

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF, POLUR.

TIRUVANNAMALAI DISTRICT.

Present : Tmt.B.Salma, B.A.,B.L.,(Hons)

District Munsif, Polur.

Friday, the 13th day of March 2026

ORIGINAL SUIT NO. 153/2017

CNR.No.TNTM06-000187-2017

R.Annadurai

...Plaintiff

/Vs/

M.Chokkanathan

...Defendant.

This suit came up before me for the final hearing on 24.02.2026 in the presence of Thiru.J.Thiyagarajan, Advocate for the Plaintiff and Thiru.N.Naveenkumar, Advocate for the Defendant and Upon perusing the oral, documentary evidences and material records filed by the both counsel and hearing both side arguments and the case having stood over for the consideration till this day, this court deliver the following:

JUDGMENT

This Suit is filed for declaration of title over the suit property and for consequential injunction against the defendant, his men, agents, not to encroach the suit property and for cost of the suit.

2. Brief Averments of the plaint:

The Plaintiff submits that the suit property is the absolute property of the plaintiff, by virtue of sale deed dated 08.10.2001 and further submits that after the execution of the sale deed, patta was mutated to his name and the plaintiff is in enjoyment and possession of the suit property by paying the necessary tax receipts to the government and further the plaintiff had filed computer chitta in his name and also adangal for the fasili year 1426 for the suit property, and further Submitted that the suit property was originally belonging to one Kanna gounder by virtue of sale deed dated 06.12.2000, and said Kanna gounder mutated the patta to his name and was enjoying the suit property and sold the suit property to plaintiff on 08.10.2001 and plaintiff submits that sale deed dated 06.12.2000 and 08.10.2001 are

submitted in the suit. The plaintiff further Submits that there is no relationship between the defendant and the suit property and the defendant is the adjacent land owner and he is the 3rd party to the suit property and is a non-law abiding person and is a man of power and money and on 10.06.2017, the defendant having no rights over the suit property, had tried to encroach the suit property, which was thwarted by the plaintiff with much difficulties, even then, the defendant is threatening to encroach the suit property and hence the plaintiff has filed this suit.

3. Brief Averments of the written statement

The defendant submits that all facts stated in the plaint are false and the plaintiff is liable to be put strict proof of the same and further submits that the suit property was originally was an ancestral property of one Rama gounder, and the said Rama gounder had executed the suit property along with other properties by execution of settlement deed dated 28.02.1966 in the favour of his minor daughters Kanniyammal and santhiya by appointing their mother Ammakannu as guardian, and further submits that the said settlement deed filed along with written statement and further submits that with respect to the suit properties the Rama gounder had executed the settlement deed for the suit S.No.167/7 out of total extent 1.27 acre, extent of 0.63 ½ acre in the favour of the aforesaid Kanniyammal and Santhiya and had give equal share to them and the kanniyammal and santhiya, after attaining majority, they both were enjoying the suit property by dividing into equal share of 0.31 ¾ Acre each, by the Kanniyammal and Santhiyammal and further submits that after the death of the said santhiyammal and her husband Ramasami gounder, their only legal heir selvam was in the possession and enjoyment of the suit property and the said selvam had executed the sale deed dated 06.07.2001 in favour of one Gundal gounder, and further submits that after the death of Gundal gounder, his legal heirs Dhanabakiyam, Sakunthala, venkatesan, moorthy were enjoying the suit property and on 11.05.2017 had executed sale deed dated 11.05.2017 in the favour of the defendant for the S.No.167/7 for extent of 0.31 ¾ acre with correct boundaries, in the presence of witnesses, and further submits that the defendant had paid the necessary batta and measured the suit property with the help of qualified surveyor of the government and transferred the patta to his name and the patta no.779, and the land in the name of defendant is subdivided as 167/7B and further submitted that the patta and FM sketch are filed by the defendant and further submits that the Ammakannu without any

rights with respect to the 0.63 ½ acres of land, had executed a sale deed infavour of one Kanna gounder and which was came to be known in the later period to the kannan gounder, and the kanna gounder inorder to avoid any future disputes with respect to suit properties had claimed the consideration amount back and executed a sale deed infavour of Kanniyammal's son Annadurai on 08.10.2001, without making dispute at that time of execution, the plaintiff is causing disputes after 16 years, with the defendant after the purchase of the suit property by the defendant, and further submits that, it is the plaintiff who had destroyed the crops worth of Rs.10,000/- on 01.07.2017 by using the tractor over the suit property, and with much difficulties the plaintiff was stopped by the defendant and at present the plaintiff had filed the present suit with false allegations and hence, there is no cause of action this suit and this suit is must be dismissed with cost.

4. On the basis of averments and denials made by the parties in the pleadings this court had framed the following issues on

1. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled for the relief of declaration of title with regard to suit property as prayed for?
2. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled for the relief of Permanent injunction against the defendant as prayed for?
3. To what relief, the plaintiff is entitled?

5. On the side of the plaintiff, the plaintiff himself examined as PW1 and marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A8 and there are no other witnesses examined on the side of plaintiff. On the side of the defendant, defendant examined himself as DW1 and marked Ex.B1 to Ex.B10 and there are no other witnesses examined on the side of defendants.

6. The learned counsel for the Plaintiff submitted that, the plaintiff had proved the title and possession over the suit property by marking Ex.A1 to Ex.A8 and further submitted that, the alleged settlement deed (Ex.B1) is marked by defendant, only by producing its Certified copy and not original settlement deed, and therefore further submits that the plaintiff had produced the parent original documents and patta documents for the year of 1994 in the name of Ammakannu and therefore submitted

that, based on the above documents, Plaintiff is entitled for the relief claimed in the suit.

7. The learned counsel for the defendant submitted that, the alleged settlement deed which is a Certified copy marked as Ex.B1 is sufficient to prove the Ammakannu and Kanniyammal had transferred their rights over the suit property through Ex.A4, to the Kanna gounder without having any title over the suit property, and further submits that Ammakannu is only the guardian for the minor daughters of Ramagounder namely Kanniyammal and Santhiyammal and the said Ramagounder had executed the settlement deed (Ex.B1) with respect to suit property in their favour by appointing his wife Ammakannu has the guardian for them and thus being the guardian, the Ammakannu is not having rights to execute Ex.A4, and further submitted that the kanniyammal is having rights only with respect of 0.31 3/4 cents in the suit survey number. However, the Ammakannu and kanniyammal wrongly executed 0.63 1/2 cents in the favour of kanna gounder without having any rights and therefore submitted that Ex.A4 is not a valid document and therefore submitted that, it is the plaintiff who disturbs that possession of the defendant and also submitted that, the defendant had subdivided the suit S.No.167/7 as 167/7B to his name by mutating patta in patta no.779 and therefore submitted that, it is necessary to dismiss the suit with cost.

8. Issue No.1

(i). Heard both counsels. Records perused. Inorder to substantiate the case, the plaintiff himself examined as PW1 and deposed the contents of the plaint and denied the allegations made in the written statement filed by defendant and also marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A8. The PW1 deposed that, he had filed suit for declaration of title and permanent injunction against the defendant with respect to suit property and further submits that, the suit property is absolutely belonging to the Plaintiff, and he had purchased the suit property through the Sale deed dated 08.10.2001 from Kanna gounder S/o Chinnathambi gounder with respect to the S.No.167/7, out of total extent of Acre 1.27, Acre 0.63 1/2 was purchased by him, for the sale consideration Rs.12,700/- The PW1 marked the Original Sale deed dated 08.10.2001 which is registered on the office of SRO of Chetpet as Ex.A1 and further the PW1 deposed that after the said purchase the Plaintiff had mutated the patta to his name

and has paid tax receipts to the government and was in the continuous possession and enjoyment of the suit property without any interruption, Ex.A2 is the Computer patta dated 12.06.2017 in the name of Kanniyammal, Annadurai, Subramaniyan in Patta no.1 for this S.No.2/1A3 in the Edayankolathur village of Chetpet Taluk, and Ex.A3 is the Attested copy of Adangal in a name of the Plaintiff with respect to the S.No.167/7 for the fasli year 1426 (2016), and Ex.A4 is the Original Registered sale deed dated 06.12.2000 wherein the Ammakannu ammal and her daughter Kanniyammal had executed a sale deed in the favour of 0.63 1/2 cents with respect to the suit property in the favour of one Kanna gounder S/o Chinnathambi gounder, and further deposed that after the execution of Ex.A4 the Kanna gounder had mutated patta in his name and paying government tax receipts and later sold the suit property in the favour of the plaintiff.

ii)And further PW1 marked Ex.A5 which is the Original Government tax receipts for the suit property in a name of Kanniyammal, Ammakannu ammal and Rajagopal (4 Nos), and Ex.A6 is the Certified copy of the Adangal extracts dated 03.09.2017 issued by Deputy Tahsildar of chetpet for the fasli years 1404, 1405, 1407 to 1410, 1414 to 1424 for the suit property wherein the Adangal for the S.No. 167/7 is issued in a name of Ammakannu ammal for the above fasili years for the extent of 0.51.5 (15 Nos), Ex.A7 is the Certified copy of the Fasli chitta for the fasli year 1411 for the suit S.No.167/7 standing in a name of Kanniyammal for the extent of Hecrares 0.51.5, Ex.A8 is the certified copy issued by the Deputy Tahsildar of chetpet dated 03.08.2017 with respect to the Adangal extract of the fasili year 1427 (2017) for the suit S.No.167/7 for total extent of 0.51.5 hectares which previously shows that it was stating in the name of Ammakannu later transferred to the name of Kanniyammal and Annadurai, thus PW1 deposed that, the defendant is having no rights over the suit property and since the defendant had tried to encroach the suit property, the suit has been filed by the plaintiff and further denied the allegations specified in the written statement, and further deposed that, the defendant is not possession in the suit property till date. There is no other witnesses adduced on the side of the plaintiff.

iii)On the side of defendant, the defendant examined as DW1, and deposed that all the facts stated in the plaint are false, and further deposed that suit property was an ancestral property of the Rama gounder, and on 28.02.1966 the said Rama gounder had executed a settlement deed in the favour of his minor daughters Kanniyammal and Santhiyammal by appointing his wife Ammakannu has guardian with respect to the suit property and some

other property, and Ex.B1 is the Certified copy of the Settlement deed dated 28.02.1966 registered in the Subregistrar of Chetpet wherein the suit property S.No.167/7 for acres 0.63 1/2 cents, including some other properties, were settled by the said Rama gounder in the favour of his minor daughters Kanniyammal and Santhiyammal, by appointing their mother as guardian of the said minors.

iv) And further deposed that, after the said settlement deed and after the attainment of majority by the Kanniyammal and Santhiyammal, the suit S.No.167/7, of the extent Acre 0.63 1/2 acres, equal share of Acre 0.31 3/4 each was enjoyed by the Kanniyammal and Santhiyammal separately and the said Santhiya who enjoyed the above 0.31 3/4 cents along with her husband Ramasamy gounder and after their lifetime, their only son Selvam was in the enjoyment of the property, which was later purchased by the defendant, and further deposed that, the said Selvam had executed a sale deed in a favour of one Gundal gounder on 06.07.2001 and the original Registered Sale deed dated 06.07.2001 was marked as Ex.B2 wherein the Said Selvam S/o Ramasamy gounder had executed the suit property with respect to 0.31 3/4 cents along with other properties to the Gundal gounder for the sale consideration of Rs.25,000/- the DW1 further deposed that, after the death of the said Gundal gounder, his legal heirs namely Dhanabakkiam, Sakunthala, Venkatesan, Moorthy, and executed a Sale deed dated 11.02.2017 in the favour of the defendant with respect to the extent of 0.31 3/4 cents in S.No.167/7 and the said Registered Original Sale deed dated 11.05.2017 was marked as Ex.B3 as deposed by the DW1.

v) And further DW1 deposed by he had transferred the patta to his name with respect to the property in Ex.B3 in Patta no.779 and later the Survey number was subdivided as 167/7B for which Patta was issued to his name separately Ex.B4 is the computer patta dated 21.06.2017 for the S.No.167/7B in patta no.779 of Edayankulathur Village for the extent of about 13 ares (32.12 cents) issued in the name of defendant. Ex.B5 is the Certified copy of the FM sketch for the S.No.167 of Edayankulathur village, showing the subdivision 167/7B, and further DW1 deposed that, by suppressing the above facts, the said Ammakannu ammal without any rights and Kanniyammal having rights only respect to 0.31 3/4 cents, had executed the sale deed dated 06.12.2000 for the 0.63 1/2 cents in the favour of one Kanna gounder and after the kanna gounder had come to know about this, in order to avoid any future disputes had again sold back to the son of Kanniyammal namely Annadurai (Plaintiff) on 08.10.2001, the defendant further deposed that, after 16 years, the plaintiff at present is

causing disputes with the defendant and had destroyed the cultivation of the crops worth Rs.10,000/- in the property belonging to the defendant on 01.07.2017 by using the tractor, and said act was thwarted by the defendant with much difficulties, and further submitted that, with false facts, the plaintiff had filed the suit, and further deposed that he his marking Ex.B6 which is the computer patta dated 21.11.2017 for the S.No.167/7B in the name of defendant, for the extent of 13 ares and Ex.B7 is the true copy of the A register extracts for the S.No.167/7 previously in the name of Ammakannu later subdivided as 167/7A with respect to the extent of 0.38.5 in the name of Kanniyammal and two others and also subdivided into 167/7B with respect to 0.13.0 in the name of defendant which was recorded as per the order in T.K.8A/245/1426 dated 14.06.2017 and the said correction was made by Mr.Manimaran SRO, Thachampadi on 09.08.2017, in Ex.B8 is the certified copy of a Adangal extracts for the S.No.167/7B in the name of defendant for the extent of 0.13.0 hectares for the fasli year 1427 (2017), Ex.B9 is the true copy of the Adangal extracts for the S.No.167/7B in a name of Sokkanathan (defendant) for the patta no.779 issued by VAO of Chetpet, and Ex.B10 is the A Register extract for the S.No.167/7B of Edayankulathur village standing in the name of Sokkanathan (Defendant) for the patta no.779 for the extent of 0.13.00 hectares, and thus defendant deposed that, in order to cause harassment to the defendant, the plaintiff had filed this suit and prays to dismiss the suit with cost. There is no other witness adduced on the side of defendant.

vi) This court had perused the evidences and documents of both sides, and it is the stand of the defendant that the suit property was an ancestral property of one Rama gounder, and the Rama gounder had executed a settlement deed with respect to suit property of 0.63 1/2 acres out of 1.27 acres in suit S.No.167/7 in the favour of his minor daughters Santhiyammal and Kanniyammal by appointing their mother Ammakannu (W/O Ramagounder) as the guardian and further submitted that, after the attainment of majority, the said Kanniyammal and Santhiyammal were in the enjoyment of 0.31 3/4 Acre each and after the life time of Santhiyammal and her husband Ramagounder, their only son Selvam was in the enjoyment of the 0.31 3/4 acres which was sold to one Gundal gounder on 06.07.2001 later after the death of Gundal gounder, his legal heirs had executed a sale deed with respect to the above 0.31 3/4 acres in the favour of the defendant on 11.05.2017, and based on which the defendant had measured the property and got the patta no.779 and subdivided the S.No. as 167/7B and obtained Patta and A register extracts in his name, and

further it is allegation of the defendant that the Ammakannu ammal without having any rights and the Kanniyammal having rights only with respect to 0.31 3/4 acres out of 0.63 1/2 acres, had executed a sale deed to Kanna gounder on 06.12.2000 and after the Kanna gounder came to know about this, had retransferred the suit property in the favour of the son of the said Kanniyammal namely Annadurai, hence Plaintiff is not entitled to the rights over suit property, and on the other hand the plaintiff, alleged that he purchased the suit property from the Kanna gounder on 08.01.2001, who in turn purchased the suit property from the Kanniyammal and Ammakannu and therefore prays to decree the suit claim. It is seen that, the plaintiff had marked original sale deed dated 08.10.2001 in his name and the original sale deed dated 06.12.2000 in the name of his vendor Kanna gounder, and also marked the A Register extracts in the name of Ammakannu from fasili year 1404 (1994).

vii) And therefore the learned counsel for plaintiff submitted that, the plaintiff had proved the title and possession over the suit property and further contended that, the Ex.B1 which is alleged certified copy of the settlement deed, wherein it convenes that Rama gounder had executed the suit property in the favour of his minor daughters Santhiyammal and Kanniyammal by appointing their mother Ammakaanu as guardian, however the Plaintiff contended that Ex.B1 is only the certified copy and the original document of the settlement deed dated 28.02.1966 was not filed by defendant, and further contended that, the presumption U/s.90 of Indian Evidence Act 1872, with respect to Ex.B1 does not arise when the certified copy is produced and further also contended that as per the judgment in **Seenappa Vs P.Krishnappa and others** (2009) 6 MLJ 1113 submitted that whenever the plaintiff denied the execution of a document and scribe and attestors if not examined, adverse inference can be drawn for non examination of attesor, therefore submitted that, the defendant had not examined the attesor to Ex.B1 and therefore failed to prove Ex.B1, and further submitted that, secondary evidence that is certified copy of settlement deed cannot be admitted without the reason for non production of primary evidence and a registration of document are admission of document in evidence doesnot dispense with its proof as held in Hon'ble Madras High Court in **2019 (3) MWN (Civil) 113** and therefore submitted that in the absence of proving settlement deed dated 28.02.1966 as alleged by the defendant, the plaintiff counsel submitted that, on the basis of Ex.A1 to Ex.A8, the Plaintiff had proved the title and possession over the suit property and therefore prays to decree the suit.

viii) The defendant counsel on other hand, submitted that as per the decision of **Hon'ble High court of Madras in (2006) 3 MLJ 225** It was held that **“Under Section 90 of Evidence Act in regard to any document purporting to be or proved to be thirty years old and is produced from proper custody, the Court may presume in its discretion that the signature and every other part of the such document which purports to be in the handwriting of any particular person is in that person's handwriting and in the case of document executed or attested that it was duly executed and attested by the persons by whom it purports to be executed and attested”**. and further submitted that, as per **Sec.57 (5) Indian Registration Act 1908**, All copies given Under the section shall be signed and sealed by the registering officer and shall be admissible for the purpose of proving the contents of the original documents, and therefore submitted that, there is no need to prove the Ex.B1 as per sec.68 of Indian evidence Act, and therefore submitted that, Ex.B1 is can be admitted in evidence, it is seen that though the registered settlement deed Ex.B1 can be accepted in evidence, it is seen that in the case of denial by the plaintiff, it is the duty of the defendant to show why the original Settlement deed was not produced and no evidences were given to state the original settlement deed was lost and further the attesor of the Original settlement deed was also not examined, thus as contended by the plaintiff counsel, an adverse inference can be drawn against the defendant for not producing the original settlement deed and for not examining the attesting witness to the said settlement deed inorder to prove the document, and therefore presumption U/s.90 of Indian evidence act with respect of genuineness of the Ex.B1 does not arise, when a certified copy of original settlement deed is filed and therefore in the absence of explanation of non production of original settlement deed, this court is of opinion that the defendant had failed to prove the settlement deed dated 28.02.1966 by only relying upon the secondary evidence, and therefore Ex.B1 cannot be taken up in the evidence.

ix) Proceeding with other documents, filed by the Plaintiff it is seen that, the plaintiff had filed the Adangal extracts for the year of 1994 for the suit S.No.167/7 in a name of Ammakannu, it is seen that it is the allegation of the defendant, the suit property is the ancestral property of Rama gounder who is the husband of Ammakannu, and on perusal of Ex.A7 it is seen that patta for suit property is standing in a name of Kanniyammal, who is the mother of the plaintiff, and kanniyammal and the Ammakannu had executed the suit property in the favour of Kanna gounder through Sale deed dated 06.12.2000 (Ex.A4)

wherein the covenant in Ex.A4 contains that, the suit property was came to the Ammakannu and Kanniyammal though settlement, it is stated in Ex.A4 as executed by Ammakannu and Kanniyammal as "கீழ்க்கண்ட சொத்தை தங்களுக்கு கிரையம் செய்திருப்பதால் இன்றுமுதல் நீரே கைப்பற்றி சர்க்கார் தீர்வை செலுத்தி சர்வ சுதந்திரமாய் கிரைய ரூல்படி சகல உரிமைகளுடன் ஆண்டு அனுபவித்து கொள்ளவும் இதில் கலன் இல்லை நேர்ந்தால் நாங்கள் முன்னின்று நாங்கள் சொந்தசெலவில் தீர்த்துதருகிறோம்

சொத்து விவரம்

தி.மலை மாவட்டம், தி.மலை ரி.டி, சேத்துபட்டு சப்டி போளூர் வட்டம், இடையனகுளத்தூர் கிராமத்தில் எங்களுக்கு செட்டில்மெண்ட் மூலம் கிடைத்து நாங்கள் அனுபவித்து வரும் புஞ்சை சர்வே எண் 167/7 ஏக்கர் 1.27 ல் பாட்டைக்கு (தெ) கோபால் உடையார் நிலத்திற்கு (மே) சகுந்தலா அம்மாள் நிலத்திற்கு (வ) குண்டால் நிலத்திற்கு (கி) மத்தியில் 0.63 1/2 செண்டுக்கு தீர்வை 0.52 NP யுள்ள நிலத்தை கிரையம் செய்துவிட்டோம். மேற்படி சொத்து சேத்துபட்டு ப.யூனியனை சேர்ந்தது. ஷ சொத்தின் சந்தை மதிப்பு ரூ.12,700/-” thus it is stated in the Ex.A4 the suit property was came to the Plaintiff’s grand mother Ammakannu and mother Kanniyammal by virtue of settlement deed, however the plaintiff had not stated anything with respect to the above settlement deed as stated in Ex.A4, and further it is also not clarified that, how the Kanniyammal also had rights in the suit property along with Ammakannu in Ex.A4 to transfer the suit property in the favour of Kanna gounder and the plaintiff has not explained why the said Kanna gounder had re transferred the suit property in the favour of the plaintiff in Ex.A1 within 1 year from the execution of Ex.A4, and further the plaintiff had not pleaded anywhere in the pleadings or in the chief examination that kanniyammal is the mother of Ammakannu is the grandmother of Plaintiff, and this facts gives raise to the doubt over the plaintiff’s case, and further in the absence of pleading with respect to the settlement deed as alleged in Ex.A4, this court is of opinion that, the plaintiff has not come with clean hands before this court and he even not disclosed that the Kanniyammal is the mother of Plaintiff, from whom the Kanna gounder had purchased the suit property, and therefore in absence of correct disclosures about the Settlement deed through which Ammakannu and Kanniyammal got the suit property as convened in Ex.A4, especially when the defendant takes as contra stand that settlement deed

was made in favour of minor Kanniyammal and Santhiyammal by appointing Ammakannu as only the Guardian, this Court is of the opinion that Plaintiff is not entitled to the Suit Claim for the above reasons this court is of opinion that, this issues is decided against the Plaintiff.

9) Issue No.2

After determining issue no.1 against the plaintiff, this court is of opinion that, since the main relief of declaration of title was decided against the plaintiff, the connected relief of Permanent injunction against the defendant is not maintainable, and hence this issue is also against the plaintiff.

10) Issue No.3

Having determined issue no.1 and 2 against the Plaintiff, this court is of opinion that, Plaintiff is not entitled to the any other reliefs in the suit. Hence this issue answered accordingly.

In the result, this suit is dismissed, No costs.

This judgment was dictated directly to the Typist by me, typed into the computer by her, corrected by me, and pronounced to the open court today the 13th day of March 2026.

**District Munsif,
Polur.**

Plaintiff side witness:

1. PW1 - Annadurai (Plaintiff)

Plaintiff side Documents:

Ex.A1	08.10.2001	Original Sale deed which is registered on the office of SRO of Chetpet
Ex.A2	12.06.2017	Compute Patta
Ex.A3	-	Attested copy of Adangal in a name of the Plaintiff with respect to the S.No.167/7 for the fasli year 1426 (2016)
Ex.A4	06.12.2000	Original Registered sale deed wherein the Ammakannu ammal and her daughter Kanniyammal had executed a sale deed in the favour of one Kanna gounder S/o Chinnathambi gounder

Ex.A5	-	Original Tax receipts (4 Nos)
Ex.A6	03.09.2017	Certified copy of the Adangal extracts dated 03.09.2017 issued by Deputy Tahsildar of chetpet for the fasli years 1404, 1405, 1407 to 1410, 1414 to 1424 for the suit property
Ex.A7	-	Certified copy of the Fasli chitta for the fasli year 1411 for the suit S.No.167/7 standing in a name of Kanniyammal
Ex.A8	03.08.2017	Certified copy issued by the Deputy Tahsildar of chetpet dated 03.08.2017 with respect to the Adangal extract of the fasili year 1427 (2017)

Defendant side witnesses:

DW1 - Chokkanathan (Defendant)

Defendant side documents:

Ex.B1	28.02.1960	Certified copy of Registered Settlement deed
Ex.B2	06.07.2001	Original Registered Sale deed
Ex.B3	11.05.2017	Original Registered sale deed
Ex.B4	21.06.2017	Computer patta in the name of Defendant (Patta No.779)
Ex.B5	-	Certified copy of the FM sketch
Ex.B6	21.11.2017	Computer patta in the name of defendant (patta No.779)
Ex.B7	-	Certified copy of A-Register extract (Patta no.779)
Ex.B8	-	Certified copy of Adangal extracts in the fasli year 1427.
Ex.B9	-	True copy of the Adangal extracts issued by VAO (Patta No.779)
Ex.B10	-	A – Register extracts (Patta No.779)

**District Munsif,
Polur.**

