

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT MUNSIF
AT KANCHIPURAM

PRESENT: Tmt.Fanny Rajan, B.A., B.L.,(Hons)

Principal District Munsif, Kanchipuram

On Monday, the 6th day of April 2026

O.S.No.191 of 2016

CNR. No.TNKP08-000255-2016

S. Revathi

...Plaintiff

//Versus//

D. Karunamoorthy

... Defendant

This suit has come up on 24.03.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of M/s. M. Ramesh Counsel for the Plaintiff, and M/s.CTA Associates, B. Sujatha, L. Sowmiya Narayanan, T. Kishore Counsels for the defendant and upon hearing the learned counsel for the Plaintiff and defendant and perusing the connected material records and having stood over till this day for consideration, this court delivers the following:

JUDGMENT

1. This suit is filed seeking for granting permanent injunction against the defendant restraining from in any way interfering with plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property and for costs.

Concise Statement of the Plaintiff as per the Plaint:

2. The plaintiff has averred that she is the absolute owner of the suit property. It originally belonged to one Manickam. After his demise, she purchased the suit property from his legal heirs represented by their power agent Sekar vide a registered Sale deed dated 08.06.2006. Having purchased for a valuable consideration, she is in possession paying kists and other revenue charges. Also the patta, chitta and Village account have been transferred in her name. She is in possession for more than 10 years without any hindrance or disturbance.

3. The defendant has no right or title over the suit property and threatened the Government officials to cancel the patta. He has given a false complaint against the VAO and also attempted to interfere with the plaintiff's peaceful possession. The defendant's attempt on 10.08.2016 was successfully prevented. Hence, this suit for permanent injunction.

Concise Statement of the defendant as per the Written statement:

4. The defendant has denied the allegations and stated that the suit property and other properties originally belonging to his grandfather Mr.Manickam. He and his sons namely Daniel i.e. his father, Shanmugam, Nagan, Jaya and Kesavan enjoyed the said property as joint family properties. The said Manickam died leaving behind his sons without any arrangement. After the

demise, a share fell upon his father, Daniel who died in 1985. He left behind his wife Kuppammal, his sons and daughters namely Karunamoorthy, Gangadharan, Kalyanasundaram, Munian, Ramesh, Mahalakshmi and Radhakrishnan. The said Radhakrishnan died issueless. Since the demise of his father, they were in joint possession.

5. Without any partition, his mother, brothers and sisters sold the suit property to the Plaintiff without his knowledge and consent. Being one of the legal heirs of the said Daniel, he is entitled to 1/8 share in the suit property. A legal notice was issued to the plaintiff 09.01.2009 questioning the sale deed dated 08.06.2006 and stated that the alleged sale deed was null and void. There was no reply. He filed a partition suit against his mother, brothers and sister before the Hon'ble Subordinate court, Kanchipuram in O.S.No.115/2009.

6. Even though the plaintiff purchased the suit property, he is in exclusive possession cultivating the rice crops on it. The plaintiff has no right over the suit property and she transferred patta in her name in 2015. Hence he gave petition to the District collector, Kanchipuram for change of patta and District Collector directed change in patta to his name as it is a Harijan welfare property. The Plaintiff have no right or possession in the property. Hence, the suit has to be dismissed.

Issues:-

7. On perusal of the plaint and written statement filed by the defendant, this Court framed the following issues on 25.11.2016.

(i) Whether the plaintiff is entitled the relief of permanent injunction as against the defendant?

(ii) Whether the suit in O.S. 115/2009 on the file of Sub court Kanchipuram is binding upon the parties of this suit?

(iii) Whether the defendant is in possession of suit property as averred in the written statement?

(iv) To what other relief?

8. **Evidences:-** To prove the case of the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's husband is examined as PW1 and a third party witness is examined as PW2 and marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A5 documents through them. On the side of the defendant, the defendant himself was examined as DW1 and has marked Ex.B1 on the side.

Discussion and Findings:

9. This Court considers the submissions of the Learned Counsel for the Plaintiff and the defendants including the written submissions filed by both. This court also perused the materials on record.

10. Case of the Plaintiff: It is the case of the Plaintiff through PW1 that the suit property was purchased by the Plaintiff vide the Ex.A1 Sale Deed dated 08.07.2006 from the legal heirs of one Mr. Mancikam, through their power agent. To prove the authority of the power Agent, the Ex.A5 Power of Attorney dated 22.12.2005 has been filed. Since purchase, the suit property is in her possession and Ex.A2, Ex.A3, Ex.A4 is the Patta, Adangal and Tax Receipt in her name. Whiles, the defendant without any authority is trying to threaten the Plaintiff and tried to interfere with her possession on 10.08.2016. The possession of the Plaintiff is substantiated by the PW2 evidence. After the attempt was averted, this suit was filed.

11. The defendant has no right in the property. He cannot claim joint possession as he had voluntarily left his family and he is living outside the suit property. Hence, he cannot claim joint possession. The Sale Deed executed in favour of the Plaintiff is valid and she is in possession. The defendant has no right in the suit property. The O.S.No.115/2009 relates to a different property even as admitted by the Defendant. Hence, the suit has to be decreed as the Plaintiff is in rightful possession.

12. Case of the Defendant: Per contra, through DW1 the defendant had denied the allegations by the Plaintiff. It is his contention that the suit property

originally belonged to his grandfather Mr.Manickam. Upon his demise, it was inherited by his father and his siblings Shanmugan, Nathan, Jaya and Kesavan. Whiles, his father died leaving behind his mother, himself and his brothers and sisters. His share was inherited by them as his legal heirs and in their joint possession. No admitted fact needs to be proved under Section 53 of the BSA and relied on the citation in ***Mrs.Leela Kumari and another Vs. T.S.Prakash Chand Gang and another, OSA No.61 of 2023 dated 12.01.2026 of the Hon'ble Madras High Court.***

13. Whiles, omitting him the other legal heirs have appointed a power of attorney and executed the Sale Deed in favour of the Plaintiff. It is pertinent to note that in the absence of his consent, his share remains unconveyed to the Plaintiff. He filed O.S.No.115/2009 for partition and a preliminary decree is passed in his favour. It is true that the final decree has not been passed in the above suit.

14. However, his 1/8 share has been upheld in the said suit as seen from Ex.B1. The Plaintiff herein was a party to the said suit and the preliminary decree is binding on her. The suit had been duly contested and thereafter, the preliminary decree is passed. Thus, there is a cloud over title as claimed by the Plaintiff. To substantiate the law regarding partition decree and it's binding

nature on the parties, he relied on the judgment in *Aburvakounder (Died) and others Vs. Balamurgan and another, 2025 (1) TLNJ 59*.

15. He is in joint possession of the suit property, unless duly excluded or ousted. He relied on the judgment in *T.Ramalingeswara Roa (Died) thr. LRS. And another Vs.N.Madhava Rao and others, 2019 AIR (SC) 1777*. Though pleaded there is no evidence to show ouster. Hence, he being in joint possession as co-owner, there can be no injunction against the co-owner. He relied on the judgment in *Prakash Sukhdev Akotkar Vs. Mansoorkha Gulabkha, 1996 (2) BCR 311*. Hence, the suit has to be dismissed with costs.

16. **Ocular and documentary evidence:** This court finds that the Plaintiff evidence was commenced by examining the PW1 on 20.03.2024 and therefore, this case is governed by the *Indian Evidence Act* as per section 170(2) *Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam*. This court finds that the PW1 and DW1 being the husband of the Plaintiff and the defendant respectively have been examined. The PW1 being the husband of the Plaintiff, his evidence is admissible under *Section 120 of the Indian Evidence Act*. Whiles, a third party was examined as PW2. This court finds that there is no material on record to question the admissibility of their evidence. Hence, the ocular evidence of PW1, PW2, DW1 are admissible in evidence.

17. This court finds that the Ex.A1 to Ex.A5 and Ex.B1 are either produced in original or online certified copies or true copies. This court finds that the Ex.A1 to Ex.A5 and Ex.B1 are all admissible as primary or secondary evidence under Section 64 and 65 of the Indian Evidence Act.

18. **Admitted facts:** This court finds that from the PW1 and DW1 it is admitted that the suit property originally belonged to one Mr.Manickam. He died and his property was inherited by his legal heirs Danivel, i.e. the defendant's father, Shanmugam, Nathan, Kesavan and Jaya. Whiles, the said Danivel died leaving behind his wife, the defendant and his siblings. The PW1 categorically admits that the defendant herein is the legal heir of the said Mr.Danivel.

19. Whiles, the Ex.A5 power of attorney deed is executed by all the legal heirs of the said Mr.Danivel, excluding the defendant. Based on the power of attorney, the Ex.A1 Sale Deed was executed in favour of the Plaintiff. The PW1 also admits that the defendant is not a party or signatory to the said deeds.

20. As relied by the learned counsel for the Defendant in ***Mrs.Leela Kumari and another Vs. T.S.Prakash Chand Gang and another, OSA No.61 of 2023 dated 12.01.2026 of the Hon'ble Madras High Court***, the admitted facts do not require any proof. The defendant being the legal heir of the said Danivel

and not being a signatory to the Ex.A5 Power of Attorney Deed and Ex.A1 Sale Deed is categorically admitted by the PW1 in his cross examination. Therefore, this court concludes that the admitted facts above need not be proved as per ***Section 58 of the Indian Evidence Act.***

21. Therefore, the contention in this suit relates to whether the Defendant was ousted and thus, the Ex.A1 Sale Deed is binding on him, whether the partition preliminary decree in O.S.No.115/2009 is binding on the Plaintiff and who is in possession of the suit property.

22. Issue No.1 to 3: The issues in No.1 to 3 relate to the entitlement of the Plaintiff to permanent injunction, the binding nature of the Preliminary Decree in O.S.No.115 of 2009 and the possession whether with the defendant. As the issues are interlinked and for the sake of brevity and to avoid repetition, these issues have to taken up together and decided.

23. This court finds that one of the main contentions raised is whether the Plaintiff was conveyed the absolute and exclusive title in the suit property. In light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Anathula Sudhakar Vs. P.Buchi Reddy (Dead) by Lrs. & Ors, 2009 2 LW 546***, had clearly differentiated the circumstances in which a suit for bare injunction would lie and where there is a cloud over title, declaratory relief has to be sought for.

24. This Court takes judicial note of the judgments in *Somasundaram Vs. Parameswariammal (Deceased), Represented by her Legal Representatives & Others, 2021 (4) CTC 44*, *K. Shanmugam (Died) & Others Versus Yasodha & Others, 2022 (1) LW 792*, the Hon'ble High Court had clearly observed that the question of declaration of title would become necessary only if the defendant established a cloud over the Plaintiff's title otherwise a bare injunction suit would be maintainable.

25. This court takes note of the judgment in *Ananthammal (died) and others Vs. M.Ramakrishnan and others, 2018 (1) CTC 24* and finds that the Plaintiff has to stand on his own legs to discharge in burden of proof and not on the weakness of the Defendants case. Now the first question to be considered in this case is whether there is any cloud over title of the Plaintiff.

26. As per the Plaintiff, the title in the suit property was conveyed to her by the legal heirs of the deceased Mr.Manickam based on the power executed to her husband i.e. PW1 through the Ex.A5 Power of Attorney Deed, who in turn executed the Ex.A1 Sale Deed in her favour.

27. The Ex.A5 Power of Attorney Deed is executed by the sons and daughters of Mr.Manickkam i.e. Shanmugam, Nathan, Jaya. Also by Kupppammal, Gangadharan, Kalyanasundaram, Muniyan and Ramesh as the legal heirs of

Mr.Danivel, the deceased son of Mr.Manickam. Further, one Chandra, Babu and Kumersan being the legal heirs of Mr.Kesavan the other deceased son of Mr.Manickam also signed the power of attorney Ex.A5 on 22.12.2006. Even as admitted by the PW1, the defendant herein is one of the legal heirs of the deceased Mr.Danivel. But he is not a signatory to the Ex.A5 Power of Attorney Deed.

28. Whiles, based on the power and on behalf of the legal heirs of the said Mr.Manickam the Ex.A1 Sale Deed dated 08.06.2006 was executed in favour of the Plaintiff. Evidently, the PW1 is the power agent of the above mentioned legal heirs and the Plaintiff is the wife of the said PW1. Even as per the case of the Plaintiff, all the shares of the legal heirs of the deceased Manickam has been transferred to the Plaintiff except the share of the defendant.

29. This court notes that the defendant already filed O.S.No.115 of 2009 for partition and the plaintiff herein is a party to the said suit. As indicated in Ex.B1, the preliminary decree has been passed in the said partition suit on 16.07.2018, whereby the 1/7th share has been allotted to the Defendant in the suit property herein as the legal heir of the deceased Mr.Manickam. Though the Defendant claimed 1/8th share in his pleadings, as per the Ex.B1 his share is 1/7th in the suit property. The wrong pleading of the share would not affect the

case of the defendant, as the Ex.B1 is a preliminary decree and has to be given due evidentiary value.

30. The PW1 admits knowledge about the suit and the fact that the defendant is also one of the legal heirs of the deceased Mr.Danivel as early as in 2009. Thus, it is evident that the Plaintiff was aware of the fact that one of the legal heirs has not transferred his share to her even before filing the suit. Yet she has chosen to file this suit seeking for the relief for injunction simpliciter.

31. The Plaintiff herein is the 7th defendant in the said partition suit. As rightly relied on by the learned counsel for the Defendant in *Aburvakounder (Died) and others Vs. Balamurgan and another, 2025 (1) TLNJ 59*, the preliminary decree decided the right and share of each party and the final decree allots specific property equivalent the shares decided in the preliminary decree. The defendant's share of 1/7th in the suit property is held in O.S.No.115 of 2009. There is no material evidence regarding any appeal or stay of the said judgment and decree. It is true that the final decree is yet to be passed. However, the fact of the defendant's rightful share in the suit property is established and declared in the said preliminary decree.

32. The preliminary decree being a 'judgment in personam' is binding on the Plaintiff herein, as she is the 7th defendant in the suit and also claims right in the

suit property through the other legal heirs of Mr.Manickam. There is no material evidence on record to show if any appeal or revision was filed against the same. The preliminary decree in O.S.No.115 of 2009 is clearly on merits and duly contested by the Plaintiff, she cannot reagitate the same issue twice.

33. The PW1 admitted that there is no appeal or revision filed against the said preliminary decree. Even though the final decree is not passed, the Plaintiff being a party to the said proceedings and in the absence of any appeal, she is thoroughly bound by the preliminary decree passed therein regarding the share of each sharer. Accordingly, the issue No.2 is answered against the Plaintiff.

34. This court finds that though the Defendant pleads possession by cultivation no documentary or oral evidence is led regarding the same. Whiles, the Plaintiff to prove her possession had adduced PW2 ocular evidence. Also, the Ex.A2, Ex.A3 and Ex.A4 Patta, Chitta, Property Tax stand in the name of the Plaintiff. Thus, the possession of the Plaintiff is duly established. Now the nature of physical possession, in light of the factum that the Defendant has a share in the suit property, the nature of possession if joint or not has to be identified. This court finds that the Plaintiff had purchased the shares of all the legal heirs of Mr.Manickam except the Defendant herein.

35. This court note of the judgment in ***T.Ramalingeswara Roa (Died) thr. LRS. And another Vs.N.Madhava Rao and others, 2019 AIR (SC) 1777***, relied by the learned counsel for the defendant. Wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court dealt a similar issue and held that on purchase of some shares the purchaser steps into the shoes of her vendor and will be a co-sharer. Accordingly, in the instant case, the Plaintiff having purchased the shares of all the owners except the Plaintiff, has stepped into the shoes of her vendors for their shares. Thus, this court finds that the Plaintiff and defendant are co-sharers.

36. This court takes judicial note of the Judgment in ***Syed Shah Ghulam Ghouse Mohiuddin and others Vs. Syed Shah Ahmed Mohiuddin Kamisul Quadri and Others, (1971) 1 SCC 597*** wherein the Hon'ble High Court held that possession of one co-owner is presumed to be on behalf of all co-owners unless it is established that the possession of the co-owner is in denial of title of coowners and the possession is in hostility to co-owners by exclusion of them. It was further held that there has to be open denial of title to the parties who are entitled to it by excluding and ousting them.

37. A three judge bench of the Hon'ble Madras High Court in ***P.Lakshmi Reddy Vs. R.Lakshmi Reddy, 1956 INSC 78*** while examining the necessary

conditions for applicability of doctrine of ouster to the shares of co-owners, held as follows:

“4. Now, the ordinary classical requirement of adverse possession is that it should be nec vi nec clam nec precario. (See Secretary of State for India V. Debendra Lal Khan [(1933) LR 61 IA 78, 82]. The possession required must be adequate in continuity, in publicity and in extent to show that it is possession adverse to the competitor. (See Radhamoni Debi v. Collector of Khulna [(1900) LR 27 IA 136, 140]). But it is well-settled that in order to establish adverse possession of one co-heir as against another it is not enough to show that one out of them is in sole possession and enjoyment of the profits of the properties. Ouster of the non-possessing co-heir by the co-heir in possession who claims his possession to be adverse, should be made out. The possession of one coheir is considered, in law, as possession of all the coheirs. When one co-heir is found to be in possession of the properties it is presumed to be on the basis of joint title. The co-heir in possession cannot render his possession adverse to the other co-heir not in possession merely by any secret hostile animus on his own part in derogation of the other co-heir's title. (See Cores v. Appuhamy [(1912) AC 230]). It is a settled rule of law that as between co-heirs there must be evidence of open assertion of hostile title, coupled with exclusive possession and enjoyment by one of them to the knowledge of the other so as to constitute ouster. This does not necessarily mean that there must be an express demand by one and denial by the other.”

38. Therefore, it is a settled position of law that in order to establish adverse possession of one co-sharer as against another, it is not enough to show that one out of them is in sole possession and enjoyment of the profits of the properties. Ouster of the non-possessing co-sharer by the co-sharer in possession, who claims his possession to be adverse, should be made out. The possession of one co-sharer is considered, in law, as possession of all the co-sharers. When one co-sharer is found to be in possession of the properties it is presumed to be on the basis of joint title. The co-sharer in possession cannot render his possession adverse to the other co-sharer not in possession merely by any secret hostile animus on his own part in derogation of the other co-sharer's title.

39. Apart from that the Ex.A2, Ex.A3 and Ex.A4 Patta, Adangal and Tax receipt in the name of the Plaintiff are purely revenue records. In light of the dictum laid in *Kesavan and others Vs. Muthu, 2012 (6) CTC 303, M.Ganesan and others Vs. Kanniappan and others, 2025 (3) TNLJ 160 (Civil)*, the revenue records do not convey title or establish title when there are title deeds. Hence, the said documents do not assist the Plaintiff to prove her case in respect of title or ouster of the Defendant from the joint possession.

40. Though the Plaintiff had claimed that the defendant has been ousted from the suit property, there is no material pleadings to show when and how the

Defendant was ousted. The fact that the DW1 admits that his parents and siblings did not attend his marriage would not in any manner amount to ouster. However, the non attendance of the marriage or not residing in the village would not in any manner amount to ouster, unless the same is to to the knowledge of the said person. There has to be specific pleadings about the date on which the defendant was ousted from the joint possession either by his co-sharers or the Plaintiff who stepped into the shoes of the co-sharers. However, in the absence of due pleadings, there can be no amount of evidence.

41. As per the well established principle of law, the possession by one co-sharer is a deemed joint possession for all the co-sharers unless ouster is duly proved. Hence, this court considers that unless ouster is duly pleaded and proved, the possession of the suit property shall be deemed to be joint possession for all the share holders. As the defendant has not conveyed his share to the Plaintiff, the possession of the Plaintiff is deemed to be in joint possession with the Plaintiff as a co-sharer/co-owner. Hence, the defendant is in joint possession of the suit property with the Plaintiff as co-sharer until a final decree is passed for separate possession. Accordingly, the issue No.3 is answered in favour of the Defendant.

42. It is a well established principle of law that no person can convey a better title than that he has. This court considers that the Plaintiff is not the absolute owner and is a co-sharer with the Defendant having purchased all shares except that of the defendant. There can be no injunction against a co-sharer as per the established principle of law. The same has been held in ***Prakash Sukhdev Akotkar Vs. Mansoorkha Gulabkha, 1996 (2) BCR 311*** relied by the learned counsel for the Plaintiff. Though the judgment is not a binding precedent, the ratio therein can be applied to the facts of this instant case.

43. The Plaintiff being a co-sharer is in possession of the suit property on behalf of the defendant, i.e. the co-sharer. Hence, there can be no injunction against the co-sharer. No prima facie or extraordinary case is established for granting any injunction against the co-sharer. Further, even as per the case of the Plaintiff, there is a cloud over the absolute title of the suit property.

44. Therefore, in light of the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Anathula Sudhakar Vs. P.Buchi Reddy (Dead) by Lrs. & Ors, 2009 2 LW 546 and The Tahsildar, Urban Improvement Trust and anr. Vs. Ganga Bai Menariya (dead) through Lrs. and others, 2024 INSC 121***, the Plaintiff have to first seek for declaration of her title to clarify conveyance of alleged absolute title upon her from her vendors, when she claims the absolute ownership in the

suit property and injunction as a true owner. The said issue regarding absolute ownership of the Plaintiff involves complicated question of law and cannot be decided in this suit for injunction simpliciter. Hence, this court is of the considered view that the cloud in title being established, the Plaintiff cannot seek for permanent injunction based on absolute title against co-sharer.

45. Further, when the essential ingredient for a relief of permanent injunction is not proved, the Plaintiff cannot be entitled to any relief of permanent injunction for the suit property against the co-sharer. This court finds that even as per the case of the Plaintiff, there is no proper pleadings or material evidence to show the conveyance of the absolute title upon the Plaintiff's vendor and subsequently upon her. In accordance with the well established law, the Plaintiff has to firstly discharge her burden regarding the title, right and possession of the suit property. As already found above, there is a cloud over the title of the Plaintiff.

46. This court concludes that there is a clear cloud over the valid conveyance of title upon the plaintiff irrespective of the pleadings regarding ownership, which involves complicated question of fact and law and cannot be decided in this suit for bare injunction. This suit is thus bad for lack of seeking declaration of title, despite knowledge about the conveyance of title.

47. Apart from that this court has already held that the plaintiff had failed to clearly plead the material facts regarding the conveyance of title upon her from her vendor in the suit property and the right for exclusive possession without interference of the defendant who is a co-sharer. Also failed to seek for declaration of title, despite being aware of the dispute in title. Apart from that there is no document to show exclusive possession of the plaintiff ousting the defendant. Further, the Plaintiff has abused the process of law by concealing about the partition proceedings to which she and her vendor were both parties.

48. Thus, this court considers that the conduct of the Plaintiff does not warrant the exercise of the discretionary power in her favour and ought to be refused under Section 41(i) of the Specific Relief Act. Hence, this court concludes that the Plaintiff had not discharged her burden of proof regarding the relief for permanent injunction. Now the issue No.1 is answered accordingly against the Plaintiff.

ISSUE NO.4: Other Relief

49. As the Issue No.1 to 3 have been answered against the Plaintiff and this Court considers that the parties are not entitled to any other relief in respect of the suit property.

50. Considering the nature of the relief sought for, this court finds that the Plaintiff being fully aware of the earlier suit for partition in O.S.No.115/2009 and having been a party to the partition proceedings, filed this bare injunction suit in 2016. She had concealed and failed reveal the proper details of the earlier partition suit. Thereby abused the process of law. Hence, this court finds that the Plaintiff shall pay the cost of this suit to the Defendant. Thus, Issue No.4 is answered accordingly.

RESULT

51. In the result, this suit is dismissed with costs. The Plaintiff is directed to pay the cost of the suit to the Defendant on or before 2 months from the date of this Judgment, failing which the Defendant is entitled to invoke the appropriate proceedings in the manner known to law.

Dictated to the steno typist partly, who directly typed the same in her Computer and partly typed by me, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 6th day April 2026.

**PRINCIPAL DISTRICT MUNSIF
KANCHEEPURAM.**

Plaintiff's side Witness:

PW1 – Sekar

PW2- Gangadharan

Plaintiff's side Exhibits:

Ex.A1	Sale deed dated 08.06.2006	Certified copy
Ex.A2	Patta dated 12.07.2008	Online copy
Ex.A3	Chitta	True copy
Ex.A4	Property Tax	Original
Ex.A5	Power of attorney dated 22.12.2005	Certified copy

Defendant's Side Witness :

DW1 – Karunamoorthy (Defendant)

Defendant's Side Exhibits:

Ex.B1	Judgment in O.S.No.115 of 2009 Hon'ble Sub Court in Kanchipuram	Certified copy
-------	---	----------------

**PRINCIPAL DISTRICT MUNSIF
KANCHEEPURAM.**