

**IN THE COURT OF THE 1st ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS
JUDGE, TIRUVALLUR**

Present : Tmt. S. TASNEEM, M.L.,
1st Additional District and Sessions Judge
Tiruvallur

Friday, dated the 17th day of April, 2026

O.S.No.15 of 2021

1. P.Sampath (died)
2. S.Saranya
3. S.Manikandan
4. S.Sundhari
(impleaded as per IA.No.9/2025 dated 22.10.2025) . . . Plaintiffs
/Vs/
P.Pandurangan . . . Defendant

This suit came up before me for final hearing on 16.03.2026, in the presence of Tr.A.R.Poovannan, Learned Counsel for the plaintiffs, and Tr.M.John, Learned Counsel for the Defendant; and upon hearing arguments from both sides and perusing the case records, and after standing over for consideration till this day, this Court delivers the following:-

JUDGMENT

Suit for preliminary decree of partition of the schedule mentioned property into 2 shares and allot one share to the plaintiffs and for final decree for the appointment of an Advocate Commissioner to divide the properties into two equal shares by metes and bounds, and to allot one such share to the plaintiffs and for permanent injunction

restraining the defendant from alienating or creating any sort of encumbrance over the schedule property and for costs of this suit.

2. Gist of averment in plaint :

The property morefully described in the schedule is the absolute property of the 1st plaintiff's mother Tmt.Narasammal, the 2nd and 3rd plaintiffs are the daughter and son of 1st plaintiff and defendant is the blood brother of 1st plaintiff. The said Narasammal purchased the suit property by way of sale deed dated 25.03.1975 vide Doc No.1175/1975 and she was in possession and enjoyment till her life time. The said Narasammal and defendant had filed a suit for partition in OS.No.482/2007 before the District Munsif, Tiruvallur in respect of the properties of Perumal Naicker and the same was dismissed on 30.01.2012 and further the defendant filed AS.No.11/2012 before the Subordinate Judge, and the same was also dismissed on 18.03.2014. During the pendency of the suits on 04.07.2008 the defendant obtained a Will in his name registered as Doc No.34/2008 on the file of SRO, Manavalanagar. The 1st plaintiff's mother during her last days on 11.12.2018 executed a Will in the name of the plaintiffs and the defendant. As per the Will of Mrs.Narasammal, the 1st plaintiff is having only life interest over the estate and had given the properties absolutely to her grandchildren namely 2nd and 3rd plaintiffs herein. After the death of said Narasammal on 21.12.2018, the Will came into effect and the plaintiffs are having equal half share. So, the 1st plaintiff approached the defendant but he was not amendable. Therefore, the 1st plaintiff issued legal notice on 28.10.2020, and the

defendant issued reply on 09.11.2020 denying the right of plaintiff. Therefore, the plaintiffs have filed this suit for partition and separate possession. Hence, this suit.

3. Gist of Written statement filed by the defendant is as follows :-

The schedule property is the absolute property of late Narasammal, she purchased the property by way of sale deed dated 25.03.1975 vide Doc No.1175/1975 and that during her life time she had executed a registered Will dated 04.07.2008 vide Doc No.34/BK3/2008 to infavour of the defendant and she died on 21.12.2018 after her death the said will came into effect and the defendant inherited the property without any encumbrance and he is in possession and enjoyment of the same. The plaintiff in order to attain unlawful enrichment over the suit property fabricated Will dated 11.12.2018, the plaintiff misrepresented the said Will fraudulently put thumb impression as his mother and the same has to sent for expert opinion to compare the thumb impression over the invalid Will dated 11.12.2018 and registered will dated 04.07.2008. At the time of invalid Will the Narasammal was taking treatment for her ailment. The suit property is the self acquired property of said Narasammal, and out of love and affection she had executed the Will dated 04.07.2008 infavour of defendant, the 1st plaintiff being elder son of Narasammal did not take care of her and the said Narasammal died at the defendant's house due to ailments. There is no cause of action for the suit and the suit is hit by law of limitation and the remedy sort by the plaintiffs is not maintainable. Hence, prayed to dismiss the suit.

4. On the basis of the above pleadings, the following issues have been framed by my predecessor:-

- 1) *Whether the will dated 11.12.2018 is true and valid?*
- 2) *Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for partition and separate possession? If so to what share?*
- 3) *Whether the suit is barred by limitation?*
- 4) *Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for permanent injunction as sought for?*
- 5) *To what other relief are the plaintiffs are entitled to?*

5. To substantiate the case of the plaintiff, the plaintiff was examined as PW1 and one Tr.Venkatesan was examined as PW2 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A6 documents were marked. On the side of the defendant, the defendant examined himself as DW1 and one Tr.Arjunan was examined as DW2 and one Tmt.Selvi was examined as DW3 and Ex.B1 to Ex.B22 documents were marked.

6. Issues No. 1 to 4 :-

The plaintiffs, **P. Sampath and three others**, have filed the present suit against the defendant, **P. Pandurangan**, seeking the relief of partition and separate possession in respect of the suit properties, along with a consequential direction to divide the same into two equal shares and allot one such share to the plaintiffs. The plaintiffs have also sought a decree of permanent injunction restraining the defendant from interfering with their alleged rights over the suit properties.

7. The crux of the plaintiffs' case is that the first plaintiff and the defendant are the sons of one Narasammal and Perumal Naicker. The plaintiffs 2 and 3 are the sons of the first plaintiff. The fourth plaintiff was subsequently impleaded in the suit and she is the wife of the first plaintiff. It is the case of the plaintiffs, as borne out by the pleadings and the evidence of PW1, that the suit property is the absolute property of the said Narasammal by virtue of a Sale Deed dated 25.03.1975. It is further stated that the said Narasammal, along with the defendant, had earlier instituted a suit in O.S. No. 482 of 2007 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Tiruvallur, in respect of the properties of Perumal Naicker against the first plaintiff, and the said suit came to be dismissed on 30.01.2012. Aggrieved by the same, the defendant preferred an appeal in A.S. No. 11 of 2012 before the Sub Court, Tiruvallur, which was also dismissed on 18.03.2014.

8. It is the further case of the plaintiffs that, during the pendency of the said suit, the defendant appears to have obtained a registered Will from Narasammal dated 04.07.2008. Thereafter, following the dismissal of the proceedings, the first plaintiff and the said Narasammal are stated to have amicably resolved their differences. According to the plaintiffs, during her last days, Narasammal, while in a sound and disposing state of mind, executed an unregistered Will dated 11.12.2018, whereby she bequeathed one half share in the suit property in favour of the plaintiffs and the remaining half share in favour of the defendant. As per the recitals of the said Will, the first plaintiff was conferred only a life interest, and the plaintiffs 2 and 3 were to

acquire absolute rights upon his demise. The said Narasammal died on 21.12.2018, and the Will is stated to have come into effect thereafter. Since the defendant did not come forward for an amicable partition in terms of the said Will, the plaintiffs caused issuance of a legal notice dated 28.10.2020, to which the defendant sent a reply dated 09.11.2020. Alleging that the defendant is attempting to create encumbrances over the suit property, the plaintiffs have been constrained to institute the present suit for the reliefs stated supra.

9. In order to substantiate their case, the first plaintiff examined himself as PW1 and marked Exhibits A1 to A6. One Venkatesan, an attesting witness to the unregistered Will dated 11.12.2018, was examined as PW2. The registered copy of the Sale Deed dated 25.03.1975 standing in the name of Narasammal was marked as Ex.A1. The photocopy of the Will dated 04.07.2008 was marked as Ex.A2. The original unregistered Will dated 11.12.2018 was marked as Ex.A3. The death certificate of Narasammal was marked as Ex.A4. The office copy of the legal notice dated 28.10.2020 was marked as Ex.A5, and the reply notice dated 09.11.2020 issued by the defendant was marked as Ex.A6.

10. Per contra, it is the case of the defendant, as set out in the written statement, that the alleged Will dated 11.12.2018 is a fabricated and forged document created by the plaintiffs. It is contended that Narasammal resided only with the defendant until her lifetime and died while in his care. According to the defendant, there was no necessity for Narasammal to execute the alleged Will dated 11.12.2018, as she had

already executed a registered Will dated 04.07.2008 bequeathing the property in his favour.

11. The defendant would further contend that the first plaintiff had abandoned Narasammal and was living separately with his family, whereas the defendant remained unmarried and took care of her. It is also contended that Narasammal was bedridden during her last days, and therefore, there was no possibility of her executing the alleged Will dated 11.12.2018. The defendant asserts that the said Will is a forged and fabricated document and undertakes to prove the same during trial. Denying all other averments in the plaint as false, the defendant has prayed for dismissal of the suit.

12. The defendant examined himself as DW1 and, through him, Exhibits B1 to B22 were marked. One independent witness, namely Arjunan, was examined as DW2. One Selvi, who claims to be an attesting witness to the registered Will dated 04.07.2008, was examined as DW3.

13. Ex.B1 is the photocopy of the Sale Deed dated 29.03.1975 standing in the name of Narasammal. The photocopy of the Will dated 04.07.2008 is marked as Ex.B2. The legal notice issued by the plaintiffs dated 28.10.2020 and the reply notice issued by the defendant dated 09.11.2020 were marked as Exs.B3 and B4 respectively. The medical records of Narasammal, including the discharge summary, medical bills, ECG reports, and X-ray reports, were marked as Exs.B5 to B14. The Xerox copies of the ESI card, family card, and smart card were marked as Exs.B15 to

B17. The Saveetha Hospital pass and the voter ID card of Narasammal were marked as Exs.B18 and B19. The death certificate of Narasammal was marked as Ex.B20. The photocopy of the complaint dated 08.12.2020 allegedly given by the defendant was marked as Ex.B21. The photocopy of the Aadhaar card of Narasammal was marked as Ex.B22.

14. Admitted Facts:-

The relationship between the parties is not in dispute. It is also admitted that the suit property was purchased in the name of Narasammal, the mother of the first plaintiff and the defendant, under a Sale Deed dated 29.03.1975. It is further admitted that a suit in O.S. No. 482 of 2007 was filed before the District Munsif Court, Tiruvallur, which was dismissed on 30.01.2012, and the appeal in A.S. No. 11 of 2012 before the Sub Court, Tiruvallur, was also dismissed on 18.03.2014. The said facts were admitted by DW1 during his cross-examination. However, it is pertinent to note that the said proceedings do not relate to the present suit property, and no documentary evidence has been produced by either side in that regard.

15. It is the case of the plaintiffs that Narasammal, while in a sound and disposing state of mind, executed an unregistered Will dated 11.12.2018 in favour of the plaintiffs and the defendant, and the original Will has been marked as Ex.A3. On the other hand, it is the contention of the defendant that Narasammal had already executed a registered Will dated 04.07.2008 and that she never executed the Will dated 11.12.2018. According to the defendant, Ex.A3 is a fabricated and forged

document, as Narasammal was seriously ill, bedridden, and under medical treatment prior to her death.

16. When the defendant has taken a specific plea that Ex.A3 is a fabricated and forged document, the burden of proving such allegation squarely lies upon him. Admittedly, the defendant has produced medical records pertaining only to the first and second weeks of November 2018, whereas the Will (Ex.A3) is stated to have been executed on 11.12.2018. Hence, the said medical records do not conclusively establish that Narasammal was incapable of executing the Will on the relevant date.

17. On the other hand, the plaintiffs have examined one of the attesting witnesses to the Will dated 11.12.2018 as PW2. PW2 has clearly deposed regarding the execution of the Will by Narasammal and has affirmed his attestation therein. Though PW2 was subjected to cross-examination, nothing material was elicited to discredit his testimony or to support the case of the defendant.

18. Further, when the defendant disputes the genuineness of Ex.A3 and contends that the thumb impression therein does not belong to Narasammal, it was incumbent upon him to take appropriate steps to prove the same, such as by sending the document for forensic examination along with admitted thumb impressions of Narasammal, including those available in the alleged Will dated 04.07.2008. However, the defendant has neither produced the original Will dated 04.07.2008 nor taken any steps to subject the disputed Will to expert examination. Thus, the defendant has failed to discharge the burden cast upon him.

19. The learned counsel for the defendant would contend that the plaintiffs forcibly took Narasammal from the custody of the defendant and obtained the Will under threat and coercion, and that a police complaint was lodged on 08.12.2018 in this regard. However, there is no material to show that such a complaint was in fact lodged before the police. Moreover, as per the contents of Ex.B21, the alleged incident occurred on 10.11.2018, whereas the complaint was made only on 08.12.2018, after nearly one month. Such unexplained delay creates serious doubt regarding the genuineness of the complaint. In the absence of any proof of its lodging, Ex.B21 cannot be safely relied upon.

20. Furthermore, the defendant has taken inconsistent stands—on one hand, contending that the Will dated 11.12.2018 is forged and was never executed by Narasammal, and on the other hand, alleging that the plaintiffs forcibly took Narasammal and obtained the Will under coercion. These contradictory pleas weaken the credibility of the defendant's case. Hence, the testimony of DW1 does not inspire confidence and appears to be inconsistent with his own earlier version.

21. Coming to the alleged Will dated 04.07.2008, the defendant has produced only a photocopy of the same. The attesting witness examined as DW3 (Selvi) has not deposed that she witnessed Narasammal executing the Will or that she attested the same in her presence. On the contrary, she has stated that she was working as a typist under a document writer and that she signed the document at his request without

knowledge of its contents. Such evidence does not satisfy the mandatory requirements for proving a Will.

22. Even assuming that the Will dated 04.07.2008 existed, no explanation has been offered by the defendant as to why the same was not disclosed or acted upon during the lifetime of Narasammal. In any event, the said Will has not been proved in the manner known to law, as required under Section 63 of the Indian Succession Act and Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act.

23. In contrast, the plaintiffs have examined an independent attesting witness (PW2), who has clearly spoken to the execution of the Will dated 11.12.2018. There is nothing on record to show that PW2 is inimically disposed towards the defendant or has any reason to falsely depose. Therefore, his testimony inspires confidence. In view of the above, this Court finds that the defendant has failed to prove that Ex.A3 is a forged or fabricated document. On the contrary, the plaintiffs have satisfactorily established the due execution and attestation of the Will dated 11.12.2018. Hence, the contention of the defendant in this regard is liable to be rejected.

24. Findings :-

This Court has carefully considered the pleadings, oral and documentary evidence placed on record. The plaintiffs rely upon Ex.A3, the unregistered Will dated 11.12.2018, said to have been executed by Narasammal while in a sound and disposing state of mind.

25. It is a settled principle of law that mere suspicion, however strong, cannot take the place of proof. In matters relating to testamentary succession, once the propounder of the Will establishes its due execution and attestation in the manner known to law, the burden shifts upon the person who challenges the Will to prove the existence of suspicious circumstances. In the case on hand, the plaintiffs have discharged their initial burden by examining an attesting witness, whose evidence clearly establishes the execution of Ex.A3. Nothing substantial has been elicited in cross-examination to discredit his testimony. On the other hand, the defendant has failed to place any convincing material to demonstrate the existence of any real or germane suspicious circumstances surrounding the said Will.

26. It is also well settled that registration of a Will is not compulsory, and an unregistered Will, if duly proved, is legally valid and enforceable. In the present case, Ex.A3, though unregistered, has been proved in accordance with the statutory requirements. Conversely, the defendant, who relies upon the alleged earlier Will dated 04.07.2008, has neither produced the original document nor proved the same through a competent attesting witness. Even assuming that such a Will existed, the subsequent Will dated 11.12.2018, being the last testament of Narasammal, would prevail and operate as a revocation of all prior testamentary dispositions.

27. In order to prove the said Will, the plaintiffs have examined PW2, one of the attesting witnesses. PW2 has categorically deposed that Narasammal executed the Will in his presence and that he attested the same. His evidence satisfies the

mandatory requirements for proving a Will. Despite cross-examination, nothing material has been elicited to discredit his testimony. On the other hand, the defendant has taken a plea that Ex.A3 is a forged and fabricated document. However, except making such bald allegations, no cogent evidence has been adduced to substantiate the same. Though the defendant disputed the thumb impression found in Ex.A3, no steps were taken to send the document for expert opinion. Further, the medical records produced by the defendant pertain only to November 2018 and do not establish that Narasammal was incapable of executing the Will on 11.12.2018. The contention of coercion and undue influence is also not supported by any reliable evidence. The alleged police complaint (Ex.B21) suffers from unexplained delay and has not been proved in the manner known to law. In such circumstances, this Court finds that the plaintiffs have successfully proved the due execution and attestation of Ex.A3, and the same is held to be true, valid, and binding.

28. The defendant relies upon a registered Will dated 04.07.2008. However, only a photocopy of the said Will has been produced and marked as Ex.B2. The original Will has not been produced before this Court, nor has any satisfactory explanation been offered for its non-production. The defendant examined DW3 as an attesting witness to the said Will. However, DW3 has not deposed that she witnessed the execution of the Will by Narasammal or that she attested the same in her presence. On the contrary, she has stated that she signed the document at the request

of a document writer, without knowledge of its contents. Such evidence falls short of the legal requirement for proving a Will.

29. Further, the conduct of the defendant in withholding the original Will dated 04.07.2008 and in failing to take steps to subject Ex.A3 to forensic examination, despite specifically disputing the thumb impression therein, gives rise to an adverse inference against him. The inconsistent and mutually destructive pleas taken by the defendant—one denying execution of the Will and the other alleging coercion—further erode the credibility of his defence. In the absence of any cogent and reliable evidence, the challenge to Ex.A3 cannot be sustained. It is well settled that mere marking of a document does not dispense with proof. The defendant has failed to comply with the mandatory requirements for proving a Will through attesting witnesses. Hence, this Court holds that the Will dated 04.07.2008 has not been proved in accordance with law. In view of the finding that the Will dated 11.12.2018 (Ex.A3) is valid and binding, the rights of the parties over the suit property are governed by the terms of the said Will. As per Ex.A3, the suit property is to be divided into two equal shares—one half share in favour of the plaintiffs and the other half share in favour of the defendant. The first plaintiff is entitled only to a life interest, and the plaintiffs 2 and 3 are entitled to absolute rights after his lifetime. Since the defendant has not come forward for an amicable partition in terms of the Will and has disputed the same, the plaintiffs are entitled to seek partition through Court.

30. In the light of the foregoing discussion and findings on the issues framed, this Court is of the considered view that the plaintiffs have successfully established the due execution and attestation of the Will dated 11.12.2018 (Ex.A3) in the manner known to law. The evidence of PW2, being an attesting witness, fully satisfies the mandatory requirements under Section 63(c) of the Indian Succession Act and Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act. Nothing has been elicited in cross-examination to discredit his testimony or to create any suspicion surrounding the execution of the Will.

31. On the contrary, the defendant, who has taken a specific plea that Ex.A3 is a forged and fabricated document, has failed to discharge the burden cast upon him. Mere allegations of forgery, without any supporting evidence such as expert opinion or other cogent material, cannot be accepted. It is well settled that when execution of a Will is duly proved in accordance with law, the burden shifts on the party alleging suspicious circumstances or forgery to substantiate the same.

32. In this regard, it is relevant to rely upon the settled principle laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **H. Venkatachala Iyengar vs. B.N. Thimmajamma (AIR 1959 SC 443)**, wherein it has been held that the propounder of a Will must prove its execution and attestation, and once the same is established, the onus shifts to the person who challenges the Will to prove the existence of suspicious circumstances.

33. Further, in **Jaswant Kaur vs. Amrit Kaur (1977) 1 SCC 369**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that mere suspicion cannot take the place of proof, and unless the suspicious circumstances are real, germane, and valid, the Will cannot be discarded.

34. In the present case, no such suspicious circumstances have been proved by the defendant. The plea of coercion and undue influence is unsupported by any acceptable evidence. The alleged police complaint (Ex.B21) is not proved and suffers from unexplained delay. The medical records relied upon by the defendant do not establish that the testatrix was incapable of executing the Will on the relevant date.

35. On the other hand, the Will set up by the defendant dated 04.07.2008 (Ex.B2) has not been proved in accordance with law. The defendant has failed to produce the original Will and has not examined any competent attesting witness who could speak about its execution as required under Section 68 of the Evidence Act. The evidence of DW3 is wholly insufficient and does not satisfy the statutory requirements.

36. It is trite law that mere marking of a document does not amount to its proof. In **Kaliaperumal vs. Rajagopal (2009) 4 SCC 193**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated that a Will must be proved strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Succession Act and the Evidence Act, and failure to examine a proper attesting witness is fatal to the case of the propounder. Thus, this Court holds that the Will dated 11.12.2018 (Ex.A3) is the last valid testament of Narasammal and governs the

rights of the parties. As per the terms of Ex.A3, the suit property is to be divided into two equal shares, one in favour of the plaintiffs and the other in favour of the defendant, with the first plaintiff having a life interest and plaintiffs 2 and 3 acquiring absolute rights thereafter.

37. Once the entitlement and shares of the parties are determined, the Court is bound to grant a preliminary decree for partition. In this regard, it is pertinent to refer to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Phoolchand vs. Gopal Lal (AIR 1967 SC 1470)**, wherein it has been held that a preliminary decree in a partition suit declares the rights and shares of the parties, and the actual division is to be effected in the final decree proceedings. Further, in **Prema vs. Nanje Gowda (2011) 6 SCC 462**, it has been reiterated that where the shares of the parties are ascertained, the Court must pass a preliminary decree declaring such shares. In the present case, as the shares of the parties stand clearly determined by virtue of the valid Will (Ex.A3), and in view of the refusal of the defendant to effect an amicable partition, the plaintiffs are undoubtedly entitled to seek partition through Court.

38. Accordingly, this Court holds that the plaintiffs are entitled to a **preliminary decree for partition and separate possession** of their half share in the suit property, in terms of the Will dated 11.12.2018 (Ex.A3).

39. The plaintiffs have also sought the relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendant from interfering with their rights over the suit property. In view of the findings rendered above and considering that the defendant has disputed

the plaintiffs' rights and attempted to deal with the property, this Court finds that such relief is necessary to protect the plaintiffs' interest.

40. Accordingly, the plaintiffs are entitled to the relief of permanent injunction as prayed for.

In the result, the suit is decreed as follows:-

1. A preliminary decree for partition is hereby passed declaring that the plaintiffs are entitled to one half (1/2) share in the suit property and the defendant is entitled to the remaining one half (1/2) share, in terms of the Will dated 11.12.2018 (Ex.A3).
2. It is further declared that the first plaintiff shall have only a life interest in the said half share, and the plaintiffs 2 and 3 shall acquire absolute rights (vested remainder) over the same upon the lifetime of the first plaintiff.
3. The plaintiffs are entitled to separate possession of their aforesaid share by division of the suit property by metes and bounds.
4. For the purpose of effecting such division, the parties are at liberty to file an application for passing of a final decree, wherein an Advocate Commissioner shall be appointed, if necessary, to divide the suit property by metes and bounds in accordance with the shares declared herein.
5. The defendant, his men, agents, or any person claiming under him are hereby permanently restrained from in any manner interfering with the plaintiffs'

peaceful possession and enjoyment of their share in the suit property.

6. In the circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

Dictated to the Steno-typist, directly typed by her in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court this the 17th day of April 2026.

I-Additional District and Sessions Judge
Tiruvallur

Plaintiffs side Witnesses:

PW1 - P.Sampath - Plaintiff
PW2 - Venkatesan - 3rd party

Plaintiffs side Exhibits:-

Ex.A1 25.03.1975 Copy of Sale deed infavour of Narasammal
Ex.A2 04.07.2008 Xerox copy of registered Will
Ex.A3 11.12.2018 Original unregistered Will
Ex.A4 ---- Death certificate of Narasammal
Ex.A5 28.10.2020 Legal notice issued by the plaintiff
Ex.A6 09.11.2020 Reply issued by the defendant

Defendant side Witnesses :-

DW1 - Pandurangan - defendant
DW2 - Arjunan - 3rd party
DW3 - Selvi - 3rd party

Defendant side Exhibits :-

Ex.B1 29.03.1975 Xerox copy of sale deed infavour of Narasammal
Ex.B2 04.07.2008 Copy of registered Will

Ex.B3	28.10.2020	Copy of legal notice issued by plaintiffs
Ex.B4	09.11.2020	Copy of reply issued by defendant
Ex.B5	05.11.2018	Lab report of Narasamma
Ex.B6	06.11.2018	Lab report of Narasamma
Ex.B7	07.11.2018	Echo cardiogram report of Narasamma
Ex.B8	09.11.2018	Discharge summary of Narasamma
Ex.B9		
(series	----	Medical bills
Ex.B10		
(series	---	Medical bills
Ex.B11	----	ECG report
Ex.B12	---	ECG report
Ex.B13	----	ECG report
Ex.B14	-----	X-Ray report
Ex.B15	---	Xerox copy of ESI card
Ex.B16	----	Xerox copy Family card
Ex.B17	-----	Xerox copy of Smart card
Ex.B18	----	Savitha Medical college Hospital visitors pass
Ex.B19	----	Xerox copy of Voter ID of Narasammal
Ex.B20	----	Copy of death certificate of Narasammal
Ex.B21	08.12.2018	Copy of complaint
Ex.B22	---	Xerox copy of Narasammal Aadhar card

I-Additional District and Sessions Judge
Tiruvallur