Dated	Description	Nature of documents
Ex.C1	-	Advocate Commissioner Report	Original
Ex.C2	-	Rough Plan	Original
Ex.C3	-	FMB Sketch	Original

District Munsif-Cum-Judicial Magistrate
Cheyyur.