

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF, SRIPERUMBUDUR
PRESENT: TR. P. JAGADEESWARAN BA.,BL.,
DISTRICT MUNSIF, SRIPERUMBUDUR

On Friday, the 27th day of March 2026
ORIGINAL SUIT NO. 971 OF 2008

CNR No.TNKP12-001193-2008

M/s.Coromandel club (P) Ltd.,

Represented by its director and authorized Signatory Mr. M.Kanagasabai
(amended as per IA 126 of 2016 dated 02.02.2016)

.....Plaintiff

Vs

1. C.Ravindhra Nath
2. K.Ethiraj
- 3.T.R.Ettiyappan

.....Defendants

ORIGINAL SUIT NO.753 OF 2008

CNR No.TNKP12-000303-2008

1. G.Mani Nadar
2. P.Rajendiran

Both represented by the power holder Mr.K.Ethiraj
(amended as per order in I.A.No. 95 of 2018 dated 02.07.2018)

.....Plaintiff

Vs

M/s.Coromandal Club (P) Ltd.,

Represented by its Managing director Mr.Kanagasabai
(amended as per Order in IA 186 of 2016 dated 21.04.2016)

.....Defendant

ORIGINAL SUIT NO. 971 OF 2008

This suit having come on 13.03.2026 before me for final hearing in the presence of
M/s.K.Selvamani, learned counsels for the Plaintiff, S.Janarthanan, learned counsels

for the Defendants, upon hearing the arguments made by the learned counsel for the plaintiff and perusal of the records, this suit having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivers the following:

ORIGINAL SUIT NO.753 OF 2008

This suit having come on 13.03.2026 before me for final hearing in the presence of M/s.S.Janarthanan, learned counsels for the Plaintiff, M/s.K.Selvamani, learned counsels for the Defendants , upon hearing the arguments made by the learned counsel for the plaintiff and perusal of the records, this suit having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivers the following:

COMMON JUDGMENT

1. **OS No.971 of 2008:** This suit is filed by the Plaintiff seeking for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their men, agents, persons interested with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the schedule mentioned property either by way of trespass, encroachment or in any other manner, alienating or creating any sort of encumbrance over the schedule mentioned property and for cost of this suit.
2. **OS No.753 of 2008:** This suit is filed by the Plaintiff seeking for a permanent injunction restraining the defendants their men and agents or subordinates in any manner further not to disturb the Peaceful possession and enjoyment of the schedule mentioned property and for cost of the suit.

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE PLAINT FILED BY THE PLAINTIFF IN OS No. 971 of 2008:

3. The Plaintiff is a Private Limited Club established in 1991 at Sriperumbudur,

spread over 81.15 acres, providing recreational facilities to its members and functioning peacefully since inception. Initially, one V. Chandrasekaran acted as a land broker and facilitated agreements with various landowners, resulting in the Club purchasing about 71.61 acres in 1992, with possession handed over and sale deeds executed. Similarly, in 1991, Chandrasekaran and his son Ravindra Nath agreed to sell about 9.54 acres, received full consideration, and handed over possession but failed to execute sale deeds. After Chandrasekaran's death, the Plaintiff repeatedly requested execution of the sale deed, but in vain. Subsequently, the defendants attempted to trespass into the suit property in 2005 but were resisted by the Club members. The Plaintiff lodged a police complaint and issued public notice in newspapers regarding the dispute. The defendants later claimed rights over the property and attempted to interfere with possession. Hence, disputes arose due to their unlawful attempts to assert ownership despite receiving full consideration. Hence, this suit for permanent injunction.

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE WRITTEN STATEMENT FILED BY THE DEFENDANTS in OS No. 971 of 2008:

4. The defendants deny all allegations in the plaint except those specifically admitted and contend that the suit lacks any valid cause of action and is liable to be dismissed. They assert that the 1st defendant is the absolute owner of Item No.2 property, having purchased it through a registered sale deed in 1982, and has been in continuous possession thereafter. The defendants deny any agreement with the plaintiff and state that the 1st defendant executed a power of attorney in favour of

the 2nd defendant, who lawfully sold the property to a third party, now in possession with valid patta and tax payments. Similarly, Item No.1 property was inherited by the legal heirs of Late Chandrasekar and later sold through proper authority to another purchaser in possession. The defendants argue that the alleged agreement of 1991 was not performed within the stipulated time, rendering it time-barred and unenforceable. They further state that the suit properties were sold prior to the filing of the present suit, making the suit not maintainable. The defendants deny handing over possession to the plaintiff and highlight the existence of another suit filed by the plaintiff on the same matter. They also contend that certain defendants are unnecessarily impleaded without any cause. Hence, the defendants submit that the suit is unsustainable, filed without clean hands, and liable to be dismissed with costs.

**CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE PLAINT FILED BY THE PLAINTIFF IN
OS No.753 of 2008:**

5. The 1st and 2nd plaintiffs submit that they lawfully purchased the suit schedule properties under registered sale deeds dated 31.07.2006 and are in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the same. The 1st plaintiff purchased 1.50 acres in Survey No.1490/2 from seven co-owners through their power agent, while the 2nd plaintiff purchased 1.81 acres in Survey No.1490/1 from Mr. C. Ravindranath, who had valid title from an earlier sale in 1982. The properties were duly registered at SRO, Sriperumbudur, and patta has also been transferred in the plaintiffs' names, with revenue taxes being regularly paid by them. The plaintiffs further state that the

defendant, who is running a club near the suit property, attempted to trespass and encroach upon the property on 31.01.2008 through his men. Though the plaintiffs approached local persons and temporarily resolved the issue, and also lodged a police complaint, no effective action was taken. The plaintiffs contend that the defendant is an influential person and poses a continuous threat of trespass. Hence, there is a reasonable apprehension of interference, causing potential irreparable loss and hardship to the plaintiffs. Therefore, the plaintiffs have been constrained to file the suit to safeguard their lawful possession and enjoyment of the property. Hence, this suit for permanent injunction.

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE WRITTEN STATEMENT FILED BY THE DEFENDANT in O.S No.753 of 2008:

6. The defendant denies the Plaintiffs' claims of ownership, possession and valid purchase of the suit property, alleging the sale deeds are sham and unenforceable. It is asserted that the Plaintiffs' vendors had not valid title, and any transactions made are void and not binding. The defendant claims lawful possession through earlier agreements and continuous enjoyment of the property. The suit is described as false, vexatious and filed to interfere with the defendant's rights. The defendant also argues that prior litigation on the same subject matter exists, making the present suit not maintainable. It is contended that the Plaintiffs suppressed material facts and obtained interim relief by misleading the court. The defendant maintains rights under part performance and adverse possession, denying allegations of trespass. Finally, the suit is challenged for legal defects like misjoinder of parties

and cause of action, and dismissal with costs.

7. On perusal of the plaint and written statement filed by the defendants, this Court framed the following issues on 27.01.2014 in OS No.971 of 2008:

8. ISSUES

- 1. Whether the Plaintiff is the owner of the suit property ?*
- 2. Whether the Plaintiff is in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property?*
- 3. Whether the defendant is alleged to interfere with the plaintiff's peaceful possession of suit property ?*
- 4. Whether the defendant is alleged to alienate the suit property ?*
- 5. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of permanent injunction ?*
- 6. To what other relief is the Plaintiff entitled to?*

9. On perusal of the plaint and written statement filed by the defendants, this Court framed the following issues on 02.02.2017 in OS No.753 of 2008:

10. ISSUES

- 1. Whether the Plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of suit property on the date of filing to the plaint ?*
- 2. Whether the defendants alleged to interfere in the plaintiff peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property ?*
- 3. Whether the suit is barred under the doctrine of Res- Sub judice under Section 10 of CPC ?*
- 4. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction ?*

5. To what other relief is the Plaintiff entitled to?

11. EVIDENCE :

Since, the suit schedule of property and prayer was one and the same, the Joint trial was order in OS.No. 971 2008 and OS.No. 753/2008 by Hon'ble High Court of Madras on 19.12.2016 in CRP (PD) No. 3707 of 2016.

On the Plaintiff's side, PW1 and PW2 were examined Ex.A1 to A13 were marked Ex.A1 to A9 were marked through PW1 Ex.A10 to A13 were marked through DW1 cross.

On the Defendant's side, DW1 were examined Ex.B1 to B11 were marked.

12. DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS :

In OS.No. 971 of 2008 Coromandel club private limited is Plaintiff, In OS.No.753 of 2008 Coromandel club private limited is the defendant. The 2nd defendant in OS.No.971 of 2008 is plaintiff in OS.No. 753 of 2008. For the sake of brevity the plaintiff in OS.No.971 of 2008 is referred as herein after as plaintiff for both the suits and defendant in OS.No.971 of 2008 referred as herein after as defendant in both the suits.

13. Case of the Plaintiff: The Plaintiff is the registered social club in the name of M/s.,Coromandel club private limited and having more 50 esteemed members it is functioning for recreation purposes to it's members. This club were started in the year 1991 the Plaintiff entered a agreement with one Mr.V.Chandrasekar who is land broker. Additionally the above mentioned Chandrasekar is the absolute owner for suit schedule property Item I : Vacant land to an extent of 1.50 acres comprised

in S.No. 1409/2, situated at Sriperumbudur village. Item II property belongs to the Chandrasekar son namely C.Ravidranath therefore the above said Chandrasekar signed that agreement for him as well as for his son and as a Power of attorney holder for some other vendors also. Therefore Plaintiff claims that based on that agreement the suit property possession was handed over immediately after the execution of sale agreement. Therefore from the date of agreement plaintiff are in peaceful possession of suit property now the defendants herein disturb the peaceful possession of Plaintiff to the schedule of property hence plaintiff seeks permanent injunction restraining the defendants their men, agents, servants or any other persons claiming under or through them from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the schedule mentioned property either by way of trespass, encroachment or in any other manner and permanent injunction restraining the defendants their men and agents from alienating or creating any sort of encumbrance over the schedule mentioned property. Hence the suit.

14. **Case of the Defendant :** The 1st defendant in O.S.No. 971 of 2008 contents that he is the absolute owner for the item 2 schedule of property and for item 1 after the demise of his father he becomes the sole legal heir therefore he is the absolute owner for the item 1 property. 1st defendant denies the agreement between the plaintiff and his father and he strongly objects that his father does not have any power to enter the sale agreement on behalf of him therefore the suit is liable to be dismissed. And vehemently contents that Plaintiff was never in the possession of

suit schedule property and they claiming the possession with false allegations. Hence, suit is to be dismissed.

15. Ex.A1 is the certificate of incorporation for the plaintiff club. Ex.A2 is the memorandum of associations and articles of associations for the plaintiff. Ex.A3 is the audit report. Ex.A4 is the agreement of sale for the suit schedule property. Ex. A5 is the receipts of sale amount received infurtharence to Ex.A4 (Total No.33 receipts). Ex.A6 and A7 are the paper publication issued by the Plaintiff to show the possession of the suit property. Ex.A8 is the minutes of meeting of Plaintiff club. Ex.A9 is the notice issued by the 2nd and 3rd defendant to the Plaintiff. Ex.A10 is the sale deed executed by the 1st Plaintiff in O.S.No. 753 of 2008 Ex.A11 is the Sale deed executed by 2nd Plaintiff in O.S.No. 753 of 2008. Ex.A12 is the subsequent sale deed to the suit property. EX.A13 is the Sale deed in vide Doc.No. 8310 of 2010.

16. On the defendant side 2nd defendant examined as DW1 and Ex.B1 to B11 were marked through him. Ex.B1 is the power of attorney executed by 1st defendant and other Legal heirs of Chandrasekar infavour of Mani Nadar. Ex.B2 is the power of attorney executed by 1st defendant and other Legal heirs of Chandrasekar infavour of Rajendiran. Ex.B3 is the power of attorney executed by the 1st defendant and other legal heirs of Chandrasekar in favour of 2nd defendant. Ex.B4 is the power of attorney executed by 1st defendant infavour of 2nd defendant. Ex.B5 patta infavour of Mani Nadar. Ex.B6 is the adangal and chitta infavour of Mani nadar. Ex.B7 is the patta infavour of Rajendran. Ex.B8 is the Sale deed infavour of 1st defendant.

Ex.B9 is the Sale deed infavour of 1st defendant. Ex.B10 is the decree in O.S.No. 34 of 2011. Ex.B11 is the judgment pronounced in O.S.No. 34 of 2011.

ANSWER TO ISSUE NO. 1,2,3,5 IN O.S.No. 971 OF 2008 AND ISSUE No. 1,2,4 IN O.S.No. 753 OF 2008 :

17. Both the suits was filed before this court seeking an permanent injunction relief against the defendants, OS.No.971 of 2008 was instituted on 02.08.2006, OS.No.753 of 2008 was instituted on 04.02.2008. The plaintiff in the OS.No. 753 of 2008 purchased the suit property on 31.07.2006 from the defendants in OS.No.971 of 2008. In both the suits the main issue to be decided is based on Ex. A4 marked in the OS.No.971 of 2008. It is a unregistered sale agreement executed by the 1st defendant father on behalf of 1st defendant. Upon perusal of the Ex.A4 the contents in the Ex.A4 shows that 1st defendant father Mr. Chandrasekar signed the sale agreement with the plaintiff for himself, for his son and for some other land owners but not even a single piece of evidence produced before this court to show on what power Mr. Chandrasekar signed the sale agreement for his son and other and other land owners. Even in the sale agreement Ex.A4 does not reveal how the Power is obtained by Chandrasekar to sign the agreement on behalf of his son and other land owners therefore the Ex.A4 contents could not bind the 1st defendant herein who is the son of Mr. Chandrasekar. In PW1 cross it was admitted by PW1 as follows - கிரைய ஒப்பந்தத்தத்தில் விற்பனைதாரர் என்று 7 நபர்களின் பெயர் போடப்பட்டுள்ளது. எத்தனை நபர்களின் கையெழுத்துகள் போடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சந்திரசேகர் என்ற ஒருவர் மட்டும் கையெழுத்திட்டார்.

18. For that plaintiff vehemently argued 1st defendant Ravidranath son of Chandrasekar received a sum of Rs. 10,000/- on 24.08.1993 and to that receipt were marked before this court as Ex.A5 Plaintiff further submits that this case is filed by the plaintiff on the basis of rights provided under Section 53 – A of Transfer of property Section 53 A act as follows : **(A) Transfer of Property, whether Moveable or Immoveable** Section 53A: Part Performance.

Where any person contracts to transfer for consideration any immoveable property by writing signed by him or on his behalf from which the terms necessary to constitute the transfer can be ascertained with reasonable certainty, and the transferee has, in part performance of the contract, taken possession of the property or any part thereof, or the transferee, being already in possession, continues in possession in part performance of the contract and has done some act in furtherance of the contract, and the transferee has performed or is willing to perform his part of the contract, then,

*notwithstanding that 3[***], or, where there is an instrument of transfer, that the transfer has not been completed in the manner prescribed there for by the law for the time being in force, the transferor or any person claiming under him shall be debarred from enforcing against the transferee and persons claiming under him any right in respect of the property of which the transferee has taken or continued in possession, other than a right expressly provided by the terms of the contract: Provided that nothing in this section shall affect the rights of a transferee for*

consideration who has no notice of the contract or of the part performance thereof.]

Based on the provision cited supra, the Chandrasekar handed over the possession of the suit property in furtherance to the execution of Ex.A4 therefore plaintiff is entitled for the permanent injunction. Now this court verifies the receipt as well as about the original document possession filed by the plaintiff infurtherance to Ex.A4. In PW1 cross – மேற்படி சந்திரசேகர் மற்றும் ரவீந்திரநாத் ஆகியோரின் தாவா சொத்து குறித்த பத்திரங்களை நான் வாங்கி வைத்துள்ளேனா என்றால் இல்லை. Last receipt for the payment of sale was took place on 23.02.1995. It is a admitted fact by the plaintiff that after 23.02.1995 there is no further transactions between the plaintiff and defendant hence for the limitation to Ex.A4 will be ended up on 23.02.1998 itself as per the limitation act after the lapse of limitation plaintiff could not seek any remedy based upon the Ex.A4 but plaintiff vehemently argued that from the date of entering into the agreement the possession was handed over to the plaintiff for the suit property. But PW1 cross admits that வாதசா ஆ 4 பத்தி 4 ல் அதிலுள்ள சொத்துக்களை கிரையம் செய்து கொள்ளவில்லை என்றால் அந்த இடத்தின் அனுபவத்தை விற்பனையாளருக்கே கொடுத்துவிடவேண்டும் என்று குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். அந்த ஒப்பந்தத்தில் பத்தி 8 ன் படி ஆறு மாத காலத்திற்குள் கிரையம் பெற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். Therefore this court verifies the nature of suit property in the plaint as follows : Item I : Vacant land to an extent of 1.50 acres comprised in S.No. 1409/2, situated at Sriperumbudur village.

Item II : Vacant land to an extent of 1.81 acres comprised in S.No. 1409/1, situated at Sriperumbudur village.

19. From the above schedule it is very clear that the schedule of properties are vacant land it is well settled law by Hon'ble apex court in many Judgments that when the property is a vacant land then possession will be follows title as per the dictum laid down in the ***Anathula Sudhakar Vs. B.Buchi Reddy (AIR 2008 SC 2033)*** *But what if the property is a vacant site, which is not physically possessed, used or enjoyed? In such cases the principle is that possession follows title. If two persons claim to be in possession of a vacant site, one who is able to establish title thereto will be considered to be in possession, as against the person who is not able to establish title. This means that even though a suit relating to a vacant site is for a mere injunction and the issue is one of possession, it will be necessary to examine and determine the title as a prelude for deciding the de jure possession. In such a situation, where the title is clear and simple, the court may venture a decision on the issue of title, so as to decide the question of de jure possession even though the suit is for a mere injunction. But where the issue of title involves complicated or complex questions of fact and law, or where court feels that parties had not proceeded on the basis that title was at issue, the court should not decide the issue of title in a suit for injunction. The proper course is to relegate the plaintiff to the remedy of a full-fledged suit for declaration and consequential reliefs. The Dictum laid down in the judgment clearly proves that when the vacant site is the suit*

property then “possession follows the title” therefore plaintiff could not claim the possession was handed over infurtherance to Ex.A4.

20. In this case the Plaintiff admits that for the suit property title was existing in the name of defendant only they never object the title over the suit property therefore when the plaintiff seeking relief from sale agreement then as per specific relief act plaintiff should show the “readiness and willingness” to prove that they were always ready and willing for executing the sale deed as per the conditions of Ex.A4 in this case the Plaintiff failed to prove the “readiness and willingness”. In PW1 cross – மேற்படி ரவீந்திரநாத் மற்றும் சந்திரசேகருக்கும் கிரையம் செய்து கொடுக்கும்படி வழக்கறிஞர் அறிவிப்பு ஏதேனும் அனுப்பினேனா என்றால் இல்லை. அவர்கள் ஊரை காலி செய்து விட்டு சென்றதால் அனுப்பவில்லை. தாவாவில் ரவீந்திரநாத்திற்கு திருபொரும்பூதூர் முகவரிதான் போடப்பட்டது. அதன்படி தாவாவில் அழைப்பானை சார்வு செய்யப்பட்டு அவர் நீதிமன்றத்தில் ஆஜராகியுள்ளார் என்றால் ஆமாம். அதனால் ரவீந்திரநாத் ஊரை காலி செய்து விட்டு சென்றுவிட்டார், என்று நான் கூறுவது தவறு என்றால் சரியல்ல.

From the answers of the PW1 it is very clear that Plaintiff was never ready and willing to execute the terms of Ex.A4.

21. In addition to that Plaintiff failed to seek the efficacious relief for that ground itself the suit is liable to be dismissed as per Section 41(h) Specific relief act. Section 41 (h) Specific relief act as follows : *41. Injunction when refused. - An*

injunction cannot be granted- (h) when equally efficacious relief can certainly be obtained by any other usual mode of proceedings except in case of breach of trust.

22. Then injunction cannot be granted simpliciter in the absence of efficacious relief. The dictum laid down in the ***Anathula Sudhakar Vs. B.Buchi Reddy (AIR 2008 SC 2033)*** *The general principles as to when a mere suit for permanent injunction will lie and when it is necessary to file a suit for declaration and/or possession along with injunction as consequential relief, were well-settled in this case in the following words:-*

Where a plaintiff is in lawful or peaceful possession of a property and such possession interfered or threatened by the defendant, a suit for an injunction simpliciter will lie. A person has a right to protect his possession by seeking a prohibitory injunction against any person who does not prove a better title. But a person in wrongful possession is not entitled to an injunction against the rightful owner.

Where the title of the plaintiff is not disputed, but he is not in possession, his remedy is to file a suit for possession and seek in addition, if necessary, an injunction. A person out of possession, cannot seek the relief of injunction simpliciter, without claiming the relief of possession.

Where the plaintiff is in possession, but his title to the property is in dispute, or under a cloud, or where the defendant asserts title thereto and there is also a threat

of dispossession from defendant, the plaintiff will have to sue for declaration of title and the consequential relief of injunction.

Where the title of plaintiff is under a cloud or in dispute and he is not in possession or not able to establish possession, necessarily the plaintiff will have to file a suit for declaration, possession and injunction.

The Plaintiff in the OS.No.753 of 2008 has filed the Original Suit before Hon'ble Sub court Kancheepuram in OS.No. 34 of 2011 and OS.No. 35 of 2011 for the prayer to declare the plaintiff are absolute owner of the suit schedule property it was decreed infavour of the plaintiff in both the suits and the plaintiff herein was the defendants in that both suits the PW1 also admits the knowledge about the decree in PW1 cross but objecting that it was obtained without necessary parties. Plaintiff is claiming that suit was decreed in the year 2011 at the time defendant herein was not at all owner to the suit property, they sold out the properties to the some other persons therefore they does not have power to obtain that decree this stand could not be acceptable when plaintiff failed to show that decree was obtained without necessary parties with strong proof or plaintiff should contest that decree in any manner provided under law but plaintiff without doing that simply coming before this court and claiming the possession is not valid one. Hence in the both suits plaintiff failed to do establish their right and impliedly admitting that they waived their right claiming over the suit schedule property. Hence Issue No.1,2,3,5 in O.S.No.971 of 2008 answered against to the Plaintiff and Issue No.1,2,4 are answered in favour of Plaintiff in O.S.No. 753 of 2008.

23. **ISSUE No. 04 in O.S.No. 971 of 2008** : Since the Issue No. 1,2,3,5 are answered against to the Plaintiff the issue no.4 also answered against to the Plaintiff.

RESULT :

24. O.S.No. 971 of 2008:

For the reasons discussed above the suit is liable to be dismissed. **In the result this suit dismissed. No costs.**

25. O.S.No.753 of 2008:

Since the original suit 971 of 2008 is dismissed the Plaintiff in this suit are the subsequent purchaser of suit property from the defendants in O.S.No. 971/2008 they establish their title through Ex.B1 to B11 and O.S.No. 971/2008 is dismissed, For the reasons stated above this O.S.No. 753 of 2008 is decreed in favour of the Plaintiff as prayed for.

In the result the suit is decreed as follows:

an order of permanent injunction is granted restraining the defendants their men and agents or subordinates in any manner further not to disturb the Peaceful possession and enjoyment of the schedule mentioned property. No costs.

Dictated to the steno-typist, transcribed by her in the desktop, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this 27th day of March 2026.

(Sd/-.Jagadeeswaran.P)
**DISTRICT MUNSIF,
SRIPERUMBUDUR.**

Plaintiff's side Witness:

PW1 – M.Kanagasabai

PW2 – Stalin

Plaintiff's side Exhibits:

Ex.A1	Certificate of Incorporation for the Plaintiff club	ORIGINAL
Ex.A2	Memorandum of association and articles of associations for the Plaintiff.	ORIGINAL
Ex.A3	Audit report	ORIGINAL
Ex.A4	Agreement of sale for the suit schedule property	ORIGINAL
Ex.A5	Receipts of sale amount received infurtharence to Ex.A4(total 33 receipts)	ORIGINAL
Ex.A6	Paper publication issued by the Plaintiff to show the possession of the suit property	ORIGINAL
Ex.A7	Paper publication issued by the Plaintiff to show the possession of the suit property	ORIGINAL
Ex.A8	Minutes of meeting of Plaintiff club	True copy
Ex.A9	Notice issued by the 2 nd and 3 rd defendant to the Plaintiff.	Original
- Ex.A1 to Ex.A 09were marked through PW1		
Ex.A10	Sale deed executed by 1 st Plaintiff in OS.No.753 of 2008	Web copy
Ex.A11	Sale deed executed by the 2 nd Plaintiff in O.S.No. 753 of 2008	Web copy

Ex.A12	Subsequent Sale deed to the suit property.	Web copy
Ex.A13	Sale deed in vide Doc.No. 8310 of 2010	Web copy
- Ex.A10 to A13 were marked through DW1 cross.		

Defendant's Side Witness :

DW1 – Ethiraj

Defendant's Side Exhibits: Nil

Ex.B1	31.07.2006	Power of attorney (Doc.No. 1320/2006) executed by 1 st defendant and other Legal heirs of Chandrasekar infavour of Mani Nadar.	Certified copy
Ex.B2	31.07.2006	Power of attorney (Doc.No. 13121/2006) executed by 1 st defendant and other Legal heirs of Chandrasekar infavour of Rajendiran	Certified copy
Ex.B3	25.08.2005	Power of attorney (Doc.No. 319/2005) executed by 1 st defendant and other Legal heirs of Chandrasekar infavour of 2 nd defendant.	Certified copy
Ex.B4	25.08.2005	Power of attorney (Doc.No. 317/2005) executed by 1 st defendant and infavour of 2 nd defendant.	Certified copy
Ex.B5	27.11.2007	Patta in favour of Mani Nadar (No. 2281)	Certified copy
Ex.B6		Adangal and chitta infavour of Mani Nadar	Certified copy
Ex.B7	27.11.2007	Patta in favour of Rajendiran (No. 2282)	Certified copy
Ex.B8		Adangal and Chitta infavour of Mani Nadar	Certified copy

Ex.B9		Sale deed executed in favour of 1 st defendant vide Doc.No. 6371/1992.	Certified copy
Ex.B10	24.08.2012	Decree in OS.No. 34 of 2011	Certified copy
Ex.B11	24.08.2012	Judgment in OS.No. 34 of 2011	Certified copy

(Sd/-.Jagadeeswaran.P)
DISTRICT MUNSIF,
SRIPERUMBUDUR.