



**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE,
RAMANATHAPURAM**

**PRESENT: Thiru. C. Mohanram, M.A., B.L.,
Additional District Judge,
Ramanathapuram.**

Wednesday the 15th day of April 2026

Original Suit No.76/2022

(CNR No.TNRM 01 004157 2022)

Karuppaiah @ Anwar Hussain

... Plaintiff

/Vs/

1. Jerina Halith

(Amended as per Order in I.A.No.5/2022 dated 04.01.2023)

2. Usha

3. Abirami

4. Mythili

5. Rajkumar

6. Manonmani

7. Mohamed Ameen

8. Mohanavanitha

9. Minor Janani

(9th defendant represented by her mother and
next friend 8th defendant Mohanavanitha)

10. Thangavel



11. Murugesan

12. Kali

13. Velammal

14. Balasubramanian

... Defendants

This suit came up for final hearing on 12.03.2026 before this Court in the presence of Thiru.J.Uduman, Counsel for the plaintiff and Thiru.J.Mohamed Sulthan, Counsel for the 1st defendant and Thiru.B.Duraimurugan, Counsel for the 9th defendant and Thiru.P.Venkatesan, Counsel for the defendants 10 to 14 and the defendants 2 to 8 have remained exparte and upon hearing both side arguments and upon perusing the entire case records and having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court delivers the following...

JUDGMENT

The suit has been filed by plaintiff for declaring that the suit properties are belonged to plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 and for consequential permanent injunction restraining the defendants 10 to 14 and their men and agents from interfering with peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff and also for permanent injunction restraining the defendants 10 to 14 and their men and agents and person claiming under them not to alienate or encumber the suit properties like othi, sale and mortgage and for costs.



2. Brief case of the plaintiff as per amended plaint:

i) The suit properties originally belonged to father of plaintiff namely Karuppan ancestrally. The said Karuppan had four children namely Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif, Mangalam, Karuppaiah @ Anwar Hussain (plaintiff), Panchavarnam @ Jerina Halith (1st defendant). The genealogy is appended with the plaint. The said Karuppan died in the year 1965. His wife Ammasi @ Saleema died in the year 1986. The said Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif S/o. Karuppan and his wife Karungammal died leaving behind no children. The said Mangalam D/o. Karuppan died in the year 1996. Her husband Sethu predeceased her. The said Mangalam had five children namely Manoharan, Rajkumar (5th defendant), Manonmani (6th defendant), Mohamed Ameen (7th defendant) and Suresh Kumar. The said Manoharan died leaving behind his wife Usha (2nd defendant). The 3rd defendant Abirami and 4th defendant Mythili are daughters of Manoharan and Usha. The said Suresh Kumar, another son of Mangalam died leaving behind his wife Mohanavanitha (8th defendant) and daughter Janani (9th defendant) as his legal heirs.

ii) After the death of Karuppan and his wife Ammasi, his legal heirs Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif, Mangalam, Karuppaiah @ Anwar Hussain (plaintiff), Panchavarnam @ Jerina (1st defendant) had acquired the properties



by inheritance. The said Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif had executed an Inam settlement deed dated 03.11.2005 in favour of his wife Karungammal and on that basis Patta was mutated in the name of Karungammal. The plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are 2nd class legal heirs of Karungammal.

iii) The defendants 10 to 14 have mutated the Patta illegally. On knowing the same the plaintiff has filed a suit in O.S.No.128/2016 on the file of District Munsif Court, Ramanathapuram. Then the said suit was withdrawn under Order 23 Rule 3A with liberty to file a fresh suit on the same cause of action as important facts are omitted to be mentioned in plaint. The 10th defendant has preferred a Civil Revision before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in CRP(MD)No.1443/2022 and the same was dismissed on 18.03.2022. The defendants 10 to 14 taking advantage of Patta in their name are attempting to alienate the properties to 3rd parties and also attempting to interfere with peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff. Hence this suit.

3. Summary of the written statement of 1st defendant:

i) Except those averments specifically admitted herein all other allegations made in the plaint have to be proved by plaintiff.

ii) It is admitted that the suit properties originally belonged to



Karuppan ancestrally and the plaintiff, Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif, Mangalam, Panchavarnam @ Jerina are the legal heirs of Karuppan. The genealogy mentioned in the plaint is admitted. It is admitted that Karuppan died in the year 1965 and his wife Ammasi @ Saleema died in the year 1986. It is admitted that Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif had no children. Mangalam, daughter of Karuppan died is also admitted. Her husband Sethu predeceased Mangalam is also admitted. They had five children is also admitted. It is admitted that the said Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif, Mangalam, Karuppiah @ Anwar Hussain, Panchavarnam @ Jerina had acquired the properties as legal heirs of Karuppan and Ammasi @ Saleema.

iii) This defendant was not aware of the Inam settlement deed dated 03.11.2025 bearing Doc.No.3866/2025 executed by Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif in favour of his wife Karungammal in respect of all the properties. This defendant was not aware of mutation of Patta. The Inam Settlement deed executed in favour of Karungammal by her husband Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif is not valid and mutation of Patta on the strength of Inam settlement is also not valid and it will not bind the share of this defendant.

iv) The defendants 10 to 14 who are brother-in-laws of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif have illegally mutated the Patta in their favour. This defendant does not aware of the suit filed by the plaintiff in O.S.No.128/2016.



The defendants 10 to 14 have no right and possession over the suit properties and they have no right to interfere with the possession of the plaintiff. It is admitted that the defendants 10 to 14 made out sell the property taking advantage of Patta in their name. All legal heirs of Karuppan are having right and interest over the suit properties and they are jointly enjoyed the properties without affecting the partition. Hence he prayed for to allow the plaintiff's suit as prayed for.

4. Summary of the written statement of 9th defendant:

i) Except those averments specifically admitted herein all other allegations made in the plaint have to be proved by plaintiff.

ii) It is admitted that the suit properties originally belonged to Karuppan ancestrally and the plaintiff, Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif, Mangalam, Panchavarnam @ Jerina are the legal heirs of Karuppan. The genealogy mentioned in the plaint is admitted. It is admitted that Karuppan died in the year 1965 and his wife Ammasi @ Saleema died in the year 1986. It is admitted that Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif had no children. Mangalam, daughter of Karuppan died is also admitted. Her husband Sethu predeceased Mangalam is also admitted. They had five children is also admitted. It is admitted that the said Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif, Mangalam, Karuppiah @



Anwar Hussain, Panchavarnam @ Jerina had acquired the properties as legal heirs of Karuppan and Ammasi @ Saleema.

iii) This defendant was not aware of the Inam settlement deed dated 03.11.2025 bearing Doc.No.3866/2025 executed by Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif in favour of his wife Karungammal in respect of all the properties. This defendant was not aware of mutation of Patta. The Inam Settlement deed executed in favour of Karungammal by her husband Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif is not valid and mutation of Patta on the strength of Inam settlement is also not valid and it will not bind the share of this defendant.

iv) The defendants 10 to 14 who are brother-in-laws of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif have illegally mutated the Patta in their favour. This defendant does not aware of the suit filed by the plaintiff in O.S.No.128/2016. The defendants 10 to 14 have no right and possession over the suit properties and they have no right to interfere with the possession of the plaintiff. It is admitted that the defendants 10 to 14 made out sell the property taking advantage of Patta in their name. All legal heirs of Karuppan are having right and interest over the suit properties and they are jointly enjoyed the properties without affecting the partition. Hence he prayed for to allow the plaintiff's suit as prayed for.



5. Summary of the written statement of 10th defendant and adopted by defendants 11 to 14:

i) Except those averments specifically admitted herein all other allegations made in the plaint have to be proved by plaintiff.

ii) It is admitted that the suit properties belonged to Karuppan ancestrally and Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif and Karuppaiah @ Anwar Hussain are sons and Mangalam and Panchavarnam @ Jerina are daughters.

iii) It is not correct to state that after the death of Karuppan the plaintiff and Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif were jointly enjoyed the properties. The suit properties were allotted to the share of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif and so separate Patta was given and the said Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif was enjoying the properties till his life time. The said Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif had settled the suit properties in favour of his wife by virtue of a registered Sale deed dated 03.11.2005 and also handedover the possession and the said Karungammal wife of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif had been enjoying the properties till her life time. The said Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif died on 09.01.2008.

iv) It is not correct to state that the plaintiff was aware of the execution of Inam Settlement deed only on 16.05.2016. It is incorrect to state that the plaintiff has obtained the possession of properties and the said Mangai



Kizhavan @ Arif and his wife Karungammal were under the custody of plaintiff. The said Karungammal died on 24.02.2012. This defendant and his brothers and sisters namely Murugesan, Velammal, Kali, Subramani are legal heirs of Karungammal. So they filed a suit in O.S.No.70/2014 for declaration that they are the legal heirs of Karungammal and the same was allowed on 03.09.2014. Then the defendants 10 to 14 have applied for mutation of Patta on the strength of the decree passed in O.S.No.70/2014.

v) The Tahsildar have denied the application filed by them and therefore they filed Writ before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court and thereafter the Tahsildar has mutated the Patta in favour of defendants 10 to 14. The defendants are enjoying the suit properties and they have also received the grab insurance amount. The suit filed by the plaintiff is barred by law of limitation and the plaintiff has wrongly filed the suit and has paid incorrect court fee. The cause of action alleged in the plaint is false and wrong and therefore he prayed for dismissal of the suit.

6. Upon perusal of pleadings and documents the following issues were framed:

1. Whether the suit property is absolutely belonged to the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 and whether they are in absolute possession in the suit properties?



2. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get the relief of declaration and Injunction as prayed for?
3. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get the relief of Permanent Injunction as prayed for?
4. To what other reliefs and cost, the plaintiff is entitled?

7. On the side of plaintiff, one Meerabai, wife of plaintiff was examined as PW1 and 16 documents were marked as Ex.A1 to Ex.A16. One Ansar Raja, Village Administrative Officer of the Kooriyur Group, Ramanathapuram Taluk has been examined as PW2 and through whom 4 documents were marked as Ex.X1 to Ex.X4. One Thavamani, Record Clerk of Ramanathapuram District Collector Office has been examined as PW3 and through whom 3 documents were marked as Ex.X5 to Ex.X7. On the side of defendants, the 10th defendant was examined as DW1 and he has marked 6 documents as Ex.B1 to Ex.B6.

8. Issues No.1 to 3:

1. The case of the plaintiff is that the suit properties originally belonged to Karuppan ancestrally and he had four children namely Karuppaiah @ Anwar Hussain (plaintiff), Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif, Mangalam, Jerina Halith (1st defendant). The genealogy is mentioned in the



plaint. It is the further case of the plaintiff that the Karuppan died in the year 1965 and his wife Ammasi @ Saleema died in the year 1986.

2. It is also the case of the plaintiff that Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif and his wife Karungammal died leaving behind no children. The daughter of Karuppan namely Mangalam died in the year 1996 and her husband Sethu predeceased her. The said Mangalam and Sethu had five children namely Manoharan, Rajkumar, Manonmani, Mohamed Ameen and Suresh Kumar. The said Manoharan died leaving behind his wife Usha and daughters Abirami and Mythili. The said Suresh Kumar died leaving behind his wife Mohanavanitha and daughter Janani. These facts are admitted by defendants 1 and 9.

3. The defendants 10 to 14 have not specifically denied the case of the plaintiff that the said Mangalam daughter of original owner Karuppan had not died leaving behind defendants 2 to 9 as her legal heirs. There is no dispute as to Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif and his wife Karungammal died leaving behind no children. The 10th defendant who has been examined as DW1 has admitted the genealogy mentioned in the plaint and also the case of the plaintiff that the plaintiff and the 1st defendant are the son and daughter of original owner



Karuppan and the defendants 2 to 9 are the legal heirs of Mangalam, daughter of original owner Karuppan. It is also admitted by both parties that the defendants 10 to 14 are brothers and sisters of Karungammal wife of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif.

4. It is the specific case of the plaintiff that the said Karungammal had acquired the suit properties by virtue of a registered Inam settlement deed dated 03.11.2005. The Xerox copy of registered Inam settlement deed dated 03.11.2005 obtained through online has been marked as Ex.A12. It is also the specific case of the plaintiff that after the death of Karungammal the plaintiff and defendants 1 and 9 have derived their rights as per Sec.15 of the Hindu Succession Act and defendants 10 to 14 have not acquired any right from the said Karungammal.

5. It is the further case of the plaintiff that the defendants 10 to 14 without impleading the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 have filed a suit for declaration and obtained a declaration that they are the legal heirs of Karungammal in a collusive manner amongst them. It is further case of the plaintiff that the defendants 10 to 14 have mutated the Patta in their name on the strength of declaration made by Civil Court in O.S.No.70/2014 on the file of District Munsif Court, Ramanathapuram. The defendants 10 to 14 are



claiming right over the properties of Karungammal and they have got no right to claim the properties of Karungammal.

6. On the other hand, the learned counsel for defendants 10 to 14 would contend that the defendants 10 to 14 are the legal heirs of Karungammal. The Civil Court has made a declaration that the defendants 10 to 14 are the legal heirs of Karungammal and therefore the defendants 10 to 14 are entitled to claim over the properties of Karungammal and on the strength of declaration given by Civil Court they have mutated Patta and they are in joint possession of the suit properties.

7. The plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are not in possession of the suit properties and therefore the declaration sought for by plaintiff that the suit properties are absolutely belong to plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 and for consequential injunction restraining the defendants 10 to 14 and their men and agents from in any way interfering with the possession of the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 and also for permanent injunction restraining the defendants 10 to 14 and their men and agents not to encumber the properties by way of Sale, Usufructuary Mortgage (othi) is not maintainable.

8. The learned counsel for plaintiff would submit that Sec.15 of the



Hindu Succession Act deals with devolution of interest of the female dying intestate. In the case on hand, it is an admitted fact that the Karungammal W/o. Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif had no children at the time of her death and she died as intestate. The property of a female Hindu dying intestate shall devolve according to the rules set out in **Section 15-**

a) Firstly, upon the sons and daughters (including the children of any pre-deceased son or daughter) and the husband;

(b) Secondly, upon the heirs of the husband;

(c) Thirdly, upon the mother and father;

(d) Fourthly, upon the heirs of the father; and

(e) Fifthly, upon the heirs of the mother.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1):

(a) Any property inherited by a female Hindu from her father or mother shall devolve, in the absence of any son or daughter of the deceased (including the children of any pre-deceased son or daughter) not upon the other heirs referred to in sub-section (1) in the order specified therein, but upon the heirs of the father; and

(b) Any property inherited by a female Hindu from her husband or from her father-in-law shall devolve, in the absence of any son or daughter of the deceased (including the children of any pre-deceased son



or daughter) not upon the other heirs referred to in sub-section (1) in the order specified therein, but upon the heirs of the husband."

Section 16 says **Order of Succession and manner of distribution among heirs of a female Hindu - The order of succession among the heirs referred to in Section 15 shall be, and the distribution of the intestate's property among those heirs shall take place, according to the following rules, namely:**

Rule 1. Among the heirs specified in sub-section (1) of Section 15, those in one entry shall be preferred to those in any succeeding entry and those included in the same entry shall take simultaneously.

Rule 2. If any son or daughter of the intestate had predeceased the intestate leaving his or her own children alive at the time of the intestate's death, the children of such son or daughter shall take between them the share which such son or daughter would have taken if living at the intestate's death.

Rule 3. The devolution of the property of the intestate on the heirs referred to in Clauses (b), (d) & (e) of sub-section (1) and in sub-section (2) to Section 15 shall be in the same order and according to the same rules as would have applied if the property had been the father's or the



mother's or the husband's as the case may be, and such person had died intestate in respect thereof immediately after the intestate's death."

9. As per Section 15 and 16 of the Hindu Succession Act, the properties devolves upon the heirs of the husband of the Karungammal and not upon the brothers and sisters of Karungammal. The learned counsel for plaintiff would submit that the defendants 10 to 14 without impleading the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 have clandestinely obtained declaration in a collusive manner that the defendants 10 to 14 are the legal heirs of the Karungammal.

10. The learned counsel for defendants would submit that the Karungammal had got the property not by way of inheritance but way of settlement. Therefore, the Provisions of Section 15 and 16 of Hindu Succession Act are not applicable. The defendants 10 to 14 being the legal heirs of Karungammal are entitled to inherit the properties and accordingly they have mutated the Patta in their favour and are in the possession of the suit properties as absolute owners and therefore the plaintiffs are not entitled to claim any right over the suit properties.



11. This Court carefully perused the records and considered the submissions made on both side. The plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 have not questioned the Inam Settlement deed executed by Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif in favour of his wife Karungammal. The plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 on the one hand and defendants 10 to 14 on the other hand have admitted the title of the Karungammal. They have also admitted that the said Karungammal died intestate leaving behind no children. So, the property of the Karungammal devolves upon to heirs mentioned in Section 15 of the Hindu Succession Act.

Section 16 of the Hindu Succession Act clearly says that the order of succession among the heirs referred to in Section 15 shall be, and the distribution of the intestate's property among those heirs shall take place, according to the following rules, namely :

Rule 1) Among the heirs specified in sub-section (1) of Section 15, those in one entry shall be preferred to those in any succeeding entry and those included in the same entry shall take simultaneously.

Rule 2) If any son or daughter of the intestate had predeceased the intestate leaving his or her own children alive at the time of the intestate's death, the children of such son or daughter shall take between them the share which such son or daughter would have taken if living at the



intestate's death.

Rule 3) The devolution of the property of the intestate on the heirs referred to in Clauses (b), (d) & (e) of sub-section (1) and in sub-section (2) to Section 15 shall be in the same order and according to the same rules as would have applied if the property had been the father's or the mother's or the husband's as the case may be, and such person had died intestate in respect thereof immediately after the intestate's death."

Section 15(2)(b) clearly says that any property inherited by a female Hindu from her husband or from her father-in-law shall devolve, in the absence of any son or daughter of the deceased (including the children of any pre-deceased son or daughter) not upon the other heirs referred to in sub-section (1) in the order specified therein, but upon the heirs of the husband."

12. It is not the case of the defendants 10 to 14 that the said Karungammal had derived the property from her father or mother. But it is an admitted case of both parties that the said Karungammal derived title from her husband by virtue of registered Inam Settlement deed dated 03.11.2005 executed by her husband. So as per Section 15 of Hindu Succession Act the properties devolves upon to the heir of her husband.



13. It is an admitted fact that the plaintiff is the brother of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif. The 1st defendant is the sister of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif. The defendants 2 to 9 are children as well as grand children of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif who is brother of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif. So, the genealogy mentioned in the plaint and relationship of the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 with Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif is not disputed by the defendants 10 to 14. Therefore, this Court without any hesitation can come to conclusion that the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are the legal heirs of Mangai Kizhavan @ Arif and therefore they are entitled to inherit the properties of Karungammal as Karungammal had no children including children of predeceased son and daughter. Therefore, the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are entitled to get the declaration as they have inherited the suit properties as legal heirs of Karungammal.

14. Now the question is whether the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are in possession and enjoyment of the suit properties or not. In other words whether defendants 10 to 14 are in possession and enjoyment of the suit properties.

15. It is admitted by defendants 10 to 14 that they have mutated the Patta on the strength of declaration given by Civil Court that the defendants



1 to 10 are legal heirs of Karungammal. The decree passed by the learned District Munsif, Ramanathapuram in O.S.No.70/2014 dated 03.09.2014 is marked as Ex.B4. Upon perusal of Ex.B4, this Court understands that the defendants 10, 11 and 13 as plaintiffs have filed the suit against D12 and D14 impleading them as defendants. That itself clearly shows that the defendants 10 to 14 have collusively obtained a decree in their favour without impleading the real legal heirs of Karungammal. Therefore, the mutation of Patta on the strength of the decree passed under Ex.B4 cannot be construed that the defendants 10 to 14 are in possession of the suit properties. Moreover, the order passed by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in Writ petition (MD)No.16809/2015 is marked as Ex.B5. Upon perusal of Ex.B5, this Court understands that the revenue officials including Collector were impleaded as respondents and 10th defendant has sought for a direction to the revenue authorities to issue a joint Patta in favour of the defendants 10 to 14 on the strength of the decree passed by the Civil Court in O.S.No.70/2014 and the Hon'ble High Court has given a direction to consider the representation of the 10th defendant and pass appropriate orders.

16. It is not the case of the defendants 10 to 14 that the revenue authorities have issued notice to plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 before



issuing Patta in their favour. The defendants have not filed any document to show that the revenue authorities after giving opportunities to plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 have transferred the Patta in favour of defendants 10 to 14. The documents produced on the side of defendants 10 to 14 itself prove that they have clandestinely obtained mutation of Patta in their favour behind the back of plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9. So mere Patta stood in the name of defendants 10 to 14 will not confer any right that they are in possession of the suit properties. Therefore this Court cannot come to conclusion that the defendants 10 to 14 are in possession of the suit properties based on the Patta marked as Ex.B1 and plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are not in possession of the suit properties.

17. It is settled possession of law that the possession follows title. The plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 have proved their title by way of inheritance from Karungammal and therefore the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are deemed to be in possession of the suit properties since the defendants 10 to 14 have obtained joint Patta behind back of the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9. Therefore the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are entitled to get an order of permanent injunction not only for possession of the suit properties but also for injunction against defendants 10 to 14 restraining them not to encumber the



suit properties by way of Sale, Usufructuary Mortgage (othi), etc. Considering the cumulative evidence produced on either side, this Court is of the considered view that the plaintiff is entitled to get all the relieves. Accordingly, the issue No.1 to 3 is answered in favour of plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 and as against defendants 10 to 14.

9. Issue No.4:

In view of issues No.1 to 3 are answered in favour of plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 that the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are absolute owner of the suit properties and also entitled to get the relief of permanent injunction and the plaintiff is entitled to get the cost of the suit. Accordingly, Issue No.4 is answered.

In the result, the suit is decreed with cost granting declaration that the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 9 are absolute owners of the suit properties and consequential injunction is granted in their favour granting an order of permanent injunction restraining the defendants 10 to 14 from not interfering with their possession and enjoyment of the suit properties and for permanent injunction restraining the defendants 10 to 14 not to encumber the suit properties by way of sale, usufructuary Mortgage, etc.



Dictated to the Steno-Typist, transcribed and typed by her in the Computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court this the 15th day of April 2026.

**Additional District Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.04.2026**

Annexure:

List of Witnesses on the side of Plaintiff:

PW1 - Tmt. Meera Banu

PW2 - Thiru. Ansar Raja

PW3 - Thiru. Thavamani

List of documents on the side of Plaintiff:

- | | | |
|-------|------------|---|
| Ex.A1 | 10.09.2022 | Online copy of Patta in Patta No.2114 regarding suit 1 st item of property |
| Ex.A2 | 10.09.2022 | Online copy of Patta in Patta No.2106 regarding suit 2 nd item of property |
| Ex.A3 | 10.09.2022 | Online copy of Patta in Patta No.1210 regarding suit 4 th item of property |
| Ex.A4 | 10.09.2022 | Online copy of Patta in Patta No.1209 regarding suit 5 th item of property |
| Ex.A5 | 10.09.2022 | Online copy of Patta in Patta No.809 regarding suit 6 th item of property |
| Ex.A6 | 10.09.2022 | Online copy of Patta in Patta No.2113 regarding suit 7 th item of property |
| Ex.A7 | 10.09.2022 | Online copy of Patta in Patta No.2111 regarding suit 8 th item of property |



- Ex.A8 10.09.2022 Online copy of Patta in Patta No.2107 regarding suit 9th item of property
- Ex.A9 10.09.2022 Online copy of Patta in Patta No.2108 regarding suit 10th item of property
- Ex.A10 10.09.2022 Online copy of Patta in Patta No.2109 regarding suit 11th item of property
- Ex.A11 10.09.2022 Online copy of Patta in Patta No.2110 regarding suit 12th item of property
- Ex.A12 03.11.2005 Copy of Inam Settlement deed
- Ex.A13 29.08.2016 Copy of plaint in O.S.No.128/2016
- Ex.A14 16.03.2021 Certified copy of order in I.A.No.199/2019 in O.S.No.128/2016
- Ex.A15 16.03.2021 Certified copy of decretal order in I.A. No.199/2019 in O.S.No.128/2016
- Ex.A16 28.03.2022 Copy of order in CRP(MD).No.1443/2021 and CMP(MD).No.8093/2021 dated 18.03.2022

List of Witness on the side of Defendants:

DW1 – Thiru. Thangavel

List of documents on the side of Defendants:

- Ex.B1 Computerized copy of Patta in Patta No.2106 regarding suit properties
- Ex.B2 Adangal Certificate – 2 Nos. regarding suit properties
- Ex.B3 Memo issued by Tahsildar, Ramanathapuram to DW1 regarding Patta
- Ex.B4 Certified copy of decree in O.S.No.70/2014 dated 03.09.2014
- Ex.B5 True copy of order in Writ Petition in WP(MD)No.16809/2015 dated 16.09.2015
- Ex.B6 Adangal Certificate – 2 Nos. regarding suit properties



List of documents on the side of PW2 and PW3:

Ex.X1	True copy of A- Register in Sy. Nos.
Ex.X2	True copy of 10(1) Chitta
Ex.X3	True copy of Blue print
Ex.X4	True copy of Adangal
Ex.X5	Copy of Patta in Sy.Nos.
Ex.X6	Copy of A-Register
Ex.X7	Copy of A-Register

**Additional District Judge,
Ramanathapuram.
15.04.2026**