

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE  
(FAST TRACK COURT) , KANCHEEPURAM**

**PRESENT:TMT.S.MOHANAKUMARI, M.A., B.L.,  
Additional District & Sessions Judge,  
Additional District and Sessions Court, (FTC)  
Kancheepuram.**

Tuesday, the 17<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026

O.S NO.81 OF 2016

(CNR.No. TNKPO6 – 000769 – 2016)

1. N.Shenpagavalli, (died)  
D/o. Late.Ratnagiri and  
W/o. S.K.Natarajan,  
Residing at No.8/23,  
Nagappa Mudaliar Street,  
Pudupet, Chennai – 600 002.
2. Natarajan,  
S/o. Late.Kamadoi,  
Residing at No.17, Ellappan Street,  
Komaleeswaranpet,  
Chennai – 600 002.
3. K.Shanthakumari,  
W/o. Kuppuraj,  
Residing at No.17,  
Choleeswaran Koil Street,  
Pillaiyarpalayam,  
Kancheepuram.
4. N.Devarajan,  
S/o. Natarajan,  
Residing at No.17, Ellappan Street,  
Komaleeswaranpet,  
Chennai – 600 002.

5. N.Sundharamoorthi,  
S/o. Natarajan,  
Residing at No.17, Ellappan Street,  
Komaleeswaranpet,  
Chennai – 600 002.

6. N.Namasivayam,  
S/o. Natarajan,  
Residing at No.17, Ellappan Street,  
Komaleeswaranpet,  
Chennai – 600 002.

.... Plaintiffs

**( Plaintiffs 2 to 6 were L.Rs of 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff. Impleaded as per the order passed in I.A.No.1/2024 dated 28.01.2025. Amended as per order passed in I.A No.3/2025 dated 03.03.2025)**

/Vs/

1. Kandasamy (Died)

2. Kodi Malar,  
W/o.Late.Manohar,  
Old No.7, Chairman Saminathan Street,  
Pillaiyar Palayam,  
Kancheepuram.

3. Hemalatha,  
D/o. Late.Manohar,  
Old No.7, Chairman Saminathan Street,  
Pillaiyar Palayam,  
Kancheepuram.

4. Perumal,  
S/o.Late.Kumarasamy,  
Old No.7, Chairman Saminathan Street,  
Pillaiyar Palayam,  
Kancheepuram.

5. Murugan,

S/o. Late.Kumarasamy,  
Old No.7, Chairman Saminathan Street,  
Pillaiyar Palayam,  
Kancheepuram.

6. Padmavathy,  
W/o. Late.Kandasamy,  
Residing at New No.41, Old No.8,  
Veeramakaliamma Koil Street,  
Pillaiyar Palayam, Kancheepuram.

7. Chithra,  
W/o. P.Gajapathy and  
D/o. Late.Kandasamy,  
Residing at New No.41, Old No.8,  
Veeramakaliamma Koil Street,  
Pillaiyar Palayam, Kancheepuram.

8. K.Sadhana,  
W/o. S.Jaganatha,  
D/o. Late.Kandasamy,  
Residing at New No.10B/118,  
Moonram Thiruvizha Mandapa Street,  
Chinna Kancheepuram.

..... Defendants

**(Defendants 6 to 8 are L.Rs of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant were impleaded as per Order in I.A No.2/2021 dated 06.01.2023. Amended as per order made in I.A.No.5/2025 dated 03.03.2025)**

This suit came up on 16.09.2025 for final hearing before me in the presence of M/s.K.Venkateshwaran, P.Parivallal, B.Aravindan and G.Sathiyamoorthy, learned counsel appearing for the Plaintiff and Mr.D.Manohar, learned counsels appearing for the Defendants 2 to 5, Mr.E.Kirubanithi, learned counsel appearing for the defendants 6 to 8, and upon perusing the entire case records, upon hearing the arguments of both side counsel and upon having stood over for consideration till this day, this court is delivering the following:

## **JUDGMENT**

The suit is filed for a Preliminary Decree for Partition to determine the shares of the plaintiffs in respect of the suit schedule property by defining the division of property into 3 shares and thereon allot 4/12<sup>th</sup> share to the plaintiff; for appointment of an Advocate Commissioner to inspect the suit property to effect division of the suit property by metes and bounds and thereon divide the suit property into 3 equal shares and allot 4/12<sup>th</sup> share to the plaintiffs or in the event of indivisibility of the property on account of its nature, effect sale of the property through the advocate commissioner and thereon allot 4/12<sup>th</sup> share out of the sale proceeds to the plaintiff in accordance to the preliminary decree passed by this Court; to grant a relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendants from any manner alienating or causing any encumbrance of whatsoever nature including that of mortgage, charge, security, lease or any loan of whatever nature over the suit schedule property; for the cost of the suit and for such other relief or reliefs as this court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

### **2.The plaint in brief:**

The plaintiffs submits that the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff is the daughter of Late.Ratnagiri and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is the son of Late.Ratnagiri. The 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant is the wife of Late.Manohar and daughter-in-law of Kuppusamy and

Kuppammal and the deceased Manohar, who is the eldest son of Kuppusamy and Kuppammal. The 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant is the daughter of late Manohar and granddaughter of Kuppusamy and Kuppammal. The 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> defendants are the sons of Kuppusamy and Kuppammal. The said Kuppammal is the daughter of late Ratnagiri and sister of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. Originally larger extent of property was jointly purchased by one Munichammal and Velmurugappa Mudaliar by virtue of a sale deed dated 24.10.1899. The said Munichammal had executed a settlement deed dated 21.06.1926 registered as Document No.2149/1926 in respect of her share in the said property in favour of Valliammal W/o. Late Velmurugappa Mudaliar and the sons born to Valliammal namely 1. Ratnagiri and 2. Sonachalam. By virtue of the said settlement deed the settlor had retained a life estate to her without any power of alienation and after her life time the settled property to devolve upon the said Valliammal and she can enjoy the said property without any power of alienation and after her life time the property should devolve upon the sons of Valliammal namely Ratnagiri and Sonachalam absolutely. The suit property bearing Door No.8, Pillaiyar Palayam, Veera Kaliammal Koil Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Division, Kancheepuram Town, Comprised in Town Survey No.1686, of an extent of 5255 Sq.ft was devolved upon the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff's father Ratnagiri and his brother Sonachala Mudaliar who are the ultimate beneficiaries under the said settlement deed and had become the absolute estate holders by

virtue of a deed of settlement, registered as document no.2149/1926 on the file of SRO,Kancheepuram by one Munichiammal. The plaintiffs further submits that the brother of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff's father Sonachala Mudaliar had died as a bachelor. After the demise of the said Sonachala Mudaliar the brother of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff's father, the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff's father had become the absolute owner in respect of the entirety of the property morefully described in the aforesaid settlement deed and he was enjoying the said property as an absolute owner without any let or hindrance from any quarters of whatsoever nature and he was in absolute possession and enjoyment of the same. The deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff's father had died intestate leaving behind the following persons as his surviving legal heirs: (I) Amirthammal (Wife), (ii) Thanigaimalai (Son), (iii). Kuppammal (Daughter), (iv).Shenpagavalli (Daughter) and (v).Kandasamy (Son). The mother of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff, elder brother of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff Thanigaimallai, and elder sister of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff Kuppammal had died and the only surviving legal heirs of late.Ratnagiri are the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. The elder brother had died as a bachelor and the elder sister Kuppammal had died leaving behind the legal heirs (i). Manohar (son), (ii) Perumal (Son) and (iii) Murugan (Son). The elder son of Kuppammal by name Manohar had died leaving behind his wife Kodi Malar, Dinesh (son) and Hemalatha (daughter) and thereafter on account of ailment the sod of deceased Manohar by name Dinesh had died and

the surviving legal heirs of late. Manohar are his wife Kodi Malar and daughter Hemalatha only. Since the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff is residing in Chennai along with her family and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant being the younger brother of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff was in enjoyment of the property more fully described in the schedule to the plaint. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had let out residential portions of the premises for tenancy and collecting rent from them. The deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff had several occasions had sought for partition in respect of the suit schedule property in which the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff is equally entitled to the said property being one of the legal heirs of late. Ratnagiri. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had given a false hope and assurance that he would give the respective share in the property but the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had failed to do so till this day. 1<sup>st</sup> defendant being the younger brother of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff and the legal heirs of late. Kuppammal (elder sister) who are arrayed as defendants 2 to 5 were entitled to a share in the suit schedule property. The deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff is entitled to 4/12<sup>th</sup> share, the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is entitled to 4/12<sup>th</sup> share and the deceased Kuppammal who is entitled to 4/12<sup>th</sup> share which is to be devolved upon the defendants 2 to 5 out of which defendants 2 and 3 were jointly entitled to 2/12 share and defendants 4 and 5 were equally entitled 1/12<sup>th</sup> share each. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had indulged in the act of knocking away the entire property without giving any share to the plaintiff the same would be apparent from the Town Survey Register where the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant suppressing the existence of the

other legal heirs of plaintiff's late father Ratnagiri had obtained patta in his name alone to snatch away the said property with a sinister motive and the same is obtained fraudulently to defeat the rightful claim in respect of the suit property. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had indulged in the act of knocking away the entire property without giving any share to the plaintiff has no other go except to issue legal notice dated 17.03.2015 seeking for partition of her 4/12<sup>th</sup> share in the suit schedule property by dividing the property into metes and bounds. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had fails to comply with the terms of the aforesaid notice had come forward to give an evasive reply dated 30.03.2015 further taken undue advantage of the error crept in the said notice with regard to the brothers name of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff's father which is wrongly mentioned as Kesavalu instead of Sonachala Mudaliar and there by fails to comply with the lawful demand made by the plaintiff. The deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff had issued a rejoinder notice on 09.04.2016 with regard to reply notice dated 30.03.2015 and the same was duly served upon the counsel for the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is indulging in the act of alienating and encumbering the suit property to defeat the rightful claim of the plaintiff. If the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant succeed in his attempt the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff would be put to immense hardship and sufferance and the same cannot be compensated and further the said act would lead to multiplicity of the proceedings, hence the plaintiff is seeking for an order of permanent injunction as against the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant from dealing with the suit property. Even

after exchange of notices as between the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant, the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had not come forward to allot share in the suit property hence, having no other alternative the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff was impelled to file the present suit for partition of the suit property by metes and bounds. The suit property constituting the property of the father of the deceased 1<sup>st</sup> plaintiff and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and grandfather of the husband of 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant and great grandfather of the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> defendants has to be divided as among the parties to the suit. The plaintiffs further submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant had died during the pendency of the suit leaving behind the defendants 6 to 8 and they were impleaded as per the order passed in I.A No.2/2021 dated 07.02.2023. The sole plaintiff had died leaving behind the plaintiffs 2 to 6 during the pendency of the suit and they were impleaded as per the order passed in I.A No.1/2024 dated 05.11.2024. The 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant and great grandfather of the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant and grandfather of the 5 and 6<sup>th</sup> defendants has to be divided as among the parties to the suit. Hence the suit is filed for preliminary decree for partition and permanent injunction.

3. **The Written Statement of 1st Defendant, which was adopted by 6 to 8 Defendants:**

The defendant denies the entire allegation contained in the plaint except those are specifically admitted by him as true herein and the and the plaintiff is put to strict proof of the facts alleged by him in the plaint. The defendant

submits that the above suit is filed by plaintiff is false frivolous and not sustainable in law and fact and has to be dismissed in limini. The 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> defendants are the son of Kuppusamy and Kuppammal is not true. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is a not proper person to claim partition suit the plaintiff wrongly filed the suit. The plaintiff failed to disclose the fact such as whether suit property is ancestral, joint family property or self acquired property of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. The plaintiff having no right to get equal 3 shares ( 4/12). The son, daughter, son in law of plaintiff indulged the plaintiff to file suit without clean hands. This defendant further denies the suit property constituting the property of the father of the plaintiff and the first defendant and grandfather of the husband of the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant and great grandfather of 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant and grandfather of 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> defendant has to divide as among the parties to the suit is not true. The 6<sup>th</sup> defendant is not impleaded in the suit. The defendant denies the entire cause of action is not true and correct. The defendants stat that the suit property cannot be divided into 3 equal shares (4/12) since the plaintiff being women member is not a join family member, she is not entitled for 4/12 shares in the schedule mentioned property. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant being in the place of in his father incurred all expenses of the marriage of plaintiff which amounted nearly 50,000/- in the year of 1965 to 1969 and also incurred the expenses of marriage of sons daughter of plaintiff which amounted 10,000,00/- for them as a seedhana in his own income of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and getting some loan. The 1<sup>st</sup>

defendant further states that the plaintiff failed to disclose, the extent of the suit property is wrong which is misleading one and not jointer of necessary party in the suit. That the plaintiff has neither cause of action nor she is entitled for any relief and the suit is liable to be dismissed with exemplary cost. Therefore this defendant most humbly prays to dismiss the suit with cost.

**4. The Additional Written Statement of First Defendant:**

The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant states that his sister plaintiff namely Shenbagavalli filed a partition suit against him and 4 others for the share of 4/12 in the suit scheduled mentioned property. 1<sup>st</sup> defendant state that his father late.Ratnagiri had three wives name (1) Visuhalakshi, (2) Amirthammal and (3) Krishnaveni, the parties herein are born out through Amirthammal W/o.Late.Ratnagiri. It is further submitted that facts are being so, the above facts have been concealed and suppressed by the plaintiff in her pleadings as well as in her depositions. The plaintiff was cross examined by the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant she categorically deposed that 1<sup>st</sup> wife of Late.Ratnagiri died intestate without any issues and there is no 3<sup>rd</sup> wife to Late.Ratnagiri and revealed that she is a legal heir of late.Ratnagiti. 1<sup>st</sup> defendant states that his father's brother Sonachalam and his legal heirs ( 3 sons) are all living at Pondycherry who are also entitled to equal share according to exhibit A-1 which contains not only the suit schedule property and other Nanjai Punjai lands to. The said Sonachalam is having original document

of Ex.A1 and plaintiff is only having the certified copy of the same. Further said Rathnagiri and Sonachalam Mudaliyar are absolute owner according to the settlement deed 1926 (Ex.A1). Afterwards, the Ratnagiri and Valliammal transferred the suit schedule mentioned property to and in favour of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is enjoying the suit schedule property till date without any disturbance. 1<sup>st</sup> defendant states that his and plaintiff's brother Thanigaimalai and his legal heirs also living in other state, the said fact and their address known to the plaintiff. But she was also not added as a proper party to this suit. Assuming for a moment, if he is died, the legal heirs of the said Thanigaimalai also not added as parties to the suit it is nothing but the callous attitude and ulterior motive of the plaintiff herein. 1<sup>st</sup> defendant, plaintiff Shenbagavalli, Kumarasamy, Thanigaimalau, Kuppammal all are five legal heirs of 2<sup>nd</sup> wife of Ratnagiri namely Amirthammal.

**5 . ISSUES:** On perusal of Plaint, Written statement and other materials placed before the court the following issues were framed:

- 1 Whether the plaintiff is entitle to 4/12 share in the suit property?
- 2 Whether the plaintiff is entitle for injunction as prayed for?
- 3 Whether the suit is bad for non joinder of necessary party?
- 4 To what relief the parties entitled?

6. **ON THESE ISSUES** :

a) **On the side of the plaintiff** : The plaintiff was examined as PW1 and Ex. A1 to Ex.A19 marked through her. One 3<sup>rd</sup> party witness Varadarajan was examined as PW2 and Ex.A20 to Ex.A24 documents were marked through him.

b) **On the side of the defendants**: The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant was examined DW1 and Ex.B1 to Ex.B7 marked through him.

7. **ON ISSUE NO.1** :

**Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to 4/12 share in the suit property?**

The plaintiffs claim that the suit property devolved upon Late Ratnagiri and his brother Sonachala Mudaliar under the settlement deed dated 21.06.1926 (Ex.A1), and that after the death of Sonachala Mudaliar as a bachelor, Late Ratnagiri became the absolute owner. It is further contended that after the death of Ratnagiri, the 1st plaintiff and 1st defendant alone survived as his legal heirs. However, the plaintiffs have not proved the core and foundational facts necessary to establish exclusive succession through Late Ratnagiri. The following serious deficiencies emerge from the evidence existence of other legal heirs suppressed, the 1st defendant has consistently pleaded and deposed that the brother of Late Ratnagiri, namely Sonachalam, had three sons residing at Pondicherry, and that they derive rights under Ex.A1. The plaintiffs have not

impleaded the said persons, nor produced any evidence to show that Sonachalam died unmarried or without issues. Suppression regarding Thanigaimalai's legal heirs evidence indicates that Late Thanigaimalai, another son of Ratnagiri, had legal heirs who also have a claim under the alleged line of succession. The plaintiffs have neither disclosed nor impleaded them. Failure to prove exclusive title of Ratnagiri. Though Ex.A1 is produced, no document has been filed to show that Sonachalam's share devolved exclusively upon Ratnagiri by survivor-ship or otherwise. No death certificate of Sonachalam, no genealogical records, and no proof of intestate succession were produced. Admission of plaintiff in cross-examination The plaintiff (PW1) has admitted that: Her father had multiple wives, She is unaware of several branches of the family, She does not know whether the other heirs are alive. Such admissions significantly weaken the plaintiffs' claim of exclusive entitlement. Partition suit must fail when necessary co-owners are omitted. A suit for partition is not maintainable unless all sharers are impleaded. The non-joinder of necessary parties directly affects the Court's jurisdiction to pass a valid and binding decree. In the absence of complete proof regarding the family tree, devolution of title, and exclusive right of plaintiffs to claim 4/12 share, the plaintiffs have failed to discharge the burden of proving title or share. Therefore, Issue No.1 is answered in the negative.

**8. ON ISSUE NO.2:****Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to injunction as prayed for?**

The relief of permanent injunction is only a consequential relief dependent on the establishment of share or title. As Issue No.1 has been decided against the plaintiffs and they have not proved any semblance of exclusive possession or share, no injunction can be granted. Hence, Issue No.2 is also answered in the negative.

**9. ON ISSUE NO.3:****Whether the suit is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties?**

From the pleadings and evidence, it is evident that the legal heirs of Late Sonachalam, legal heirs of Late Thanigaimalai, other branches claiming under Ratnagiri, are all necessary sharers whose rights are directly affected by any partition decree. Their non-impleadment renders the suit not maintainable. Hence, Issue No.3 is answered in favour of the defendants.

**10. ON ISSUE NO.4:****To what reliefs are parties entitled?**

In view of the findings on Issues 1 to 3, the plaintiffs are not entitled to any relief sought in the suit.

11. **RESULT**: In the result, this suit is dismissed. No costs.

Dictated to the stenographer directly in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.

Additional District & Sessions Judge,  
Additional District & Sessions Court (FTC)  
Kancheepuram.

**LIST OF WITNESS ON PLAINTIFF'S SIDE:**

PW1 – N.Shenpagavalli.

PW2 – Varadharajan.

**LIST OF EXHIBITS ON PLAINTIFF'S SIDE:**

Ex.A1 21.06.1926 Settlement deed executed by Munciammal in favour of Valliammal – Original.

Ex.A2 04.02.2015 Town Survey Register Extract – Original.

Ex.A3 17.03.2015 Legal notice issued by the plaintiff – Office copy.

Ex.A4 30.03.2015 Reply notice issued by the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant – Office copy.

Ex.A5 09.04.2016 Rejoinder notice issued by the plaintiff – Office copy.

Ex.A6 - Acknowledgment card – Original.

Ex.A7 16.04.2013 Encumbrance Certificate – Original.

Ex.A8 21.08.1966 Wedding invitation – Photostat.

Ex.A9 18.04.2013 Mortgage deed executed by R.Kandasamy in favour of T.Arumuga Mudaliar – Certified copy.

Ex.A10 01.05.2012 Death certificate of Manoharan – Photostat.

Ex.A11 30.12.2015 Death certificate of Thiruvengadam – Photostat.

- Ex.A12 30.09.2015 Settlement deed executed by N.Anandavel and others in favour of R.Kandasamy – Certified copy.
- Ex.A13 10.02.2016 Sale deed executed by R.Kandasamy in favour of A.Nandakumar – Certified copy.
- Ex.A14 19.02.2018 Manjal Neeratu Vizha invitation – Original.
- Ex.A15 11.07.2018 Wedding Invitation – Original.
- Ex.A16 13.07.2019 Encumbrance Certificate – Online copy.
- Ex.A17 23.08.1977 Mortgage deed executed by R.Kandasamy – Certified copy.
- Ex.A18 - Photo – Original.
- Ex.A19 - Photo – Original.
- Ex.A20 - Photos with C.D – Original.
- Ex.A21 - Photos with C.D – Original.
- Ex.A22 - Aadhaar card of Thiruvengadam – Photostat.
- Ex.A23 - Family card of Thiruvengadam – Photostat.
- Ex.A24 30.12.2015 Death certificate of Thiruvengadam – Photostat.

**LIST OF WITNESS ON DEFENDANT’S SIDE:**

DW1 – Kandasamy.

**LIST OF EXHIBITS ON DEFENDANT’S SIDE:**

- Ex.B1 03.06.1967 Name transferred House Tax receipt in the name of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and his brother Thanigaimalai – Original.
- Ex.B2 30.05.2002 Patta order u/s 9(2) notice – Original.
- Ex.B3 31.12.2015 Encumbrance Certificate – Online copy.
- Ex.B4 6 series Property Tax and Water Tax receipts – Original.
- Ex.B5 03.09.1941 Judgment in O.S No.169/1941 on the file of District Munsif Court, Kancheepuram – Certified copy.
- Ex.B6 02.02.1940 Settlement deed executed by Ratnagiri Mudaliar in

favour of Krishnaveni Ammal – Certified copy.

Ex.B7 10.02.1942 Release deed executed by Krishnaveni Ammal in favour of Ratnagiri Mudaliar – Certified copy.

Additional District & Sessions Judge,  
Additional District & Sessions Court (FTC)  
Kancheepuram.

**Draft/Fair Judgment**

**O.S.No.81/2016**

**D.D.17.03.2026**

**ADJ(FTC) KPM**