



**IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT JUDGE, NILGIRIS DISTRICT
AT UDHAGAMANDALAM**

**Present : A.Muraleetharan, M.A., B.L.,
District Judge, Udhagamandalam**

Tuesday the 21st day of April, 2026.

**O.S.No. 04/2018
TNNS010000172018**

1. Vasantha Raghavan
2. T. Shobana Devi

... Plaintiffs

/Vs/

1. T. Mohandas
2. T. Sivadas
3. T. Sanjeev Kumar

... Defendants

This Suit is coming up for final hearing before me on 09.04.2026 in the presence of Thiru. K.G. Puneeth Advocate for the Plaintiffs and Thiru. K. Jaichandran Advocate for the 1st Defendant and Thiru. M. Santosh kumar Galada Advocate for the 2nd and 3rd Defendants and upon hearing the arguments of both sides, upon perusing the records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

Suit is for partition and to set aside the partition deed dated 22.05.2015 in respect of the undivided half share of Late. Mrs.M.A. Kamalam.



02. The Brief averments of the plaint:

The plaintiffs and Defendants are sisters and brothers being the children of late P.R.Thangappan. Under the Registered Sale Deed dated 12.12.1969 the said P.R.Thangappan along with his wife Mrs.M.A.Kamalam, jointly became entitled to the property measuring 0.54 1/2 acres in R.S.No.3909, 0.05-14/16 acres in R.S.No.3909 and 0.04-11/16 acres in R.S.No. 3908 with corresponding T.S.Nos.E/6/115, E/6/118, E/6/67 and E/6/68, all of Ootacamund Town, making in all 0.65-1/16 acres together with Buildings thereon bearing Door Nos. 163 and 164, present Door Nos. 164, 164A, 164A2 and 164A3, all of Udhagamandalam Municipality and generally known as Gulshan Bungalow.

The said property has been jointly enjoyed by the said P.R.Thangappan and the said Mrs.M.A.Kamalam. Mrs. M.A.Kamalam died intestate on 22.09.2004 leaving behind the plaintiffs and defendants being the daughters and son apart from the said P.R.Thangappan, her husband as her heirs and legal representatives. P.R.Thangappan had also died intestate on 12.07.2017. Therefore the plaintiffs and defendants being the children are entitled for equal share in respect of Kamalam undivided half share.

Taking advantage of the advanced stage of the said P.R.Thangappan, the defendants have colluded together and obtained a Registered Settlement Deed dated 25.03.2015 in respect of his half share.



Subsequently the defendants have colluded together and claimed that under an alleged oral partition the half share of Mrs.M.A.Kamalam, mother of the plaintiffs was partitioned among defendants and accordingly they have created Registered Partition Deed 22.05.2015 without any reference to the plaintiffs. The execution and registration of the said Registered Partition Deed 22.05.2015 among the defendants shall not bind the subsisting right of the plaintiffs as the plaintiffs being the daughters of the said Mrs.M.A.Kamalam are entitled for equal share and for all practical purposes they deemed to be in joint possession all along.

When the defendants had attempted to put up illegal and unauthorised construction within the suit property the plaintiffs were forced to file a suit in O.S.No.92/2016 on the file of District Munsif, Ootacamund for the relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendants, from putting up any construction or change the nature of the property or carry on any developmental work until they work out their remedy by way of partition and separate possession.

To defeat the valuable rights of the plaintiffs the defendants have colluded together and created the said Partition Deed and otherwise the defendants have no right to deny the inherited right of these plaintiffs being the daughters of late Mrs.M.A.Kamalam who are entitled to 1/5th undivided share in the half share (1/10th share in the entire property jointly purchased by late Mrs.M.A.Kamalam and the said Mr.P.R.Thangappan).



In furtherance of the cooked up partition deed the defendants have mutated the revenue records and consequently such revenue records and the change in the Municipal assessments are all unilateral and shall have no binding effect on the rights inherited by the plaintiffs by way of succession.

The plaintiffs therefore pray to pass a decree and Judgment to divide the suit properties into 10 equal shares and allot one such share to each of the plaintiffs and set-aside the registered partition deed dated 22.05.2015 in respect of the undivided half share of late Mrs. M.A. Kamalam and for costs of the suit.

03. The gist of the Written Statement filed by the 1st defendant :

As per the recitals in the Title Deed it can be seen that on the date of filing of the Plaint, the Suit Schedule Property did not belong to the deceased Mrs. M.A. Kamala. As the Plaintiffs have already filed a Suit in respect of one and the same Suit Schedule Property in O.S. No. 92 of 2016 before the Learned District Munsif Court, Ootacamund, this Suit is hit by Order II Rule 2 of the Civil Procedure Code and the Plaint is liable to be rejected.

The allegations that under a Registered Sale Deed, dated 12.12.1969, Mr.P.R. Thangappan along with his wife Mrs. M.A. Kamala, jointly became entitled to the property are all false. In fact, Mr. P.R. Thangappan, had paid the entire Sale consideration and from the date of purchase, Mr. P.R. Thangappan was exercising exclusive right of ownership and was in exclusive possession and enjoyment of the



Suit Schedule property, as exclusive Owner thereof, to the knowledge of their Mother Mrs. M.A. Kamala. Even otherwise, admittedly, as per the recitals in the said Title Deed the purchase is in favour of "Either of Survivor" and hence after the death of the Plaintiffs and the Defendants mother Mrs. M.A. Kamala on 22.09.2004, the father of the Plaintiffs and the Defendants Mr. P.R. Thangappan became the absolute and exclusive Owner of the Suit Schedule Property and as such, on the date of the filing of the Suit, the Plaintiffs do not inherit or derive any share in the Suit Schedule Property nor are the Plaintiffs in joint possession or Co-Owners of the Suit Schedule Property as alleged and hence there is no cause of action for the Suit.

Even otherwise, Mr. P.R. Thangappan was the sole Owner of the Suit Schedule Property, after the demise of the Mrs. M.A. Kamala, as the Suit Schedule Property was purchased and devolved by Either of the Survivor.

The allegations that taking advantage of the advanced stage of Mr.P.R.Thangappan, the Defendants have colluded together and obtained a Registered Settlement deed, dated 25.03.2015, in respect of Mr.P.R.Thangappan half share, are all patently false. In fact, the Plaintiffs and Defendants father Mr.P.R.Thangappan, voluntarily, out of his own free will, had executed the aforesaid Settlement Deed, in respect of the half undivided share in the Suit schedule properties, among other properties, in favour of the Defendants and there is no collusion as alleged. The aforesaid facts, allotment of half undivided share in the Suit



Schedule Property in the Oral Partition in the year 2004, the execution of the Settlement Deed etc.. among others, has been admitted by Mr.P.R.Thangappan, the father of the Plaintiffs and the Defendants in the Written Statement filed in O.S.No.92 of 2016, on the file of the District Munsif Court, Ootacamund.

The allegations that the Defendants have colluded together and created the Partition Deed dated 22.05.2015, where under the Defendants claimed that under an Oral Partition, the half share of Mrs. M.A. Kamala, was partitioned among Defendants etc., are all false. In fact, from the date of Purchase by Mr.P.R.Thangappan till the date of Oral Partition, between the Defendants and their Father Mr. P.R. Thangappan, allotting half undivided share in the Suit Schedule Property, jointly in favour of the Defendants in the 1st Week of October 2004, after the 11th day death ceremony of Mrs. M.A. Kamala, to the knowledge of the Plaintiffs and others and thereafter till date the execution of the Settlement deed by Mr.P.R.Thangappan in respect of the remaining half undivided share in the Suit Schedule Property, among others, jointly in favour of the Defendants on 25.03.2015, the deceased Mr.P.R.Thangappan was exercising rights of exclusive Ownership and was in possession and enjoyment of the Suit Schedule Property, as exclusive Owner thereof. Mr.P.R. Thangappan had got the 1st Plaintiff married in the year 1976, after providing dowry, more than 100 sovereign of gold jewels etc., Though the 2nd Plaintiff had got married on her own in the year 1985, the father of the Defendants



Mr.P.R.Thangappan had provided the 2nd Plaintiff dowry, more than 100 sovereign of gold jewels and others. Further as per the Defendants custom, father Mr.P.R.Thangappan had provided the entire house hold articles, gold ornaments and others for both the Plaintiffs, at the time of giving birth of their children. Mr.P.R.Thangappan had also purchased house sites in the name of the 1st Plaintiff and her husband at Ootacamund and in the name of the 2nd Plaintiff and her husband at Thanjavur and had also provided them substantial financial assistance to the tune of several lakhs of rupees for construction of their houses and provided substantial financial assistance for Educating the Plaintiffs children also.

The Defendants have filed a detail Written Statement in O.S.No. 92/2016 in District Munsif Court, Udthagamandalam and have also filed a Petition in I.A. No. 297 of 2017, for rejection of the Plaint in O.S. No. 92 of 2014, on the ground that there is no cause of action for the said Suit.

After the death of Mrs. M.A. Kamala, Mr. P.R. Thangappan became the absolute Owner of the Suit Schedule Property and after the Oral Partition and the execution of the Settlement Deed by Mr. P.R. Thangappan in favour of the Defendants, the Defendants became the absolute Owners, with exclusive possession and enjoyment of the Suit Schedule Property, till partition and allotment of separate shares, among the Defendants. It has been acted upon and mutation of the names of the Defendants, in all the Government, Revenue and Municipal records have been



effected and the Defendants are exercising their specific, exclusive absolute right, title, interest and exclusive possession, to their respective distinct properties and have made considerable improvements, by way of addition etc., by spending several lakhs of Rupees, to the knowledge of the Plaintiffs. The Plaintiffs have no manner of right, title, interest or possession, over the Suit Schedule Property.

Suit as framed, without declaration of the Title and possession, is prima face not maintainable in Law and the Suit Schedule Property, has not been valued properly and the Court fees paid is not correct. In fact, the Suit Schedule Property is worth several crores of Rupees and the Plaintiffs are liable to be pay Court fees, on the market value of the Suit Schedule Property, for the relief claimed in the Suit.

The 1st Defendant therefore prays to dismiss the Suit, with Compensatory Costs.

04. The gist of the written statement filed by the defendants 2 and 3:

The very same facts averred in the written statement of the 1st defendant is set out in the written statement of the defendants 2 and 3 also.

05. Upon the above pleadings, the following issues are framed:

01	Whether the suit is hit by Order 2 Rule 2 of CPC?
02	Whether the suit property is in joint possession of the plaintiffs and defendants?



03	Whether there is no cause of action for the suit?
04	Whether the suit is bad for partial partition as contended in the written statement?
05	Whether the suit without the relief of declaration of title and possession is not maintainable?
06	Whether the Court fee paid is correct?
07	Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to a preliminary decree for partition as prayed for?
08	Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to the relief of setting aside the partition deed dated 22.05.2015 registered in Doc.No.734/2015 as prayed for?
09	To what other reliefs.

On the side of the Plaintiffs, the 1st plaintiff and her husband Raghavan were examined as PW1 and PW2 respectively and Exhibits A1 to A4 were marked.

On the side of 1st defendant, he himself was examined as DW1 and Exhibits B1 and B2 were marked. Out of this Ex.B1 was marked with the consent of Plaintiff side and Ex.B2 was marked during the cross examination of PW1.

The defendants 2 and 3 side represented that they have no oral evidence and no exhibit was marked on their side.

Heard both sides arguments. Records perused.



06. Issue No. 1 and 3:

It is not in dispute that plaintiffs are sisters of the defendants 1 to 3 and they are the children of Late. P.R. Thangappan and Late. M.A. Kamalam and that the suit property was purchased jointly in the name of P.R. Thangappan and his wife M.A. Kamalam through the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 sale deed dated 12.12.1969 and M.A.Kamalam died on 22.09.2004 and P.R. Thangappan died on 12.07.2017.

The contention of the plaintiffs is that they have sought the relief of partition to divide the suit property into 10 shares and allot them with each one share is in respect of their mother M.A. Kamalam's undivided half share only in the suit property as she is the joint purchaser of the same through Ex.A1=Ex.B2 and died intestate.

The defendants, though did not dispute the fact of the intestate death of their mother, disputing the claim of the plaintiffs in respect of mother's alleged undivided half share and according to the defendants it is clearly recited in the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 sale deed itself that it was purchased by the parents with clear terms as "either of Survivor" and as such after the death of mother M.A.Kamalam on 22.09.2004, their father P.R.Thangappan became the absolute owner of the entire properties covered on Ex.A1 in the capacity of the 'survivor' of the two in whose name the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 stands and moreover their father P.R.Thangappan had paid the entire sale consideration for the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 sale and from the date of purchase, he was exercising exclusive right of ownership and he was in exclusive possession and



enjoyment of the suit property with the knowledge of his wife M.A.Kamalam and children namely the parties to this suit.

07. It is true, the plaintiffs herein filed a suit in O.S.No. 92 of 2016 on the file of District Munsif Court, Ootacamund against their father P.R.Thangappan as well as the present defendants for the relief of permanent injunction alone to restrain them from putting up any construction or change the nature of property or carry on any developmental work until they work out their remedy by way of partition and separate possession. The copy of the plaint in O.S.No.92 of 2016 is marked as Ex.A3. The copy of written statement filed by P.R.Thangappan who was the first defendant in that suit and alive by that time is marked as Ex,B1 with the consent of the plaintiff side.

In the Ex.A3 plaint it is averred that their father is already 93 years old and their brothers (defendants herein) are confining him by force and they are attempting to create some records transferring the father share in the name of brothers and the defendants (father and brothers of plaintiffs) started levelling the vacant land and dumping construction materials to construct building in the suit property and they have to be restrained until the plaintiffs workout their remedies for partition particularly the undivided half share of their mother M.A.Kamalam.



The same facts as those stated in the Ex.B1 written statement filed by P.R.Thangappan in O.S.No. 92 of 2016, is set out in the written statements filed by the defendants in this suit also.

08. The defendants of this suit, raised a plea in their written statement that the plaintiffs having filed the earlier suit in O.S.No. 92 of 2016 on the file of District Munsif Court, Ootacamund for a lesser relief in respect of the very same property, their present suit is hit by order II Rule 2 of CPC.

The defendants filed I.A.No.259 of 2018 in this suit for rejection of plaint, wherein they raised as one of the grounds under Order II Rule 2 of CPC and after due contest, this court did not accept it, by holding that in a suit for partition the cause of action will arise on the refusal of one of the co-sharers for amicable partition and the present plaintiffs prayer in O.S.No.92 of 2016 itself is that to grant permanent injunction from putting up any construction or change the nature of property until they workout their remedy by way of partition and thereafter they filed this suit in the year of 2018 itself and as such the plea of the defendants, to reject the suit under Order II Rule 2 of CPC is not acceptable and finally dismissed the said petition.

Therefore the argument of the learned counsel for the defendants herein that as per Order II Rule 2 of CPC, the plaintiffs ought to have claimed all the reliefs including partition which was available in the earlier suit itself and it is a contingent and on the date of filing this suit, the earlier suit in O.S.No. 92 of 2016 was also



pending and mere not pressing that suit will no way helpful to plaintiffs is not acceptable and it held that the contention of the defendants that there is no cause of action for this suit is not acceptable.

Accordingly the Issue No.1 and 3 are answered.

09. Issue No: 7

The plaintiffs claim partition in respect of their mother's undivided half share in the suit properties on the strength of the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 sale deed which stands jointly in the name of their parents P.R.Thangappan and M.A.Kamalam. As already stated, the defendants also did not dispute the fact that their mother M.A.Kamalam died intestate on 22.09.2004 and upon her death, her husband P.R.Thangappan who was alive by that time and her children namely the plaintiffs and defendants in this suit are her legal heirs. P.R.Thangappan, had executed Ex.A4 settlement deed dated 25.03.2015 subsequently in favour of defendants herein in respect of his undivided half share in the suit property. The plaintiffs though made some averments in this plaint, as it was obtained taking advantage of the advanced stage of father P.R.Thangappan the plaintiffs did not seek any relief in respect of the same and they have not made any claim in respect of father P.R.Thangappan's half share in the suit property.

10. The contention of the defendants is that in the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 Sale deed itself, apart from mentioning the names of parents P.R.Thangappan and M.A.Kamalam as



purchasers, it is specifically mentioned as ‘either of survivor’ also and as such on the death of mother M.A.Kamalam, the father P.R.Thangappan who was alive on that date has become the owner of the entire property as he was the survivor out of the two and it is further argued by the defendants that though their mother name is also added in the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 Sale deed, father P.R.Thangappan had only paid the entire sale consideration and he had only exercised absolute right and remained in exclusive possession. The learned counsels for the defendants argued that the suit property through Ex.A1=Ex.B2 was purchased in the capacity as joint tenants with survivorship and as per Section 91 and 92 of Evidence Act, no other interpretation can be given to the recitals of Ex.A1=Ex.B2 and it is not as tenants in common and it is to be constructed as joint tenants only and as such on the death of one of the joint tenant M.A.Kamalam, her interest will devolve automatically to other joint tenant namely P.R.Thangappan.

11. On perusal of Ex.A1 sale deed dated 12.12.1969, it is learnt that it is not only mentioned as “either of survivor” but it is further mentioned as the expression shall include the survivor of two his or her heirs legal Representatives and Assigns. Therefore the arguments of the defendants side that the expression in the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 sale deed has to be construed as ‘either of survivor’ only and as such after the death of M.A.Kamalam, her husband P.R.Thangappan became the absolute owner as the survivor of the said two, seems to be not acceptable.



Further as pointed out by the learned counsel for the plaintiffs, the Ex.A1=Ex.B2 sale deed does not state that P.R.Thangappan had paid the entire sale consideration or that he is the exclusive owner through the same. In the Ex.A2 partition deed dated 22.05.2015, which was executed between the defendants alone that too on that day their father P.R.Thangappan was very much alive, it is mentioned as the properties covered in the same are all Joint properties by way of inheritance and by virtue of registered settlement deed order 25.03.2015.

12. In the Ex.A4 Settlement deed dated 25.03.2015 which was executed by P.R.Thangappan infavour of his sons namely the defendants herein, in respect of undivided 1/2 share only (in the suit survey numbers), there is no satisfactory explanation for executing the settlement deed in respect of 1/2 share only. It is stated in para 7 of the written statement that P.R.Thangappan out of his own free will, had executed the said settlement deed in respect of the half of the undivided share in the suit properties among other properties.

13. It is further averred in the written statement that oral partition, between the defendants and P.R.Thangappan was taken place in 1st week of October 2004 after the 11th day death ceremony of M.A.Kamala to the knowledge of plaintiffs by allotting undivided half share in the suit property jointly in favour of the defendants. The learned counsel for the defendants argued that these facts are averred by



P.R.Thangappan himself in the Ex.B1 written statement filed by him in O.S.No. 92/2016.

The Ex.B1 written statement was filed after the execution of Ex.A2 partition deed and Ex.A4 Settlement deed. But the said oral partition is not mentioned in the Ex.A2 and Ex.A4. The DW1 deposed during the cross examination that since their father had given undivided half share in the suit property to the defendants jointly in the oral partition took place in the year of 2004, it was mentioned in the Ex.A4 Settlement deed (2nd item of Ex.A4) that undivided half share in the suit property was only settled in their favour. Therefore this explanation of the DW1 attracts much significance. Despite that no such mentioning about the said oral partition in the Ex.A4 settlement deed. There is no evidence or acceptable details placed by the defendants in support of their contention with regard to the oral partition except the Ex.B1 written statement of their father which was filed much later that too after dispute arose between the plaintiff and the defendants. There is no acceptable explanation on the side of defendants with regard to the question, if the P.R.Thangappan was the exclusive owner of the suit property what was the necessity for him to enter into the alleged oral partition that too by allotting undivided half share in jointly to defendants.

14. The learned counsel for the 1st defendant has relied upon the Judgment of **Honourable High Court of Gujarat- (Full Bench)** reported in **AIR 1973 Gujarat 131**



and argued that it is made clear in the above Judgment also there are two main forms which co-ownership of property may assume, one is Joint tenancy and the other is tenancy in common and the two main features of the joint tenancy are the right of survivorship and the four unities (unities of possession, interest, title, time) and that a tenancy in common is quite different and there is no right of survivorship amongst tenants in common and that on the death of joint tenant, his interest will devolve to other joint tenant.

But in the same Judgment it is further clarified that the rule of English Law is to presume that a transfer to a plurality of persons creates a joint tenancy unless there are words of severance and the law in India is however different and it has always been held in this country that where there is transfer to two or more person, they must be presumed to take as tenants in common unless there are clear words conveying a contrary intention.

Therefore for all the reasons stated above, it is held that the contention of the plaintiffs that they are entitled to claim share in the undivided half share of their mother M.A.Kamalam as they are also her legal heirs is acceptable and as such it is held that the plaintiffs are entitled to the preliminary decree for partition as prayed for.

Accordingly the issue No.7 is answered.



15. Issue No:4

The defendants averred in their written statement that the suit is bad for partial partition as the immovable properties at parthipully, Palakkad has not been included. The learned counsels for the defendants have drawn the attention of this court to the evidence of PW1, deposed during cross examination that there might be 40 cents of ancestral land for their mother at Palakkad.

But the defendants have not given any details such as survey numbers, who are all entitled to the same, whether their mother has any right as per law or in what way she is entitled to the same, in whose name the said properties now stand and whether they have taken any steps, in this regard or atleast whether they are able to identify those lands. According to the evidence of PW1, it seems, the plaintiffs are also not sure about it. No records also produced by defendants in this regard.

Further it is not the evidence or case of the plaintiffs that they intend to file any further suit in respect of the property said to be at Palakkad. In such circumstance, this court does not accept that the suit is bad for partial partition.

Accordingly the Issue No: 4 is answered

16. Issue No:2,5 and 6

In view of above reasons and that it is proved that the plaintiffs have established their right in their mother's undivided half share in the suit property, it has to be presumed that they are deemed to be in joint possession of the same and that



there is no necessity for the plaintiffs to seek the reliefs of declaration of title and possession and accordingly the court fees paid by them under Section 37 (ii) of TamilNadu Court fees and suits valuation Act is correct.

Accordingly the Issues No: 2,5 and 6 are answered.

17. Issue No:8

Apart from the relief of partition, the plaintiffs have sought the relief to set aside the partition deed (Ex.A2) dated 22.05.2015 in respect of the undivided half share of late Mrs. M.A.Kamalam. As already stated the plaintiffs have established that they are also entitled along with the defendants to the undivided half share of their mother M.A.Kamalam in the suit property and as such they are entitled to this relief also consequently. But it is noticed that the plaintiffs have not paid any court fees separately for this relief. The argument of the learned counsel for the plaintiffs that when they have paid court fees for the larger relief of partition and when they are not parties to the said partition deed dated 22.05.2015 there is no necessity to pay court fees for the same is accepted to the extent to hold that it will not bind the plaintiffs and moreover when it is held that plaintiffs are entitled to the shares claimed in the suit property and when they are not parties to any document contrary to the same, it is to be held that any document created against their right will not bind them. Accordingly it is held to the extent that the partition deed dated 22.05.2015



executed between the defendants will not bind the plaintiffs in respect of their share in the suit property.

Accordingly the Issue No:8 is answered.

18. Issue No:9

In view of decision taken by this court for the issue No: 1 to 8 , it is held that the plaintiffs are entitled to a decree for partition to divide the suit properties into 10 equal shares and allot one share to each of the plaintiffs and that it is declared that the Ex.A2 partition deed dated 22.05.2015 will not bind the plaintiffs share in the suit properties.

Accordingly the Issue No: 9 is answered.

In the result, suit is decreed in favour of plaintiffs to divide the suit properties into 10 equal shares and allot one share to each of the plaintiffs and it is declared that the partition deed dated 22.05.2015 registered as document No:734/2015 on the file of Sub Registrar, Ootacamund will not bind the plaintiffs in respect of their shares in the suit properties. No Cost.

Dictated to stenographer and directly typed by her in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court this 21st day of April 2026.

**District Judge,
Udhagamandalam.**

**Annexure:****i) Witnesses examined on the side of Plaintiff:**

PW1 Mrs.Vasantha Raghavan (1st Plaintiff)

PW2 Mr. Ragavan

ii) Exhibits Marked on the side of Plaintiff:

Exhibits	Date	Details of document	Nature
Ex.A1	12.12.1969	Sale Deed in favour of Thangappan and Kamalam	Online Certified Copy
Ex.A2	22.05.2015	Partition Deed executed between the defendants	Certified Copy
Ex.A3	***	Plaint in O.S.No. 92/2016 on the file of District Munsif Court, Ootacamund.	True Copy
Ex.A4	25.03.2015	Settlement Deed executed by Thangappan in favour of the defendants	Certified Copy

iii) Witnesses examined on the side of 1st Defendant :

DW1 Mr. T. Mohandas (1st Defendant)

iv) Exhibits Marked on the side of 1st Defendant :

Exhibits	Date	Details of document	Nature
Ex.B1	****	Written Statement filed by the Thangappan in O.S.No. 92/2016 on the file of District Munsif Court, Ootacamund.	Certified Copy



Ex.B2	12.12.1969	Sale Deed in favour of Thangappan and Kamalam.	Certified Copy
-------	------------	---	-------------------

(v) **Witnesses examined and exhibits marked on the side of defendants 2 and 3 :**

- NIL-

**District Judge,
Udhagamandalam.**

District Court,
Udhagamandalam
Fair/Draft Judgment in
O.S.No.04/2018
Dated:21.04.2026