



IN THE COURT OF THE SUBORDINATE JUDGE, ATTUR
SALEM DISTRICT

PRESENT: **Thiru S.Ganesan, B.Sc.,M.A.B.L.,**
Subordinate Judge, Attur.

Monday, this the 8th day of June 2026

O.S.No.60/2014

(CNR Number : TNSA120000682014)

1. Pitchayee
2. Ramalingam
3. Nallammal
4. Rajkumar

.....

Plaintiffs

-Vs-

- *1. Soundiram @ Soundarammal (Died)
2. Sellammal
- *3. Gandhi (Died)
4. Selvaraju
- *5. Selvi
- *6. Selvakumar

*7. T. Roja

Defendants

**(*Amended Plaint copy as per Order in
I.A.No.923/2019 Dated 16.10.2024)**

This Suit having been heard on 06.04.2026 in the presence of Thiru.T. Govindan, Learned Advocate for the Plaintiffs and Thiru.V.R.Rajindra Magajan, Learned Advocate for D1, 3 & 4 and the defendants 2 and 5 to 7 are called absent and set exparte and considering that upon perusing the records and arguments of both side and having stood over for consideration this Court delivered the following..

JUDGMENT

1. This Suit is for preliminary decree to directing the defendants to divide the suit property into two equal share ($\frac{1}{2}$) and allot one such share to the plaintiffs and they put in separate possession by metes and bounds by the preliminary decree and passing a final decree by all terms and conditions and appropriate advocate commissioner to divide the suit properties into two equal shares ($\frac{1}{2}$) and allot one such share to to the plaintiffs and put them in separate possession with all conveniences to enjoy their share in the suit property, to declare the 25.03.2014 dated of deed of Gift settlement under Doc.No.743/2014 of Sub Registrar Office of Gangavalli in respect of suit property in the name of the 3rd defendant N. Gandhi is null and void; restraining the defendants No.1 to 3 not to alienate or encumbrance the suit property to third parties or anybody else in the earth by means of permanent injunction and for costs.

2. **The averments of the amended plaint:**

3. The suit is filed by the plaintiffs for partition, separate possession, and permanent injunction. The suit property is comprised in Patta Nos. 61 and 327 in Survey Nos. 6/10, 6/14, 6/8, 4/4, 4/9 and 87/4C, measuring a total extent of Acre 2.78 cents, situated at Kavarpanai Revenue Village, Thalaivasal Taluk, Salem District.

4. Earlier, the suit property belonged to one Sengamalai Gounder. The said Sengamalai Gounder had two sons, namely Sellamuthu and Nallu Gounder. Sellamuthu had only one daughter, namely Pitchayee, who is the 1st plaintiff in the suit. The 1st plaintiff married one Solaimuthu. The plaintiffs 2 to 4, namely Ramalingam, Nallammal, and Rajkumar, are the

sons and daughter of the 1st plaintiff herein.

5. The other son of Sengamalai Gounder, namely Nallu Gounder, married Soundiram @ Soundiraammal, who is the 1st defendant herein. The defendants 2 and 3 are the daughter and son of the 1st defendant herein. The 4th defendant, namely Selvaraju, is a purchaser from defendants 1 to 3 herein.

6. The said Sengamalai Gounder enjoyed the suit property along with his sons Sellamuthu and Nallu Gounder till his death. The said Sengamalai Gounder died leaving behind his two sons. Subsequently, the suit property was enjoyed by Sellamuthu and Nallu Gounder, the sons of the deceased Sengamalai Gounder.

7. After the death of Sengamalai Gounder, the suit property stood in the name of Sellamuthu. To prove the same, the revenue records, namely the Patta Pass Book standing in the name of Sellamuthu, are produced herewith along with the plaint.

8. The said Sellamuthu, his wife Nallammal, and Nallu Gounder died about 30 years ago, leaving behind their daughter, grandchildren, and wife as legal heirs. The legal heirs of the said Sellamuthu and Nallu Gounder are arrayed as plaintiffs and defendants herein, except the 4th defendant, as shown in the Genealogy Tree.

9. The plaintiffs and the defendants, except the 4th defendant, are members of a Hindu Undivided Joint Family, and the suit property is their ancestral property. The plaintiffs and the defendants, except the 4th defendant, are co-parceners in the suit property. They have succeeded to the suit property by legal heirship and are in joint possession and enjoyment of

the same till date. The revenue records, such as Patta Pass Book, Old Chitta, and Computer Pattas relating to the suit property, are produced herewith along with the plaint for the kind perusal of this Court.

10. Furthermore, the plaintiffs and defendants 1 to 3 have equal shares in the suit property. The said Sellamuthu and Nallu Gounder were each entitled to one share in the suit property. Accordingly, one share devolves upon the legal heirs of the deceased Sellamuthu and the other share devolves upon the legal heirs of the deceased Nallu Gounder. The suit property is liable to be divided into two equal shares as per the Hindu Succession Act.

11. Therefore, the plaintiffs and defendants, except the 4th defendant, are each entitled to half share in the suit property. However, no partition has been effected by metes and bounds till date, and they continue to be in joint possession.

12. While so, the defendants 1 to 3 executed a registered Sale Deed dated 14.11.2002 in respect of the suit property in favour of the 4th defendant, namely Selvaraju, son of Palanimuthu of Kavarpanai Village. The defendants 1 to 3 had no right to alienate the undivided joint family property to any person by way of Sale Deed. The Sale Deed dated 14.11.2002 is not binding on the plaintiffs and is subject to the decree to be passed in this suit.

13. The act of defendants 1 to 3 in executing the Sale Deed in respect of the undivided ancestral property is arbitrary, illegal, and improper. Further, the 1st defendant deleted the names of Sellamuthu and Nallu Gounder in the revenue records and inserted her name in respect of a portion of the suit property in S.Nos. 6/10, 6/14, and 6/8 under Patta No. 61 by

clandestine means.

14. The patta standing in the name of the 1st defendant does not confer any right, title, or interest upon her, as the property is ancestral in nature. The act of the 1st defendant in obtaining a Computer Patta dated 12.03.2013 in her name is unjust, unfair, and unwarranted.

15. The defendants 1 to 3 created another fraudulent document in the name of the 3rd defendant in respect of the undivided suit property, in order to defeat the lawful share of the plaintiffs.

16. On 25.03.2014, the 1st defendant executed a Gift Settlement Deed in favour of her son, the 3rd defendant, namely Gandhi, in respect of the Hindu Undivided Joint Family property. The total extent of the suit property is Acre 2.78 cents, out of which the share of defendants 1 to 3 is Acre 1.39 cents, and the remaining share belongs to the plaintiffs.

17. The defendants 1 to 3 have already sold an extent of Acre 0.83 cents to the 4th defendant. The 1st defendant has no right to create encumbrance by way of Gift Settlement, including the legitimate share of the plaintiffs. The Gift Deed dated 25.03.2014 in favour of the 3rd defendant is null and void and has not been acted upon till date.

18. On coming to know of the transfer of revenue records in the name of the 1st defendant, the plaintiffs demanded partition of the suit property from defendants 1 to 3. However, the 1st defendant executed the Gift Deed in order to defeat the share of the plaintiffs. The recitals contained in the said Gift Deed are not binding on the plaintiffs, as they are not parties to the same. The said document is fraudulent and a concocted one.

19. The rights of the plaintiffs over the suit property are affected

by the said fraudulent Gift Deed dated 25.03.2014. Hence, the plaintiffs are constrained to seek a declaration that the said Gift Settlement Deed is null and void.

20. After the execution of the Gift Deed, on 29.03.2014, the plaintiffs approached defendants 1 and 2 requesting partition of the suit property, but they refused. Again, on 01.04.2014, the plaintiffs approached the elders of the village and relatives for an amicable partition, but defendants 1 to 3 refused to comply with the advice.

21. Therefore, the plaintiffs have no other alternative except to approach this Court seeking partition of the suit property into two equal shares and allotment of one such share to the plaintiffs.

22. Further, the defendants 1 and 3 have proclaimed in the village that they intend to sell the suit property and are seeking purchasers. Hence, the plaintiffs seek a relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendants from alienating the suit property, failing which the plaintiffs will be put to great loss and hardship. The suit is filed by the plaintiffs seeking the relief of partition, declaration, and permanent injunction.

23. **Written statement filed by the 3rd defendant and adopted by the 1st & 4th defendants:**

24. The suit is false, frivolous, vexatious, and unsustainable in law and on fact.

25. This defendant does not admit any of the allegations stated in the plaint except those that are specifically admitted herein, and the plaintiffs are put to strict proof of the same.

26. The allegations stated in paragraph 3 are all false and incorrect. It is false to allege that the suit property originally belonged to one Sengamalai Gounder and that he enjoyed the same till his death along with his sons Sellamuthu Gounder and Nallu Gounder. It is equally false to allege that the said Sengamalai Gounder died leaving behind his two sons. It is completely false to allege that subsequently the suit property was enjoyed by Sellamuthu and Nallu Gounder. The genealogical tree submitted by the plaintiffs has to be strictly proved by them.

27. It is untenable to allege that the plaintiffs and defendants 1 to 3 are members of a Hindu Undivided Joint Family and that the suit property is their ancestral property. It is equally false to allege that the plaintiffs and defendants 1 to 4 are co-parceners in the suit property. It is absolutely false to allege that the plaintiffs and defendants 1 to 3 succeeded to the suit property by legal heirship and that they are in joint possession and enjoyment of the same till date.

28. The allegations stated in paragraph 4 of the plaint are all false and incorrect. It is false to allege that the plaintiffs and defendants 1 to 3 are having equal shares in the suit property and that the aforesaid Sellamuthu and Nallu Gounder had one share each in the suit property. It is meaningless to state that one share will devolve upon the legal heirs of the deceased Sellamuthu and another share upon the legal heirs of the deceased Nallu Gounder.

29. It is untenable to allege that the suit property has to be divided into two equal shares as per capita under the Hindu Succession Act. It is completely false to allege that the plaintiffs and defendants 1 to 3 have not effected partition by metes and bounds till date and that they are in joint

possession of the suit property.

30. It is true that defendants 1 to 3 executed a registered Sale Deed in favour of the 4th defendant on 14.11.2002 in respect of the property mentioned therein. It is incorrect to state that defendants 1 to 3 have no right to alienate the said property.

31. The allegations stated in paragraph 5 of the plaint are completely false and incorrect. The other allegations are nothing but an invented story with a view to gain unlawful and illegal advantage by filing this vexatious suit.

32. The 1st defendant is the absolute owner of the suit property by virtue of a registered Gift Settlement Deed executed by her husband Nallu Gounder on 25.08.1954, registered in the office of the Sub-Registrar, Gangavalli as Document No.1084/1954. From the date of the said Gift Settlement Deed, the 1st defendant has been in continuous possession and enjoyment of the entire suit property without any interruption.

33. The 1st defendant's right, title, possession, and interest in the suit property are well recognized by the revenue department and known to the villagers. All revenue records such as patta, chitta, and adangal stood in the name of the 1st defendant, and she has paid kist and other taxes regularly.

34. Accordingly, on 14.11.2002, defendants 1 to 3 executed a registered Sale Deed in favour of the 4th defendant in respect of S.No.6/8 (0.45 cents), S.No.6/12 (0.17 cents), and S.No.6/14 (0.38 cents), situated at Kavarpanai Village. The 4th defendant is in actual possession and continuous enjoyment of the said properties without interruption.

35. The 1st defendant executed a registered Gift Settlement Deed on 25.03.2014 in favour of this defendant in respect of various survey numbers as mentioned therein. This defendant has been in possession and enjoyment of the said properties even prior to the Gift Deed and continues to do so. He has been paying kist and other taxes regularly. Similarly, the 4th defendant has been paying taxes in respect of the properties purchased by him. The revenue records stand in the respective names of the 3rd and 4th defendants. Except these defendants, no other person has any right, title, interest, or possession over the said properties.

36. The plaintiffs are utter strangers to the suit property and were never in possession or enjoyment of the same at any point of time. The plaintiffs never demanded partition from defendants 1 to 3 and did not issue any legal notice. They never convened any panchayat with the elders or relatives of the village. The suit has been filed only to grab the property and to harass the defendants. The documents produced by the plaintiffs are self-serving, invalid in law, and not binding on the defendants. There is no cause of action for the suit, and the alleged cause of action is false and incorrect.

37. The suit as framed is not maintainable in law. The court fee paid is insufficient and incorrect. The valuation of the property is also wrong. The defendants reserve their right to file an additional written statement upon obtaining necessary documents. Therefore, the defendants pray that the suit be dismissed with costs.

38. **Reply Statement filed by the 1st Plaintiff and adopted by Plaintiffs 2 to 4:**

39. The plaintiffs hereby deny the averments made in

paragraphs 7, 8, and 9 of the written statement, especially with respect to the alleged Gift Settlement Deed executed by the 1st defendant's husband, Nallu Gounder, on 25.08.1954, said to have been registered on the file of the Sub-Registrar Office, Gangavalli, in favour of the 1st defendant, Soundiram, in respect of the suit properties bearing Survey Nos. 4/4, 6/8, and 87/04 under Patta No. 295.

40. The said Nallu Gounder had no right to execute the said Gift Settlement Deed in favour of his wife, Soundiram, as the properties covered under the said deed are not his separate properties but are joint family properties of Nallu Gounder, his brother Sellamuthu, and their father Sengamalai Gounder.

41. Further, the Gift Settlement Deed dated 25.08.1954 was never acted upon or implemented till the filing of the present suit. Neither the said Nallu Gounder nor his wife Soundiram ever declared or disclosed the existence of the said Gift Settlement Deed publicly during their lifetime or during the lifetime of the co-owner Sellamuthu.

42. The 2nd defendant has, for the first time, disclosed the said alleged Gift Settlement Deed in favour of the 1st defendant only through the written statement. Further, the 1st defendant was never in exclusive possession and enjoyment of the entire property covered under the said alleged Gift Deed.

43. The said Gift Settlement Deed is a sham and nominal document, purportedly executed under the influence of the 1st defendant. Till date, the properties covered under the said deed are in joint possession and enjoyment of the plaintiffs and defendants, except the 4th defendant.

44. The said Gift Settlement Deed does not create or confer any right, title, or interest in favour of the defendants and is invalid in the eye of law. The Gift Settlement Deed dated 25.08.1954 is non est and does not confer any right, title, or interest upon the defendants.

45. Accordingly, the 1st defendant has no right to execute any subsequent documents based on the said invalid Gift Settlement Deed. Any changes made in the revenue records in respect of the suit property in the names of defendants 1 to 3 subsequent to the filing of the suit are also invalid and not binding on the plaintiffs. Hence, prayed to receive the reply statement.

46. On gingerly and circumspectly combed into the pleadings adduced by the both parties, the following issues were formulated by learned predecessor in office on 05.11.2016 for proper and complete adjudication of the suit:-

47. **Issues:**

- 1 *Whether the suit properties are joint family properties?*
- 2 *Whether the suit properties absolutely belongs to D1?*
- 3 *Whether the sale deed executed by D1 to D3 on 14.11.2002 is valid one?*
- 4 *Whether the gift settlement deed executed on 25.04.2014 in favour of D3 is valid one?*
- 5 *Whether the plaintiffs are having ½ share?*
- 6 *Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for partition and separate possession as prayed for?*

- 7 *Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for declaration relief as prayed for?*
- 8 *Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for permanent injunction as prayed for?*
- 9 *What are the other reliefs?*
- 10 *Whether the suit is maintainable as framed?*

48. On the side of the Plaintiffs, PW.1 and PW.2 were examined, and Exs.A1 to Exs.A9 were marked. During the cross examination PW.1 none of the defendants come forward to cross the PW1. Thereby they become exparte on 11.03.2026 for the continuation of the cross examination.

49. On the side of the defendants, no oral or documentary evidence was adduced.

50. The learned counsels for the plaintiffs orally argued the case of their legal pleas in this case. Based upon the same and in light of the same and on basis of the oral as well as documentary evidence, the following issues are answered as follows:-

51. **Issue No.1**

52. *Whether the suit properties are joint family properties?*

53. The suit is filed for partition and declaration claiming $\frac{1}{2}$ share of the suit property and also declared to the gift deed dated 25.3.2014 as null and void and also sought for permanent injunction not to alienate suit property.

54. The genealogy tree filed by the plaintiff along with the plaint is admitted. The property stands in the name of Sellamuthu as per the patta marked under Ex.A.1. Further, the Chitta marked as Ex.A.2, in respect of the suit property, stands in the names of Sellamuthu and Soundiram.

Soundiram is none other than the brother's wife of Sellamuthu. Therefore, these two documents categorically show that the suit property is a joint family property. Further, under Ex.A.3, the sale deed executed by Soundirammal, Chellammal, and Shanthi in favour of one Selvaraj states that the property belonged to Soundirammal by way of inheritance. As per Ex.A.5, Patta No. 327 also stands jointly in the names of Chellamuthu and Soundiram. Hence, it is categorically proved that the properties are joint family properties. Therefore, the suit properties are joint family properties. Hence, Issue No. 1 is answered accordingly.

55. **Issue No.2 :-**

56. *Whether the suit properties absolutely belongs to D1?*

57. As per the findings arrived at in Issue No. 1, it is held that the suit properties are joint family properties. Therefore, the 1st defendant has no exclusive proprietary right over the suit properties. Further, as per the recitals in Ex.A.3, it is stated that the property devolved upon her by way of inheritance. Hence, the 1st defendant cannot claim any exclusive or absolute right over the suit properties. Further, the revenue records also stand jointly in her name. Therefore, this Court comes to the conclusion that the suit properties do not absolutely belong to the 1st defendant. Accordingly, Issue No. 2 is answered.

58. **Issue No.3**

59. *Whether the sale deed executed by D1 to D3 on 14.11.2002 is valid one?*

60. Coming to Ex.A.3, admittedly, no partition has been effected between the legal heirs of Sengamalai Gounder, namely, Chellamuthu and Nallu Gounder. Defendants 1 to 3 are the legal descendants of Nallu

Gounder, and the plaintiffs are the legal descendants of Chellamuthu. It is evident that no partition has been effected among them. The same is revealed through the evidence of PW.1. The evidence of PW.2 also corroborates the testimony of PW.1 with regard to the demand for partition, joint enjoyment of the property, and cultivation thereof. Further, the evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 has not been effectively challenged in the cross-examination by the defendants. Therefore, this Court comes to the conclusion that the execution of the sale deed by Defendants 1 to 3 in favour of the 4th defendant, without a prior partition of the suit properties, is not valid insofar as the plaintiffs' share is concerned.

61. Furthermore, the sale deed is arbitrary, illegal, and improper. Since the suit properties are undivided joint family properties, Defendants 1 to 3 could not have conveyed the entire property in favour of the 4th defendant. Therefore, without the consent of the plaintiffs, the sale deed will not bind the plaintiffs to the extent of their share in the suit properties. Further, the sale deed dated 14.11.2002 does not specifically deal with or extinguish the share of the plaintiffs. Hence, insofar as the plaintiffs' share is concerned, the sale deed dated 14.11.2002 is liable to be declared null and void. Accordingly, Issue No. 3 is answered.

62. **Issue No.4**

63. *Whether the gift settlement deed executed on 25.04.2014 in favour of D3 is valid one?*

64. As per the findings arrived in Issue No.1 to 3, it is arrived that the suit properties are joint family properties and the D1 has no individual right over the property. Further, Defendants 1 to 3 has no right to execute any sale deed in favour of the Defendant no.4 without the written

consent of the plaintiff. Thereby, the sale deed dated 14.11.2002 is invalid one. While so, it is proved that there is no partition has been took place among the Legal heirs of the Chellamuthu and Nallu Gounder. Thereby, without any partition any alienation whether it is sale or gift is also invalid one. Therefore, by applying the formula the gift deed dated 25.04.2014 is also invalid one. Therefore, the document itself is also null and void and it will not bind the plaintiffs as to their share in the suit properties. Further more, to desist from the findings arrived above, there is no contradictory evidence has been adduced or any oral as well as document evidence has been put forth by the defendants. Further more, after the cross continuation of the PW.1 The defendants didn't come forward to adduced any oral evidence To substantiate the contention raised in the written statement. Therefore, there is no other go except to rely upon the oral as well as document evidence of the plaintiffs which will conclude that the gift deed is invalid one. Hence, the issue no.4 is answered accordingly.

65. **Issue No.5:**

66. *Whether the plaintiffs are having ½ shares?*

67. As per the findings arrived at in Issue Nos. 1 to 4, it is held that the suit properties are joint family properties and that the 1st defendant has no exclusive or individual right over the same. Further, Defendants 1 to 3 had no right to execute the sale deed in favour of the 4th defendant without the consent of the plaintiffs. Therefore, the sale deed dated 14.11.2002 and the gift deed dated 25.04.2014 are held to be invalid insofar as the plaintiffs' share is concerned.

68. It is evident that no partition has been effected between the legal heirs of Sengamalai Gounder, namely, Chellamuthu and Nallu

Gounder. Defendants 1 to 3 are the legal descendants of Nallu Gounder, and the plaintiffs are the legal descendants of Chellamuthu. The same is revealed through the evidence of PW.1. The evidence of PW.2 also corroborates the testimony of PW.1 regarding the demand for partition, joint enjoyment of the property, and cultivation thereof. Further, the evidence of PW.1 and PW.2 remains unshaken. Therefore, this Court holds that, branch-wise, the plaintiffs are entitled to a $\frac{1}{2}$ share and Defendants 1 to 3 are entitled to the remaining $\frac{1}{2}$ share in the suit properties. Accordingly, the plaintiffs are entitled to an undivided $\frac{1}{2}$ share in the joint family properties, namely, the suit properties. Hence, Issue No. 5 is answered in favour of the plaintiffs.

69. **Issue No.6**

70. *Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for partition and separate possession as prayed for?*

71. As per the findings arrived at in Issue Nos. 1 to 5, it is held that the suit properties have not been partitioned and that no partition has been effected till date, either orally or through a written instrument. Therefore, the plaintiffs are entitled to a $\frac{1}{2}$ share in the suit properties and are entitled to have the same divided by metes and bounds by way of a preliminary decree for partition. Hence, Issue No. 6 is answered accordingly.

72. **Issue No. 7**

73. *Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for declaration relief as prayed for?*

74. As per the findings arrived in Issue No.1 to 6, it is arrived that the alienation and transfer made by the defendants through sale and gift deed or invalid and not binding the share of the plaintiffs. Thereby, the

documents No.743/2014 gift deed dated 25.3.2014 has to be declared as null and void. Thereby, the declaration of gift deed has to be intimated to the concern SRO Gangavalli under Section 89 of the Civil Rules of Practice. Hence, the issue no.7 is answered accordingly.

75. Issue No.8

76. Coming to the aspect of permanent injunction aspects, if the parties to the suit properties mentioned herein are subject to the partition. Thereby, prima facie case is made out in respect of the suit property and based upon the preliminary decree of partition, if any revenue records or any alienation has been made by the parties, it will create multiplicity of proceedings. Thereby, the plaintiffs has made out balance of convenience in their favour. Therefore, if the plaintiffs has not been granted with permanent injunction, the plaintiffs will be put into heavy irreparable loss and hardship than that of the defendants . Thereby, the plaintiffs are entitled to the reliefs of permanent injunction not to alienate the property till the passing of the final decree. Hence, the Issue No.8 is answered accordingly.

77. Issue No. 10.

78. As per the findings arrived at in Issues Nos. 1 to 8, the suit is clearly framed, and there is no legal flaw found, as contended by the defendants. Further, the defendants also failed to substantiate their defence by adducing oral as well as documentary evidence. Being a simple suit for partition claiming a ½ share, there is no need to look into any other technical aspects. Therefore, there is no other ground or threshold revealed from the oral as well as documentary evidence of the parties so as to deny the relief sought by the plaintiffs. Hence, Issue No. 10 is answered accordingly.

79. **Issue No. 9.**

80. By summation of the findings arrived for the issues, 1 to 8,10, the plaintiff has been granted with partition of 1/2 share in the suit properties in respect of suit proprieties are subject to partition.

81. The plaintiffs has also been granted with permanent injunction restraining the defendants from alienating or encumbering in respect of the suit properties till the final decree. Further, as per the dictum, the parties are liberty to file final decree petitions as per the procedure established by Law. The document No.743/2014 gift deed dated 25.3.2014 has to be declared as null and void. Thereby, the declaration of gift deed has to be intimated to the concern SRO Gangavalli under Section 89 of the Civil Rules of Practice. Hence, apart from the above reliefs, the parties are not entitled to any other reliefs.

82. *In the result, the suit is hereby decreed with cost by passing preliminary decree of partition of 1/2 share of the plaintiffs in the suit properties. That the the document No.743/2014 gift deed dated 25.3.2014 has been declared as null and void and also Also by granting permanent injunction restraining the defendants 1 to 7 from alienating or encumbering the schedule of properties till the final decree. For passing final decree, the parties are liberty to file final decree petitions.*

Dictated by me to the Steno-Typist, computerized by her directly to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court, this the 8th day of June 2026.

Subordinate Judge,
Attur.

Witnesses examined on the side of Plaintiffs:PW.1 - Thiru Ramalingam (2nd plaintiff)

PW.2 - Thiru. Sellapillai

Exhibits marked on the side of Plaintiffs:-

Ex.A.1	--	Patta No.295 in Nila Udaimai Register
Ex.A.2	10.01.2014	Patta No.295 in Chitta
Ex.A.3	14.11.2002	Sale Deed in the name of 4 th defendant
Ex.A.4	12.03.2013	Patta No.61 - Online copy
Ex.A.5	08.01.2014	Patta No.327 - Online copy
Ex.A.6	--	Patta No.295 - Kist receipts (Nos.9)
Ex.A.7	25.03.2014	Gift Settlement Deed in the name of 3 rd defendant
Ex.A.8	17.06.2017	Objection Petition submitted by the plaintiffs to the RTO, Attur.

Witnesses examined on the side of Defendants: NIL**Exhibits on the side of the Defendants: NIL**

Subordinate Judge,
Attur

Draft/Fair judgment
O.S.No.60/2014
Sub-Court,Attur
Dated:08.06.2026.