



plaintiff's father Velu Gounder had purchased the lands in total extent of Acre 1.16 cents in Survey Nos.22/1A, 22/1B, 22/1C and 23/3 situated at Maruthambakkam Village, Walaja Taluk under a registered sale deed dated 07.08.2002. Subsequently he sold 58 cents in the said Acre 1.16 cents to the plaintiff under a registered sale deed dated 27.07.2007. The remaining extent of 58 cents of land was enjoyed by the said Velu Gounder which is given as the 3<sup>rd</sup> item in the plaint schedule. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant created a sale deed dated 03.01.2002 in his wife name 4<sup>th</sup> defendant for an extent of 48 cents of land in Acre 1.16 cents as if she purchased from one Mani. The said Mani had no any right in the above said acre 1.16 cents. The alleged sale deed dated 03.01.2002 is not valid under law and it will not bind the plaintiff or his father Velu Gounder. The plaintiff's father Velu Gounder purchased the 4<sup>th</sup> item of the schedule mentioned properties from one Paliyammal under a registered sale deed dated 05.09.1983. He had been in possession and enjoyment of the same as the absolute owner. The plaintiff and 1<sup>st</sup> defendant jointly purchased the 5<sup>th</sup> item of the schedule mentioned properties under a registered sale deed dated 10.02.2000 and 22.01.2010 for valid sale consideration. The said Velu Gounder died on 27.07.2019 leaving behind the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 3 as his legal heirs to succeed his estate. After the death of the Velu Gounder, the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 3 are in joint possession and enjoyment of the items 1 to 4 of the schedule mentioned properties. The plaintiff is having 1/4th share in the items 1 to 4 and half share in the 5<sup>th</sup> item of the schedule mentioned property. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and 4<sup>th</sup> defendant is trying to alienate the suit properties to third parties for the past one week secretly, so it is no more possible to be in joint possession and enjoyment of the suit properties along with the defendants. Hence the suit is filed.

**II. Nutshell of the Written statement filed by the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and adopted by the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant is as follows:-**

The suit for partition and declaration is not maintainable either in law or on facts. This defendant has also contributed towards the construction of the RCC roofed house by the said Velu Gounder. This defendant admits the contents in para 4 of the plaint that the plaintiff's father Velu Gounder purchased the landed properties in total extend of 1.16 acres in S.No.22/1A, 22/1B, 22/1C and 23/3 situated at Maruthampakkam Village, Walaja taluk under the registered sale deed dated 07.08.2002. But it is not correct that the said Velu Gounder sold 58 cents out of the 1.16 acres to the plaintiff under the registered sale deed dated 27.07.2007. The alleged sale deed dated 27.07.2007 for the alleged sale of 58 cents is a sham and nominal document. The entire 1.16 acres of land belongs to the joint family and being enjoyed by all the joint family members. Therefore, the sale of 58 cents of lands is not valid in law as it is a sham and nominal document. The sale deed dated 07.08.2002 through which the property was purchased in the name of Velu Gounder in the capacity as kartha of the joint family. This defendant also contributed his hard earnings and hard labour for the welfare of the joint family. From and out of the joint family income only, the 3<sup>rd</sup> item viz., 1.16 acres was purchased in the name of Velu Gounder. The plaintiff does not have any source of any independent income to purchase the property. The 4<sup>th</sup> defendant had purchased the 48 cents of land property through a registered sale deed dated 03.01.2002 from one Mr. Mani from and out of the money contributed by her parents that is much prior to the purchase of the 1.16 acres of land by the plaintiff's father Velu Gounder. It is true that the plaintiff's father Velu Gounder purchased the 4<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties from one Paliyammal under the registered sale deed dated 05.09.1983 and that he had been in possession and enjoyment of the same as the absolute owner. It is true the contents in pare 7 of the plaint

that the plaintiff and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant jointly purchased the 5<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties under the registered sale deed dated 10.02.2000 and 22.01.2010 for valid sale consideration, that the said Velu Gounder died on 27.07.2019 leaving behind the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 3 as his legal heirs and after his death, the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 3 are in joint possession and enjoyment of the items 1 to 3 of the suit properties, that the plaintiff is having 1/4th share in the items 1 to 3 of the suit properties and half share in the last item of the suit properties. The plaintiff is in joint and constructive possession of the 1.16 acres of lands only. This has no any connections with the land 48 cents stands in the name of the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant. The 4<sup>th</sup> defendant's property viz., 48 cents is the absolute property of the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant. She is having every right to deal with her property. The plaintiff cannot question about her individual property. The plaintiff has filed vexatious suit with intent to grab the property that belongs to the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant and also to grab the property purchased by Velu gounder an extent 1.16 acres from and out of the joint family income. The defendant is entitled to share in the suit properties excluding the 48 cents of lands which belongs to the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant. This defendant is ready to pay the necessary court fee in respect of his share. Hence the suit may be dismissed.

**III. On the basis of the above pleadings, the following issues were framed on 25.03.2021 for trial :-**

1.	Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get ½ share in the suit property?
2.	Whether the sale deed dated 3.1.2002 is liable to be declared as null & void?
3.	Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get the Preliminary decree for partition of ½ share as prayed for?
4.	Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get permanent injunction as prayed for?
5.	To what other relief and cost, the plaintiff is entitled?

**Discussions :-****IV. Issue Nos.1 to 4 :-**

**Point:** 1) The plaintiff has filed the suit praying to pass a decree for partition of his  $\frac{1}{4}$  share in Item Nos.1 to 4 of the suit properties and  $\frac{1}{2}$  share in the 5<sup>th</sup> Item of the suit properties. But Issue No.1 has been mistakenly framed by this court as if the plaintiff has prayed  $\frac{1}{2}$  share in all the items of suit properties. Hence Issue No.1 alone is modified as below by correcting the shares claimed by the plaintiff in the suit properties.

- Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get  $\frac{1}{4}$  share in Item Nos.1 to 4 of the suit properties and  $\frac{1}{2}$  share in Item No.5 of the suit properties?

2) According to the plaintiff, the item Nos.1 and 2 of the suit properties are the ancestral properties of his father Velu Gounder and the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> items of suit properties were purchased by his father by virtue of registered sale deeds dated 07.08.2002 and 05.09.1983 respectively. The plaintiff has pleaded that the 5<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties were jointly purchased by him and his brother the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant under registered sale deeds dated 10.02.2000 and 22.01.2010. The plaintiff is the brother of defendants 1 and 3 and the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant is the mother of the plaintiff. The 4<sup>th</sup> defendant is the wife of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. The plaintiff has asserted that he has been in joint possession with the defendants 1 to 3 in respect of item Nos.1 to 4 and hence he is entitled to get the relief of partition in respect of his share in the suit properties.

3) To substantiate his case, the plaintiff himself entered into the witness box and was examined as PW1 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A8 such as Computer generated copies of Patta (5 Nos.) for Patta No.704 & Patta No.410, Xerox copies of Manai Vari Thoraya Patta, True copy of Registered sale deed dated 07.08.2002 executed by Perumal in favour of Velu Gounder,

Registered sale deed dated 27.07.2007 executed by Velu in favour of Plaintiff, Online downloaded copy of Sale deed executed by M.Mani in favour of 4<sup>th</sup> defendant, True copy of Sale deed dated 10.02.2000 executed by Varadhan in favour of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and Plaintiff, Online downloaded copy of Sale deed executed by G.Lakshmanan in favour of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and Plaintiff, Death certificate of Velu and Legal heir certificate of Velu were marked. No other witness was examined on the side of plaintiff.

4) The defendants 2 & 3 are remained exparte. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant has filed written statement and the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant has adopted the written statement filed by her husband the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant has admitted that item Nos.1 and 2 of the suit properties are the ancestral properties of his father Velu Gounder and the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> items were purchased by his father by means of registered sale deeds. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant has also admitted that the 5<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties were jointly purchased by him and plaintiff under two different sale deeds.

5) It is the main contention of the defendants 1 & 4 that the plaintiff has to claim only  $\frac{1}{4}$  share in the entire 1.16 Acre of lands in the 3<sup>rd</sup> item of the suit properties and the alleged sale deed dated 27.07.2007 projected by the plaintiff claiming exclusive title in respect of 58 cents in the said 1.16 Acres is only a sham and nominal document. Further the defendants 1 & 4 have mainly contended that 48 cents of land in the survey numbers given in the 3<sup>rd</sup> item was purchased by the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant under a registered sale deed for valid consideration and hence the said 48 cent is exclusively belonged to the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant.

6) The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant himself was examined as DW1 and Ex.B1 and Ex.B2 such as the Online downloaded copy of sale deed dated 03.01.2002 in the

name of 4<sup>th</sup> defendant and Ex.B2 true copy of sale deed in the name of one Mr.Mani were marked. Besides DW1, one Mr.Mani was examined as DW2 on the side of the defendants 1 & 4.

7) As stated above, the plaintiff and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant who are the sons of Late.Velu Gounder have pleaded that item Nos.1 & 2 of the suit properties are the ancestral properties of their father Velu Gounder. In fact, the plaintiff has specifically pleaded in para 3 of the plaint that item Nos.1 & 2 of the suit properties were allotted to his father Velu Gounder under oral partition which took place four decades ago between his father Velu Gounder and the brother of Velu Gounder namely Subramani. It is significant to be noted that the plaintiff himself pleaded in the plaint that the Patta for the 1<sup>st</sup> item of the suit properties is standing in the joint names of his father Velu Gounder and Subramani.

8) It is seen from perusal of Ex.A1 Revenue records produced by the plaintiff that the Patta for the suit 1<sup>st</sup> item in S.Nos.55/1, 54/2 & 54/1 for the total extent of 1 Hectare 48 ares is standing in the joint names of Subramani, plaintiff and defendants 1 to 3. At this juncture, it is absolutely necessary to extract hereunder the survey numbers and extents given for the 1<sup>st</sup> item of the suit properties in the plaint schedule of properties.

1) Ranipet District, Walajah Taluk, Marathambakkam Village,

(i) S.No.55/1 extent of 1.86 ½ cents value of Rs.9,99,640/-

(ii) S.No.54/2 extent of 1.00 cents value of Rs.1,00,500/-

(iii) S.No.54/1 extent of 71 ½ cents value of Rs. 71,500/-

**totally Acres 3.65 ½ in which half share Acre 1.83 cents.**

9) It is clear from the plaint averments, particulars given in the plaint schedule of properties and Ex.A1 Patta that the properties given in 1<sup>st</sup> item

of the suit properties are still jointly standing in the names of **one Subramani** and the legal heirs of Velu Gounder. The plaintiff and defendants 1 to 3 are the legal heirs of Velu Gounder. The plaintiff has claimed partition in the total extent of 3.65 ½ Acres of the ancestral properties of his father Velu Gounder and Subramani. The plaintiff/PW1 has specifically stated in his chief examination affidavit that his father Velu Gounder enjoyed ½ share in the 1<sup>st</sup> item of the suit properties as per oral partition took place between his father and Subramani. But the plaintiff has filed the present suit seeking division of the entire 3.65 ½ Acres of lands by two and then to allot his ¼ share in 1. 83 Acres. So the plaintiff has prayed for partition of the undivided property of his father Velu Gounder and Subramani. If the ancestral properties his father Velu Gounder were partitioned between him and his brother Subramani four decades ago and the said oral partition was acted upon between them and if they separately enjoyed their respective ½ share, it would certainly reflect in the revenue records and it is also not necessary for the plaintiff to seek division of the entire 3.65 1/2 acre into two. The plaintiff has not furnished any reason as to whether the said Subramani is alive or not. Further the plaintiff or the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant did not take any steps to examine either the said Subramani or any of his legal heirs. In the above circumstances, this court is of the view that the entire extent of 3.65 ½ Acres of the 1<sup>st</sup> item of the suit properties which is admittedly the joint property of Velu Gounder and Subramani cannot be divided into two without impleading Subramani as a party to the suit. As it is clear from the plaint averments and Ex.A1 patta that it is not possible to determine the shares of plaintiff and defendants 1 to 3 without making division of entire 3.65 ½ acres of land, this court is of the view that the suit in respect of 1<sup>st</sup> item of the suit properties without impleading the said Subramani is not maintainable and accordingly, the relief of partition cannot be granted to the plaintiff.

10) It is also to be noted that the suit 2<sup>nd</sup> item of property consisting land and house building in S.Nos.182/13 is said to be the ancestral property of Velu Gounder. The plaintiff has produced only the xerox copy Manaivari Thoraya patta in Ex.A1 in the name of his father Velu. No explanation is given by the plaintiff for not producing the original Manaivari Thoraya patta. The extent of the 2<sup>nd</sup> item of the suit properties is given in the plaint schedule of properties as East to 11.8 meter on Southern side; 11.4 meter on Northern side, East to West 10.8 meter on Western side and 12.8 meter on Eastern side. But on perusal of the sketch drawn on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of Manaivari Thoraya patta, the measurement of East to West is given as 12.8 meters. But the plaintiff has mistakenly mentioned as 10.8 meters. No explanation is given in the plaint for such variation in the extent given in Ex.A1 Thoraya patta. It can be verified only from the original Manaivari Thoraya patta which is admittedly not produced by the plaintiff. Hence the plaintiff is also not entitled to get the relief of partition of his  $\frac{1}{4}$  share in the 2<sup>nd</sup> item of the suit properties without rectifying the defects in the measurements given in the plaint schedule of properties.

11) So far as the properties furnished under Item No.3 of the plaint schedule of properties are concerned, the plaintiff as well as the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant have pleaded that those properties, totally measuring an extent of 1.16 Acres were purchased by their father Late.Velu Gounder under a registered sale deed dated 07.08.2002. The plaintiff has also produced the true copy of sale deed dated 07.08.2002 in the name of his father Velu Gounder in respect of 3<sup>rd</sup> Items of suit properties. The original sale deed is not produced on both side and no explanation given for not producing the original sale deed for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Items of the suit properties.

12) It is seen from perusal of Ex.A2 true copy of sale deed that the plaintiff's father Velu Gounder had purchased 0.37-1/2 cents in S.No.22/1A; 20 cents in S.No.22/1B; 21 cents in S.No.22/1C and 0.38 ½ cents in S.No.23/3. It has been specifically recited in Ex.A2 sale deed that out of the total extent of 1.17 Acres in the above survey numbers, 0.02 ½ cents to be excluded for channel and the remaining one Acre 14 ½ cents alone sold to Velu Gounder. Whereas the plaintiff has mentioned in the plaint schedule of properties that total extent of 3<sup>rd</sup> items is 1.16 Acres. The plaintiff has produced copy of patta for the survey numbers given in Item No.3 in his name and also produced another copy of patta along with Ex.A1 Revenue records for the same survey numbers in the joint names of himself and 4<sup>th</sup> defendant and one Velu, S/o.Muniyappa Gounder.

13) It is seen from Ex.A1 Xerox copy of computer generated patta No.410 dated 09.12.2012 that for the total extent of 0.47.50 Hectares for the survey numbers of 3<sup>rd</sup> Item of suit properties, along with the name of the plaintiff and 4<sup>th</sup> defendant, one another person namely Velu, S/o.Munniyappa Gounder has also been included for which no explanation is given on both sides. In fact the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant has claimed exclusive 48 cents of land in the survey numbers given under Item No.3 of plaint schedule.

14) Even though the defendants 1 & 4 have specifically claimed 48 cents in the survey numbers given in the 3<sup>rd</sup> item of the suit properties by virtue of Ex.B1 sale deed, it is not their case that the said 48 cents of land is included in total extent of 1.16 Acres. The defendants 1 & 4 have contended in para No.9 of the written statement that the said 1.16 Acres of land have no connection with the 48 cents of land standing in the name of 4<sup>th</sup> defendant. So according to the defendants 1 & 4, the said 48 cents of land is not form part of 3<sup>rd</sup> item of the suit properties.

15) It is to be noted that as stated above, apart from the names of plaintiff & 4<sup>th</sup> defendant, one another name Velu, S/o.Munniyappa Gounder is also given in Ex.A1 Patta No.410-downloaded on 09.12.2012 for the same extent of one Acre 17 cents in the survey numbers given under Item No.3 of the suit properties. Even though the plaintiff has produced Ex.A2 true copy of sale deed dated 07.08.2002 in the name of Velu Gounder in respect of his purchase of one Acre 14 ½ cents out of the total one Acre 17 cents, the plaintiff has not produced Encumbrance Certificate to examine whether any transaction has been made by any of the parties and no evidence or document is available on both sides to find out as to why the name of Velu S/o.Munniyappa Gounder was included in patta No.410 in respect of the 3<sup>rd</sup> item of the suit properties.

16) At this juncture, it is to be noted that the plaintiff has claimed exclusive right and title over 58 cents of land out of 1.16 Acres in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Items of the suit properties. In fact, the plaintiff has prayed for partition of 58 cents alone in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Item of the properties. It is to be noted that as seen from Ex.A3 sale deed the plaintiff has purchased only half share in the total extent of 1.16 Acres in S.Nos.22/1A, 22/1B, 22/1C and 23/3. In fact, even though four boundaries are given in Ex.A3 sale deed for the half share of 58 cents in the total extent of 1.16 Acres, it has been mentioned just below the four boundaries that the said half share of 58 cents of land is existing in the center of total extent of 1.16 Acres. The plaintiff has not furnished boundaries in the plaint schedule of properties for the 3<sup>rd</sup> item of the properties of 1.16 Acres. It has also not been mentioned in the plaint as to the exact location of his 58 cents of land purchased under Ex.A3 sale deed. When the plaintiff purchased only half share in the total extent of 1.16 Acres without mentioning the exact side in which it is located, the proper remedy for the plaintiff to seek partition of his undivided 58 cents from the

total extent of 1.16 Acres and also to claim his share in the remaining 58 cents as in the capacity of legal heirs of Late.Velu Gounder.

17) As stated above, the plaintiff or the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant has not explained as to why the name of one Velu, S/o.Muniyappa Gounder was included in patta No.410. While being so, this court is of the view that it is necessary for the plaintiff or the defendants 1 to 3 to add the said Velu, S/o.Muniyappa Gounder as one of the parties to the suit or to explain as to why his name was included in patta No.410 in respect of the 3<sup>rd</sup> item of the suit properties. In the above circumstances, this court is of the view that even though the plaintiff and his brother 1<sup>st</sup> defendant pleaded that the 3<sup>rd</sup> item of the suit properties, totally 1.16 Acres of lands were purchased by their father Velu Gounder, this court is of the view that the present suit has not been filed with proper particulars and without putting the entire 1.16 Acres of lands for partition and also without adding one Mr.Velu S/o Muniyappa Gounder as a party to the suit. Hence this court is of the view that the relief of partition in respect of 3<sup>rd</sup> Items of the suit properties cannot be granted. The question as to whether plaintiff has purchased 58 cents in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Item of the suit properties can be decided only if he prayed for partition of the said undivided 58 cents in the total extent of 1.16 Acres.

18) So far as the 4<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties in S.No.253/12 is concerned, the plaintiff and 1<sup>st</sup> defendant have asserted that it was purchased by their father Velu Gounder under a registered sale deed dated 05.09.1983. But the plaintiff has not produced the said sale deed dated 05.09.1983 and no explanation is given for not producing the said sale deed dated 05.09.1983. But at the same time, the plaintiff has produced only the Xerox copy of Manaivari Thoraya patta for the above S.No.253/12 alone with the other Revenue records in Ex.A1.

19) It is seen from Ex.A1 Xerox copy of Manaivari Thoraya patta in respect of 4<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties that it has been issued in the names of 1) one Gopal, S/o.Velu, 2) Minor.Padmavathy (Guardian and father Chinnakannu) and Velu. S/o.Molaiya Gounder. It is seen from verification of the other documents produced on the side of the plaintiff that the above mentioned Velu, S/o.Molaiya Gounder is the father of the plaintiff. Whereas the above mentioned Gopal and minor Padmavathy are not the parties to the suit and no pleadings or explanation given in the plaint or in the written statement as to why the names of Gopal and minor Padmavathy are also given in the patta for the 4<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties. As stated above, the plaintiff has not produced the sale deed dated 05.09.1983 for the 4<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties and the xerox copy of temporary patta produced in respect of 4<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties are standing in the name of some other persons jointly with the father of the name of the plaintiff. In the above circumstances, the relief of partition cannot be granted to the plaintiff in respect of the 4<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties.

20) So far as the 5<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties is concerned, there is no dispute between the parties with regard to their joint title and ownership over the same by virtue of Ex.A5 sale deed dated 10.02.2020 and Ex.A6 sale deed dated 12.02.2010. The plaintiff and 1<sup>st</sup> defendant are having equal share in the 5<sup>th</sup> item of the properties and hence the plaintiff is entitled to get the relief of partition in respect of his ½ share in the above 5<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties.

21) Considering the entire oral and documentary evidences adduced on the side of the plaintiff and defendants 1 & 4, this court is of the view that the plaintiff is not entitled to get the relief of partition in respect of the properties mentioned in Item Nos.1 to 4 of plaint schedule of properties and

he is entitled to get the relief of partition only in respect of his 1/2 share in the 5<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties. As this court has come to the conclusion that the suit in respect of Item Nos.1 to 4 is liable to be dismissed for the reason that the plaintiff has not furnished full particulars in respect of those items of the suit properties and the necessary parties are not added in the suit and no explanation is given for not impleading the 3<sup>rd</sup> parties whose names found in Ex.A1 Revenue records. In the above circumstances, the plaintiff is not entitled to get the relief of declaration in respect sale deed dated 03.01.2002 and the relief of permanent injunction. These issues are answered accordingly.

**Issue No.5:-**

**Point:-** This court has come to the conclusion that the plaintiff is entitled to get the relief of partition only in respect of 5<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties. This court has declined the relief of partition in respect of suit item Nos. 1 to 4 for the reason that the suit has not been properly framed and the plaintiff has not furnished full and correct particulars of the above properties and also failed to produce the sale deed in respect of 4<sup>th</sup> item of the suit properties. As there is no serious dispute between the plaintiff and 1<sup>st</sup> defendant in respect of the title their father in respect of the properties in item Nos.1 to 4 of the plaint schedule, this court in the interest of justice, is of the view that liberty can be given to the parties to agitate the disputes for claiming partition in item Nos.1 to 4 by filing proper fresh comprehensive suit with full and correct particulars. Accordingly this issue is answered.

In the result, the suit is partly decreed and a preliminary decree for partition of plaintiff's ½ share is granted only in respect of item No.5 of the suit properties. The suit in respect of the relief of partition in respect of other items of the suit properties, the relief of declaration in respect of sale

deed dated 03.01.2002 and the relief of permanent injunction is dismissed. Liberty is given to the plaintiff to file a fresh comprehensive suit on the same cause of action for partition with full and correct particulars in respect of item Nos.1 to 4 of the suit properties. The plaintiff shall take necessary steps for passing of final decree in respect of item No.5 of the suit properties within a period of 30 days from the date of preliminary decree. Considering the relationship between the parties, there shall be no order as to cost.

Dictated by me to the Steno-typist transcribed and typed by her in the computer, corrected, additions made by me and pronounced by me in the open court, this, the 27<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.

I Additional District Judge,  
Ranipet.

**Witnesses Examined on the side of Plaintiff.**

PW1 Thiru.Asokan

PW2 Thiru.Umapathy

**Exhibits marked on the side of Plaintiff.**

Ex.A1	----	Computer generated copies of patta. (5 nos) for Patta No.704 & Patta No.410, Xerox copies of Manai Vari Thoraya Patta,	(Online downloaded copy)
Ex.A2	07.08.2002	Registered sale deed executed by Perumal in favour of Velu Gounder.	(True copy)
Ex.A3	27.07.2007	Registered sale deed executed by Velu in favour of Asokan.	(Original)
Ex.A4	03.01.2002	Sale deed executed by M.Mani in favour of Revathy.	(Online downloaded copy)

Ex.A5	10.01.2000	Sale deed executed by Varadhan in favour of Muruganandham and Asokan.	(True copy)
Ex.A6	12.02.2010	Sale deed executed by G.Lakshmanan in favour of Muruganandham and Asokan.	(Online downloaded copy)
Ex.A7	16.11.2021	Death Certificate of Velu.	(Original)
Ex.A8	13.09.2019	Legal heir Certificate of Velu.	(Original)

**Witnesses Examined on the side of the defendants 1 & 4 :-**

DW1 Thiru.Muruganandham

DW2 Thiru.Mani

**Exhibits marked on the side of defendants 1 & 4 :-**

Ex.B1	03.01.2002	Sale deed executed by Mani in favour of Revathy.	(Online downloaded copy)
Ex.B2	29.07.1978	Sale deed executed by Krishna Reddy in favour of Mani.	(True copy)

I Additional District Judge,  
Ranipet.