

IN THE COURT OF THE SUBORDINATE JUDGE, METTUR

Present: Thiru. R.Saravana Babu,B.A., L.L.B.,

Subordinate Judge, Mettur

Thursday, the 27th day of August 2026

O.S.No.313/2022

CNR.No: TNSA16-000808-2022

R.Premavathi

... Plaintiff

//Vs//

1. N.Rajamanickam

2. R. Saravanabhavan

... Defendants

This suit is coming on 08.08.2026 before this Court for final hearing in the presence of Thiru.S.Peter Raj learned counsel for the plaintiff and Tr.L.Ganapathy Subramanian learned counsel filed vakalath for defendants and the defendants having remained exparte and upon hearing the plaintiff side arguments and on perusing the documents as well as the oral testimony and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

The suit is filed for Permanent Injunction and for other reliefs.

2. The Brief facts of the plaint is as follows:-

According to the plaintiff, she was the absolute owner of the suit property as per the gift settlement deed dated 29.09.2005 through her mother namely Amutha. It is further stated that 90 feet on the east-west side and 30 feet north-south side and totally comprised of about 2700 Sq Ft of land. From the date of execution of gift settlement deed, she was in possession and enjoyment over the suit property. The revenue records were also mutated in the name of the plaintiff. It is further stated that the defendants were strangers to the suit property and approached the plaintiff to sell the suit property for lower rate. On 03.11.2022, the defendants and his men were trying to tress-pass in to the suit property and trying to dispose the plaintiff from the suit property. It was prevented by the well-wishers of the plaintiff. Therefore, it necessitated the plaintiff to laid the suit for the relief of permanent injunction against the defendants.

3) The defendants D1 and D2 were set exparte on 08.03.2023.

4) In order to prove the claim of the plaintiffs, on the side of plaintiffs, PW1 has been examined and Ex A1 to A4 were marked.

5) Based on the above pleadings, this court framed the following issues:-

1. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to permanent injunction as prayed for?
2. What do other reliefs?

6. Issue No.1

6.1) The plaintiff has laid the suit for the relief of permanent injunction against the defendants. The plaintiff has claimed the title that she is the absolute owner of the suit property by way of gift settlement deed executed by her mother Amutha through settlement deed dated 29.09.2005. The land is all about 2700 Sq Ft. On east-west side it is about 90 feet and on the north-south side it is about 30 feet. The plaintiff is in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit property. The revenue records were also mutated in the name of the plaintiff and property tax were assessed with Mettur municipality. The electricity service connection also obtained in the name of the plaintiff. The defendants are third parties to the suit property and trying to purchase the suit property for lower rate. The defendants were trying to tress-pass into the suit property and it was prevented by the well-wishers of the plaintiff. Hence, the plaintiff has filed suit for the relief of permanent injunction against the defendants.

6.2) To substantiate the claim of the plaintiff, she herself examined as PW1 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A4 were marked. On perusal of Ex.A1, it is found that the mother of the plaintiff have executed the settlement deed in favour of the plaintiff. On perusal of Ex.A2, it is found that the patta has been issued in favour of the plaintiff. On perusal of Ex.A3, it is found that the property tax were paid to the municipality to the suit properties and receipts were issued to the same. On perusal of Ex.A4, it is found that the plaintiff has paid electricity service charges to the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board. From the above discussions, it is crystal clear that the plaintiff is the absolute owner of the suit property and she was in

peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit properties. Hence, it is decided that the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of permanent injunction as prayed for.

7. Issue No.2

Since, the issue no.1 is answered in favour of the plaintiff. Therefore, the plaintiff is not entitled to any other relief as prayed in the plaint.

8. In the result, suit is decreed as prayed for. Considering the nature of the suit, there shall be order of no cost.

Dictated to the typist directly and computerized by her, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, this the 27th day of August 2026.

**Subordinate Judge,
Mettur.**

Plaintiff Side Witness:

PW.1 : Premavathi

Plaintiff Side Exhibits:

Ex.A1	29.09.2005	Registered Gift Settlement Deed duly executed by one Amutha in favour of the plaintiff	Original
Ex.A2	05.10.2017	Patta (Patta No.2277)	Original
Ex.A3	04.11.2022	Property Tax receipt	Original
Ex.A4	04.11.2022	Electricity Consumption Charge Receipt	Original

Defendants side Witness: Nil

Defendants side Exhibits: Nil

**Subordinate Judge,
Mettur**