

IN THE COURT OF THE SUBORDINATE JUDGE, METTUR

Present: Thiru.S.MUTHURAMAN, B.L.,
Subordinate Judge, Mettur.

Saturday, the 5th day of August 2023
(2054 Thiruvalluvaradu Soba Kiruthu Varudam Aadi Month 20th day)

OIRIGINAL SUITT.No:116 of 2019

CNR.NO: TNSA-1600234-2019

- 1.Kamala
2. Sarkkaraiyan
3. Ramasamy
4. Ponnusamy
5. Sarasu
6. Rani

... Plaintiffs

/Versus/

- 1.Lakshmi
2. Raja
3. Ayyavu
4. Saroja
5. Selvi
6. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. By the District Collector, Collectorate, Salem.
7. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Revenue Divisional Office, Mettur, Salem
8. The Tahsildhar, Mettur, salem

... Defendants

This suit coming up for final hearing on 18.07.2023 before this Court in the presence of Thiru.M.K.Arjunan, Advocate for Plaintiffs and of Thiru.B.Selladurai Advocate for D1 to D5, and of Thiru.A.Balaji, Government Pleader for D6 to D8 and upon hearing the arguments of the both sides and perusing the records, having stood over for consideration till this date, this Court delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

1. This is a suit for by declaring the title of the plaintiffs over the suit property with a consequential permanent injunction restraining the defendants 1 to 5 and their men from in any way trespassing into the suit property, and by passing mandatory injunction directing the defendants 6 to 8 to cancel the Patta No.1006 of Lakkampatty Village in the name of Vellaiyan son of Sevian as null and void, and by passing an order of mandatory injunction directing the defendants 6 to 8 to issue separate patta in the name of the plaintiffs to the suit property and cost of the suit.

2. Brief averments of the plaint are as follows:

1. That the property described hereunder hereinafter called the suit property situates at Lakkampatty Village, Mettur Taluk, Salem District, within the jurisdiction of this Court. That the plaintiffs are the owners of the suit property. That the plaintiffs are brothers and sisters. That the 1st defendant is the mother of the defendants 2 to 5. That the plaintiffs are the absolute owners of the suit property. Originally the plaintiffs' father namely Thavuriyan purchased the suit property on 05.04.1967 for valuable consideration by a registered sale deed in Document No.625/1967 registered at Sub Registrar Office, Mecheri. That the plaintiffs' are producing the original sale deed in the name of the plaintiff's father herewith and the same may be read as part and parcel of the plaint. That the plaintiff's father was in absolute possession and enjoyment of the property till his life time. That the plaintiffs father Thavuriyan died intestate on 23.10.2004. That the plaintiffs are the only legal heirs and successors to their father. That the plaintiffs are in joint possession and enjoyment of the

suit property. That nobody is having right or interest or possession over the suit property except the plaintiffs. That the plaintiffs are producing death certificate of their father and legal heir certificate herewith and the same may be read as part and parcel of this plaint.

2. While the matter is so, that on 21.01.2019 the defendants 2 and 4 came near the suit property with the firka surveyor to measure the suit property. On seeing that the plaintiffs questioned the right of the defendants to enter into the suit property to measure the same. At that time, the defendants 2 and 4 told that the patta to the suit property in Patta number 1006 of Lakkampatty Village is in the name of Vellaiyan, the father of 2 and 4th defendants. On hearing this, the plaintiff's got shock. That the plaintiffs and their father are illiterates. Taking advantage of the illiteracy, the father of the defendants Vellaiyan fraudulently transferred the Patta to the suit property in his name. Only on 21.01.2019 the plaintiffs got the knowledge of the Patta Transfer in the name of the defendants' father. That the old survey number of the suit property was 548/2. That in the resurvey that took place in the year 1979 and 1980, the new Survey No.489/A was given to the suit property. But now it learns that the Patta is wrongly transferred in the name of the said Vellaiyan, the father of the defendants. That the said Vellaiyan is no more. That the defendants 1 to 5 are the legal heirs of the said Vellaiyan. That the defendants are not having any right, title, interest or possession over the suit property. After getting the knowledge of the Patta wrongly issued in the name of the defendants father Vellaiyan, the plaintiffs perused the revenue records and found the Patta was wrongly issued.

3. Therefore the plaintiffs filed an appeal before the 7th defendant to rectify the mistake and to cancel the Patta in the name of Vellaiyan and to issue separate Patta in the name of plaintiffs regarding the suit property. That the appeal was preferred on 06.02.2019. After receiving the appeal the 7th defendant did not order any enquiry. In such circumstances, on 27.02.2019 the defendants 1 to 5 came near the suit property along with their men and made an unsuccessful attempt to trespass into the suit property, challenging the title of the plaintiffs' over the suit property. But the plaintiff's thwarted the unsuccessful attempt of the defendants 1 to 5 with the help of the elders of the locality. While leaving the place, the defendants openly declared that they would achieve their aim at any cost, they will not allow the plaintiff to enjoy the suit property peacefully. Therefore now it becomes necessary to protect the right and title of the plaintiff over the suit property. Since the defendants 1 to 5 have challenged, the right of the plaintiffs over the suit property it becomes necessary to declare the title of the plaintiffs over the suit property. Further the 7th defendant did not order to have an enquiry over the appeal petition. It becomes necessary to file the suit against the Government of Tamil Nadu and the defendants 6, 7, 8 in order to correct the Patta. Hence it becomes necessary to file the suit against the defendants for the relief of Consequential injunction and Mandatory injunction. Otherwise the plaintiffs' right and title will be affected. Otherwise the plaintiffs will be put into great loss, injury and damage. Hence the suit for declaration, consequential permanent injunction and mandatory injunction. That the plaintiffs are not having sufficient

time to issue the notice under Section 80 of C.P.C. as contemplated in law to the Government authorities. Hence the plaintiffs are filing separate petition to dispense with the Section 80 of C.P.C. notice to file the suit against the Government of Tamil Nadu. Therefore the plaintiffs prays that by declaring the title of the plaintiffs over the suit property with a consequential permanent injunction restraining the defendants 1 to 5 and their men from in any way trespassing into the suit property, and by passing mandatory injunction directing the defendants 6 to 8 to cancel the Patta No.1006 of Lakkampatty Village in the name of Vellaiyan son of Seviaan as null and void, and by passing an order of mandatory injunction directing the defendants 6 to 8 to issue separate patta in the name of the plaintiffs to the suit property and cost of the suit.

3. Brief averments of the written statement filed by the 4th defendant and adopted by the 1 to 5 defendants are as follows:

1. The suit is false, vexatious, frivolous, unsustainable either on law or on facts. Save those allegations those that are specifically admitted hereunder rest are denied as untrue, put the plaintiff to the strict proof of the same. This defendant submits that the contents of para 4 of the plaint are all false and denied as untrue. It is false to state that the plaintiffs are owners of the suit properties. The relationship noted in the plaint are generally true. It is false to state that one purchased the suit properties on 05.04.1967 for valid consideration vide document No.625/1967 registered at Sub Registrar of Mecheri. The sale deed dated 05.04.1967 is not acted upon, does not bind these defendants because of fabricated one and possession was not handed over the suit

property by the vendors of the sale deed. Either the plaintiffs' or the father of the plaintiffs are not in possession of the suit properties at any point of time. It is false to state that father the plaintiffs was in absolute possession enjoyment of the suit properties till his life time. The plaintiffs must proof the date of death of the deceased Thavuriyan and died intestate. It is false to state that the plaintiffs are in joint possession over the suit property nowadays. It is false to state that the except the plaintiff nobody has got right or title over the suit properties. The legal heir certificate of Thavuriyan is suspicious one because wife of deceased Thavuriyan by name Govindhee not added as legal heirs. She is alive.

2. The contents of para 5 of the plaint are partly false and denied as untrue. It is true that Patta No.1006 of Lakampatty Village is in the name of the Vellaiyan who is none other than the father of the defendants 2 to 4. It is false to state that the plaintiffs are illiterate and knew the fact of existence of Patta No.1006 of Lakkampatty only when Firka Surveyor came to the suit property on 21.01.2019. It is false to state that the said Vellaiyan fraudulently transferred the patta to the suit property. The defendants herein submits that after due enquiry was made by the revenue officials, the Patta No.1006 of Lakkampatty was issued in favor of the said Vellaiyan. It is false to state that the legal heir of the deceased Vellaiyan are not having any right, title or possession over the suit properties. It is false to state the said Patta was issued wrongly.

3. The content of the para 6 of the plaint are all false and denied. The

defendants have no knowledge of Patta appeal proceedings state in the plaint. It is false to state that the defendants came near the suit properties on 27.02.2019 attempted to trespass into the suit properties and such attempt were thwarted by the plaintiffs. It is again false state that on hearing the place the defendant declared that they would achieve their aim at any cost, the plaintiffs rights have to be protected.

4. The contents of para 7 of the plaint are concocted story invented by the plaintiffs For cause of action to harvest the suit properties for which they are not entitled. The valuation for the purpose of Court Fee and Jurisdiction are not correctly valued. The document No.625/1957 dated is nominal one, fraudulently created by the parties of the said document without banding or taking over the possession, with an intention to defraud the said Vellaiyan who was in then actual possession and enjoyment of the suit properties. Hence the said sale deed No.625/1967 is liable to be ignored. The defendants are the possession, enjoyment of the suit properties after demise of the said Vellaiyan, enjoying the suit property in common without any encumbrance. Hence the suit is liable to be dismissed.

4. Brief averments of the written statement filed by the 8th defendant and adopted by the 6 and 7 defendants are as follows:

The suit is false, frivolous, unsustainable in law and on facts. The defendant does not admit any of the allegations except those that are specifically admitted herein. The burden of proof is on the part of the plaintiff to prove it. The averments contained in the plaint are all false

and denied by the defendant. It may be correct that the relationship between the plaintiffs and also the defendants 1 to 5. It is not correct to state that the plaintiffs are the absolute owners of the suit property. The plaintiffs have to prove that the plaintiffs' father Thavuriyan arian purchased the suit property on 5-4-1967 under document No. 625/1967. It is false to state that on 21-1-2019 the defendants 2 & 4 came near the suit property with the Firka Surveyor to measure the suit property. It is again false to state that only on 21-1-2019 the plaintiffs got the knowledge of the patta transfer order in the name of the defendants' father. It is false to state that the plaintiffs filed an appeal before the 7th defendant to rectify the mistake and to cancel the patta in the name of Vellaiyan and two issue separate patta in the name of the plaintiffs regarding the suit property and the appeal was preferred on 6-2-2019. It is again false to state that the 7th defendant did not order for any enquiry in the said appeal. The other averments are not correct. The plaintiffs have to prove all the averments through documentary evidence. The defendant submits that the patta No.1006, S.No. 489/2A, an extent of 0.95.50 Punjai Hec is in the name of Vellaiyan son of Seviyan. If the plaintiffs are challenged the said patta, they have to file appeal before the 7th defendant. The plaintiffs have never filed any appeal in respect of the patta numbers 1006 of Lakkampatti Village, Mettur Taluk. The plaintiffs have created the plaint document No.6 and filed the vexatious suit against the defendant. The description of properties is not correct and the court fee paid by the plaintiffs and the valuation of the suit property is also not correct. The plaintiff has not complied Sec.80 of C.P.C. The defendant reserves her right to file additional written statement in future. Therefore, the defendant prays that to dismiss the above suit with heavy

cost.

5. Basing on the above pleadings, following issues were settled for trial on 27.07.2022.

1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled the relief of permanent injunction against D1 to D5 as prayed for?
2. Whether the plaintiff is entitled the relief of mandatory injunction the D6 to D8 in respect of Patta No.1006 for cancellation?
3. Whether the defendants No.6 to 8 can be ordered to issue fresh patta to plaintiffs in respect suit schedule property?
4. Whether the plaintiffs are in the possession of suit schedule properties?
5. Whether the suit is bd for non-jointer of necessary parties?
6. It is correct to said by defendants that they never known the patta appeal proceedings?
7. Whether the suit is under valued?
8. Whether the U/s 80 of CPC complied or not?
9. To what other relief entitled by the plaintiffs?

6. During trial, plaintiff examined himself as P.W1, Chinnusany was examined as P.W.2 and Mayilsamy was examined as PW3 and Ex.A1 to A11 marked through PW1. On the side defendant no one was examined and Ex.B1 was marked on D6 to D8 side during the cross-examination of PW.3.

7. Heard both sides. Records perused. The learned counsel for plaintiff would submitted in his arguments and says that the plaintiffs are the legal

heirs of Thavuriyan. The said Thavuriyan purchase the schedule property in the year 1967 on that date onwards the said Thavuriyan was peaceful possession and enjoyment of the schedule property after his lifetime the plaintiffs jointly possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The D1 to D5 have no right over the suit scheduled property. The plaintiffs is clearly proved this case through oral and documentary evidences more over the defendants does not come to witness box. Hence the suit decreed as prayed for. On the other hand, the Government Pleader argued that the suit itself is false one. The patta no.1006 S.No.489/2A stands in the name of one Vellaiyan in respect of changing the patta no appeal was filed before the revenue authorities by the plaintiffs. The plaintiffs have failed to prove the cases. Hence, suit is dismissed with cost of defendants.

8. Issues No.4:

According to this issue it has to be decided first, whether the plaintiffs are in the possession in the suit schedule properties. To prove their fact the 3rd plaintiff was examined as PW1 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A11 were marked through him. Two more witness were examined as PW2 and PW3. On the side of D6 to D8 no evidence was produced and after giving sufficient time their evidence was closed by this court. During the cross examination of PW2, Ex.B1 was marked on the side of D6 to D8.

2. The plaintiffs case is that they are the legal heirs of Thavuriyan, their father Thavuriyan had purchased the suit property on 05.04.1967 through registered sale deed. That sale deed dated 05.04.1967 was

marked as Ex.A1. On perusal of the Ex.A1 it is a registered sale deed that the Thavuriyan has purchased a land bearing S.No.548/2 2.acre 58 cents from one Raju. Ex.A2 is the death certificate of Thavuriyan and Ex.A3 is the legal heirs certificate of Thavuriyan. Such facts was not denied by the defendants. Ex.A4 and Ex.B1 are one and same that is a patta of S.No.489/2A stands in the name of one Vellaiyan. Ex.A5 is the encumbrance certificate which was taken for the period from 01.01.1966 to 27.01.2019 in respect of S.No.548/2. The plaintiffs case is that the old Survey.No.of suit property was 548/2 and after the resurvey took place in the year 1979 and 1980. New Survey.No was given as 489/1A. During the resurvey period the patta is wrongly transferred in the name of Vellaiyan. But the Vellaiyan as well as his legal heirs (i.e) 1 to 5 defendants have no right at all over the suit schedule property. But no such documents were produced by the plaintiffs that the alleged S.No.489/A is the old S.NO of the 548/2 . It is a well settled law that the plaintiffs can succeed by substantially proving the very story it alleges. It must stand on its own legs. It cannot take advantage of the weakness of the defense. Moreover the plaintiff 's side never produced any documents would show that they are in the possession of suit property. On perusal he documents on the side of plaintiffs which was issued by the revenue authority does not reveals that the S.No.489/A is old No.as 548/2. No revenue authorities was examined as the side of the plaintiffs. It is well settled law plaintiffs must be proved in no initial burden. As per the plaint averments the property is the agricultural land. Regarding the possession of agricultural land the plaintiffs must be produced Land possession certificate, tax receipt, mutation certificate also. But no

one documents relating to the possession was produced by plaintiffs. In *M. Siddiq v. Mahant Suresh Das*, 2020-1 SCC 1, the Apex Court quoted the following from **State of AP v. Star Bone Mill & Fertiliser Company, (2013) 9 SCC 319** where Justice B.S. Chauhan explained as under:

- *'21.....The said presumption is read under Section 114 of the Evidence Act and applies only in a case where there is either no proof, or very little proof of ownership on either side. The maxim – **possession follows title** – is applicable in cases where proof of actual possession cannot reasonably be expected, for instance, in the case of wastelands, or where nothing is known about possession one way or another.*
- ***Presumption of title** as a result of possession, can arise only where facts disclose that no title vests in any party. Possession of the plaintiff is not prima facie wrongful, and title of the plaintiff is not proved. It certainly does not mean that because a man has title over some land, he is necessarily in possession of it. It in fact means, that if at any time a man with title was in possession of the said property, the law allows the presumption that such possession was in continuation of the title vested in him.*
- *A person must establish that he has continued possession of the suit property, while the other side claiming title, must make out a case of trespass/ encroachment, etc.*
- *Where the apparent title is with the plaintiffs, it is incumbent upon the defendant, that in order to displace this claim of apparent title and to establish beneficial title in himself, he must establish by*

way of satisfactory evidence, circumstances that favour his version.

- *Even, a revenue record is not a document of title. It merely raises a presumption in regard to possession.*
- *Presumption of possession and/or continuity thereof, both forward and backward, can also be raised under Section 110 of the Evidence Act.'*

So upon considering the possession the plaintiffs failed to prove that they are in true enjoyment and possession of suit property. Accordingly the issue was decided as against the plaintiffs.

9. Additional Issue 1:

Regarding the additional Issue No.1 whether the plaintiffs is entitled the relief of declaration over the suit schedule property. Admittedly the Ex.A1 was stands in the name of the Thavuriyan who is the none other man the father of plaintiffs. The plaintiffs side pointed out that the defendants No.1 to 5 are set exparte. They never came into witness box to give evidence. As already stated supra that the plaintiffs can succeed his case only stands its own leg. Further that the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that its Judgment referred in 2022 Like Lw (SC) 19 Smiriti Debbarma D Vs. Prabha Ranjan Debbarama, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that a decree of possession cannot be granted in favour of plaintiff merely because defendants were not able to fully establish their right, title and interest in the property weakness of the defense cannot be a justification to decree the suit. Further, regarding the possession of plaintiffs over the suit scheduled property no one documents or oral

evidence was produced. Hence, the plaintiffs failed to prove regarding the possession in respect of suit scheduled property hence, this issue was answered against the plaintiffs accordingly.

The High Court's opinion was based on the reasoning contained in an earlier decision of the same High Court, the case of Sri Aralappa vs. Sri Jagannath & others (ILR 2007 Kar 339). In this judgment, it was held:

" 31. Even if the plaintiff comes to Court asserting that he is in possession and that if it is found after trial that he was not in possession on the date of the suit, even then, the suit for declaration and permanent injunction is liable to be dismissed as not maintainable, as no decree for permanent injunction can be granted if the plaintiff is not in possession on the date of the suit.

In such circumstances, it is necessary for the plaintiff to amend the plaint before the judgment and seek relief of possession. Therefore, a suit for declaration of title and permanent injunction, by the plaintiff who is not in possession on the date of the suit, when he is able to seek further relief of recovery of possession also, omits to do so, the Court shall not make any such declaration and the suit is liable to be dismissed as not maintainable".

10.Issue No.5

The written statement of D1 to D5 stated that, the legal heir certificate of Thavuriyan was suspicious one and the wife of Govindhee was not added in the legal heir certificate. Hence they submitted that in the written statement the suit is bad for non-jointer of necessary parties. On perused the Ex.A3 is the legal heir certificate of deceased Thavuriyan.

The certificate of issued by the Mettur Tahsildhar on 05.02.2018. The said Thavuriyan died on 23.10.2004. Once the defendants raised a question regarding the non-jointer of necessary party, the plaintiffs alone has to be proved whether it is correct or not. As already stated that the plaintiffs side never examined revenue authorities regarding Ex.A3 is genuine or not. The plaint itself nothing stated whether the Govindhee is on alive or not. So, the suit is hit for non-jointer of necessary party and this issue was answered against the plaintiffs.

In Moreshar-yadaorao-mahajan-vs-Vyankatesh-sitaram-bhedi-d-2022-livelaw-sc-802- The Supreme Court observed that a suit is liable to be dismissed if a "necessary party" is not impleaded. For being a necessary party.

10. Issue No.6

D1 to D5 side filed the statement and stating that they are never known the patta appeal proceedings as stated by the plaintiffs. If it is really that the plaintiffs filed a appeal before the revenue authorities, notice also sent to the D1 to D5 by the reveuue authorities and there is a possibility that D1 to D5 was may be on appeared through their counsel. Further, that no documents was filed by the plaintiffs would show regarding the appeal pending before the revenue department. Ex A6 is concern it not show recital of the case number pending before Revenue Department. So, the avernments made in the written statements by D1 to D5 is not able to avoid that they never known the patta proceedings before the revenue department.

11. Issue No.1 to 3:

Admittedly D1 to D5 were called absent and set exparte. Even though they called absent set exparte, then it cannot be taken into consideration that the plaintiffs proved their case. It is a settled proposition of law injunction cannot be granted against the true owners. More over there are several judgments by the APEX courts no possession of property no injunction can be granted. The Government officials filed their written statement and stated that the patta no.1006 S.No.489/2A an extend of 0.95.50 புஞ்சை ஏக்கர் in the name of Vellaiyan. During the cross-examination of PW3, the D6 to D8 was marked Ex.B1 patta. On perused the patta no.1006 in Lakkampatty village stands in the name of Vellaiyan who is the none other than the husband of D1 and father of D2 to D5. The plaintiffs had failed to produced the documents the S.No.489/A is the old S.No of 548/2. Ex.A7 to Ex.A11 never disclosed that the S.No. 548/2 is now S.No.489/2A. During the cross-examination of PW3 he stated that ராமசாமி தாவா சொத்தை அனுபவித்து வருவதற்கு என்ன ஆவணங்களை தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளார் என்ற விவரம் தெரியுமா என்றால் தெரியாது. 6 முதல் 8 பிரதிவாதிகள் எந்த தேதியில் நிலத்தை அளக்க வந்தார்கள் என்று தெரியுமா என்றால் தெரியாது. என்னிடம் காட்டப்படும் பட்டாவில் வெள்ளையன் என்பவர் பெயர் உள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். அது ரீசர்வவேயில் மாறியுள்ளது. அந்த பட்டா பி.வா.சா.ஆ.1 ஆகும். பட்டா மாறுதல் சம்மந்தமாக யாரிடம் எந்த தேதியில் மனு கொடுத்தார்கள் என்ற விவரம் எனக்கு தெரியுமா என்றால் தேதி தெரியாது. மனு கொடுத்த விவரம் தெரியும். So, the S.No.489/2A

was in the possession of said Vellaiyan. The revenue authorities rightly issued the patta in favour of said Vellaiyan. As a real owner of said Vellaiyan the plaintiffs have no right at all to entitle the mandatory injunction as well as the fresh patta in favour of them against the D6 to D8. Upon considering the above said fact the plaintiffs are not entitled the relief in issue no.1 to 3 as prayed for.

12. Issue No.7 and 8:

The D1 to D5 side case is that the suit is not properly valued and D6 to D8 stated that the plaintiffs did not comply with Sec 80 of CPC regarding the value of the suit is concerned. The written statement of D1 to D5 contains nothing specific. Order 8 Rule 3 says that "It shall not be sufficient for a defendant in his written statement to deny generally the grounds alleged by the plaintiff, but the defendant must deal specifically with each allegation of fact of which he does not admit the truth, except damages. Moreover such fact it has to be proved by the defendants 1 to 5 alone. But, they are set aside hence they have no right to question about the value of the suit. Apart from that the plaintiffs filed a dispensation application in IA.1/2019 and stated that the D6 to D8 are the Government officials since there is urgency in filing the suit, no time to issue sec 80 of CPC notice to D6 to D8. Hence to dispense the same. That application was allowed on 14.03.2019. Hence, the question raised by the D6 to D8 is not accepted one.

11. Issue No.9:

plaintiffs never entitled any relief in further accordingly.

12.In the result,

discussed above, the plaintiffs categorically failed to prove the contention as mentioned in the plaint. Examining the case of the plaintiff on the basis of preponderance of probabilities and in view of the testimony of the witnesses , the plaintiffs cannot be held entitled to the reliefs claimed by them by way of present suit. Therefore, the suit of the plaintiffs are hereby dismissed. No order as to costs. Decree sheet be prepared accordingly,

Directly typed by me in my own laptop and corrected and pronounced by me on this 5th day of August, 2023.

Subordinate Judge,
Mettur.

Plaintiff's side Evidence :

PW1 - Ramasamy (3rd Plaintiff)
PW2 - Chinnusamy
PW3 - Mayilsamy

Plaintiff's side Exhibits :

Ex.A1	05.04.1967	Sale deed Doc.No. 625/1967 in favour of Thavuriyan	Original
Ex.A2	12.07.2018	Death certificate of Thavuriyan (23.10.2004)	Certified copy
Ex.A3	05.06.2018	Legal heir certificate of Thavuriyan	True copy
Ex.A4	31.01.2019	A-Register and FMB in Patta No.1006 (Vellaiyan)	Online copy
Ex.A5	28.10.2019	Encumbrance Certificate from 01.01.1966 to 28.01.2019	Certified copy
Ex.A6	06.02.2019	Appeal memorandum	Office copy
Ex.A7	18.10.2022	Adangal of 1378 Pasali	Certified copy
Ex.A8	18.10.2022	Adangal of 1383 Pasali	Certified copy
Ex.A9	18.10.2022	Adangal of 1384 Pasali	Certified copy

Ex.A10	18.10.2022	Adangal of 1388 Pasali	Certified copy
Ex.A11	18.10.2022	Adangal of 1389 Pasali	Certified copy

Defendant's side Evidence : Nil

Defendant's side Exhibits:

Ex.B1	18.11.2020	Patta No.1006 (Vellaiyan)	Online copy
-------	------------	---------------------------	-------------

Subordinate Judge,
Mettur.