

**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

Monday, dated the 27th day of April, 2026

A.S.No.39 of 2023

G.Aruljothi

... Appellant/Plaintiff

/vs/

1. T.Jayaraman
2. T.Rathinam
3. T.Ayilu
4. The District Collector, Tiruvallur
5. The Tahsildar, Pallipet
6. The Sub-Registrar, Tiruvallur

...Respondents/Defendants

This Appeal has been preferred against the decree and Judgment passed in O.S.No.58/2016, dated 09.06.2023 on the file of the Subordinate Judge, Tiruttani.

G.Aruljothi

... Plaintiff

/vs/

1. T.Jayaraman
2. T.Rathinam
3. T.Ayilu
4. The District Collector, Tiruvallur
5. The Tahsildar, Pallipattu
6. The Sub-Registrar, Pallipattu

...Defendants

Cross A.S.No.14 of 2026

1. T.Jayaraman
 2. T. Rathinam
 3. T. Ayilu . . . Cross appellants

/Vs/

1. Aruljothi ..1st respondent/plaintiff
 2. The District Collector, Tiruvallur
 3. The Tahsildar, Pallipattu
 4. The Sub-Registrar, Pallipattu
 ..Respondents 2 to
 4/Defendants 4 to 6

Cross appeal against the judgment and decree in O.S.No.58/2016 dated 09.06.2023 on the file of Subordinate of Court, Tiruttani.

G.Aruljothi ... Plaintiff

/vs/

1. T.Jayaraman
 2. T.Rathinam
 3. T.Ayilu
 4. The District Collector, Tiruvallur
 5. The Tahsildar, Pallipattu
 6. The Sub-Registrar, Pallipattu ...Defendants

These appeal coming before me for final hearing on 10.04.2026, in the presence of Tr.M.K.Subramani, learned counsel for the Appellant in AS.No.39/2023 (the 1st respondent in AS 14/2026), Tmt.T.K.Mythili, learned counsel for the Respondents 1 to 3 in AS.No.39/2023 (the appellants in AS 14/2026) and Government Pleader of the Respondents 4 to 6 in AS 39/2023 (the Respondents 2 to 4 in AS 14/2026); 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:-

COMMON JUDGMENT

The appellant in AS No.39 of 2023 is the Plaintiff and respondents 1 to 3 are defendants in OS No.58 of 2016 on the file of Subordinate Judge's Court, Tiruttani. The appellant filed the suit for declaration, permanent injunction and various reliefs before the said court, and after hearing both sides, the trial court, dismissed the suit. As against the same, the plaintiff filed AS No.39 of 2023. Pending appeal, the defendants 1 to 3 filed cross appeal and numbered as AS No.14 of 2026. Since both the appeal and cross appeal arose out of one judgment, both the appeal and cross appeal are taken up for common discussion and to render common judgment.

1.2) A.S.No.39 / 2023 :-

Appeal has been filed by the plaintiff to set aside the decree and judgment passed in OS No.58 of 2016 dated 09.06.2023, passed by the Subordinate Judge's Court, Tiruttani, by dismissing the suit filed by the plaintiff.

1.3) AS No. 14 of 2026 (Cross Appeal)

The cross appeal has been filed by the defendants 1 to 3 thereby to allow the Cross-Objections by answering all the issues, including Issue No.7 relating to adverse possession, in favour of the Cross-Appellants / Defendants 1 to

3; dismiss the Appeal Suit in its entirety; and confirm the dismissal of the suit in O.S. No.58 of 2016 dated 09.06.2023, with costs in favour of the Cross-Appellants.

2) Relief in OS No.58 of 2016 :-

The suit is filed by the Plaintiff for a declaration that the Plaintiff is the owner of the schedule-mentioned property; for recovery of possession of the said property from Defendants 1 to 3; for a declaration that the alleged partition deed bearing Document No.337 of 2010, dated 04.03.2010, registered before the SRO, Pallipet, executed between Defendants 1 to 3 and their father, is null and void and not binding on the Plaintiff or the schedule-mentioned property; for a direction to Defendants 1 to 3 to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- towards past damages for trespassing upon the Plaintiff's land; for a direction to Defendants 1 to 3 to pay a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month as future damages for their illegal enjoyment of the Plaintiff's land from the date of filing of the plaint till the date of delivery of possession; for a mandatory injunction directing Defendants 4 and 5 to issue patta in the name of the Plaintiff after cancelling the illegal patta standing in the name of Defendants 1 to 3 and their father; for a permanent injunction restraining Defendants 1 to 3 from in any manner interfering with the Plaintiff's peaceful possession of the schedule-mentioned property after recovery of possession; and for costs.

3) Plaint averments in OS No.58 of 2016 :-

3.1) The suit property originally belonged to her father, Subba Reddy, who, out of love and affection and towards her *manjal kungumam sreedhanam*, executed

a registered settlement deed dated 06.12.1972 in her favour. By virtue of the said settlement, the Plaintiff became the absolute owner of the suit property. Though she was married and residing at Kancheepuram, the property continued to be in her possession and enjoyment, and was being managed through her family members, who cultivated the land and paid her share of the income. According to the Plaintiff, one Thangavel Reddy, the adjacent landowner and father of Defendants 1 to 3, approached her in the year 2004 seeking permission to cultivate the suit property on the understanding that he would pay 1/3rd share of the produce. The Plaintiff permitted him to cultivate the land, and accordingly, from 2004 to 2008, he paid the agreed share. Thereafter, he expressed his inability to continue cultivation and handed over possession of the property to the Plaintiff in or about October 2008.

3.2) The Plaintiff would further state that, in the year 2010, when she visited Paduthalam Village, she came to know that the said Thangavel Reddy had, without any manner of right, caused the patta in respect of the suit property to be transferred to his name. On the strength of such illegal patta, he is stated to have trespassed into the suit property in August 2010. The Plaintiff immediately lodged a complaint on 01.09.2010 before the competent revenue authority (5th Defendant) seeking cancellation of the said patta, and the said proceedings are stated to be pending. At the time of filing the suit, Thangavel Reddy had passed away and Defendants 1 to 3 had taken possession of the suit property and were continuing in illegal occupation thereof. The Plaintiff has therefore claimed damages for such unlawful possession.

The Plaintiff would also contend that, only in July 2015, upon obtaining an Encumbrance Certificate, she came to know that Defendants 1 to 3, along with their father, had executed a partition deed dated 04.03.2010, registered as Document No.337 of 2010 on the file of the Sub-Registrar Office, Pallipet, wherein the suit property was included and described as 'D' schedule property and allotted to the share of the 3rd Defendant. According to the Plaintiff, the said partition deed is wholly illegal, having been executed by persons who had no right, title, or interest in the suit property, and is therefore not binding on her.

3.3) It is the specific contention of the Plaintiff that neither Thangavel Reddy nor Defendants 1 to 3 ever had any right or title over the suit property, and that the alleged patta and the subsequent partition deed are illegal creations intended to defeat her lawful title. In these circumstances, the Plaintiff was constrained to institute the suit seeking declaration of her title to the suit property, recovery of possession from Defendants 1 to 3, declaration that the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 is null and void and not binding on her, recovery of damages for past and future unlawful occupation, and consequential reliefs including injunction and cancellation of patta.

4) **WRITTEN STATEMENT OF DEFENDANTS 1 AND 3:-**

The Defendants 1 and 3, while not disputing that the suit property originally belonged to Subba Reddy, the father of the Plaintiff, and that a settlement deed dated 06.12.1972 was executed in favour of the Plaintiff, contended that the

Plaintiff, after her marriage and settlement at Kancheepuram, was not in a position to personally cultivate or manage the suit property. It is their specific case that, taking advantage of such circumstances, the Plaintiff herself approached their father, Thangavel Reddy, in or about April 1982 and offered to sell the suit property for a sum of Rs.25,000/- due to her financial needs. However, considering that the property lacked adequate irrigation facilities and was not fertile, Thangavel Reddy negotiated and expressed his willingness to purchase the same only for a lesser sum. After discussions, the sale consideration was mutually fixed at Rs.21,000/-.

4.2) According to these Defendants, on 20.04.1982, the parties met at the residence of the Plaintiff's parents in the presence of witnesses, including the 1st Defendant, one Damodharan, Muniyappan, and Venkatesa Reddy. On that day, the Plaintiff received the entire sale consideration of Rs.21,000/- from Thangavel Reddy and executed an unregistered sale letter in his favour, acknowledging receipt of consideration and agreeing to convey the property. As it was a holiday, it was agreed that a registered sale deed would be executed at a later date, during the Plaintiff's subsequent visit to the village. Simultaneously, possession of the suit property was delivered to Thangavel Reddy, who immediately commenced cultivation by ploughing the land and sowing groundnut seeds.

4.3) It is further contended that, subsequently, when Thangavel Reddy called upon the Plaintiff to execute the registered sale deed, she resiled from her earlier promise and demanded an additional sum of Rs.10,000/-, stating that the

agreed consideration was not acceptable to her husband. When this demand was resisted, she declined to execute the sale deed. Thereupon, Thangavel Reddy demanded refund of the amount already paid. The Plaintiff expressed her inability to repay the same and undertook to repay it within a period of three years with interest. However, she neither executed the sale deed nor refunded the consideration. In these circumstances, Thangavel Reddy continued in possession and enjoyment of the suit property, treating it as his own. From the year 1982 onwards, their father, and thereafter they themselves, have been in continuous, open, and uninterrupted possession and enjoyment of the suit property to the knowledge of the Plaintiff. They have been cultivating the land by raising crops such as sugarcane and paddy, and have been irrigating the land through a well, situated in S.No.202/10B, located within about 1 kilometre from the suit property, in which an electric motor was installed by their father. The factum of their possession and cultivation is well known to the villagers and to the Plaintiff. They also contended that the revenue records have been duly mutated in the name of their father, Thangavel Reddy, in view of his long-standing possession. The patta stands in his name, and other revenue records such as chitta, adangal, and settlement registers also reflect his possession. Kist for the suit property has been regularly paid by them and their father for several years. The Plaintiff, who had allegedly received the full sale consideration, has not exercised any act of ownership over the property for decades.

4.4) The Defendants specifically denied the Plaintiff's allegation that their father was permitted to cultivate the land between 2004 and 2008 on a share basis. According to them, such a plea has been falsely introduced to bring the suit within limitation. They denied that their father ever paid 1/3rd of the produce to the Plaintiff or that he handed over possession in the year 2008. They further denied the allegation of trespass in the year 2010, stating that they have been in lawful and continuous possession since 1982. It is further contended that the Plaintiff had knowledge of their possession and enjoyment for several decades, and also of the mutation of patta and other revenue entries. In the year 2010, a partition deed dated 04.03.2010 was executed between Thangavel Reddy and Defendants 1 to 3, under which the suit property was included and divided among them, with specific extents allotted to the respective sharers. The Defendants assert that such partition was effected on the basis of their lawful possession and enjoyment. Without prejudice to their primary contention of title through purchase, Defendants 1 and 3 further pleaded that, in any event, they and their father have perfected title to the suit property by adverse possession, having been in open, continuous, hostile, and uninterrupted possession for more than the statutory period of 12 years, to the knowledge of the Plaintiff. They contended that their possession was never permissive and that the Plaintiff has failed to establish any lease arrangement or permissive occupation. They also raised the plea that the suit is barred by limitation. According to them, the Plaintiff had knowledge of the alleged patta

transfer and the partition deed as early as in the year 2010. However, the suit has been filed only in the year 2016, beyond the prescribed period of limitation, particularly in respect of the relief of declaration and cancellation of the partition deed. It is further contended that the Plaintiff has suppressed material facts and has not approached the Court with clean hands. The Plaintiff herself has not entered the witness box to depose regarding the alleged transactions and has instead examined her son as Power of Attorney holder, who has no personal knowledge of the facts. The Defendants contend that an adverse inference is liable to be drawn against the Plaintiff on this ground. In the above circumstances, Defendants 1 and 3 prayed for dismissal of the suit in entirety, contending that the Plaintiff has no subsisting right, title, or possession over the suit property and is not entitled to any of the reliefs claimed.

5) WRITTEN STATEMENT OF THE 2nd DEFENDANT

The 2nd Defendant, while adopting the factual matrix and defence set out by Defendants 1 and 3, specifically denied the Plaintiff's allegation that his father, Thangavel Reddy, was in permissive possession of the suit property between 2004 and 2008 on an agreement to share 1/3rd of the produce, contending that such a plea has been falsely introduced solely to overcome the bar of limitation; he further denied that his father had trespassed into the suit property in August 2010 or that the Defendants are in unlawful possession, and asserted that their possession traces back to 20.04.1982, when the Plaintiff executed an unregistered sale letter in

favour of Thangavel Reddy upon receipt of full consideration and handed over possession, pursuant to which their father, and thereafter the Defendants, have been in continuous, open, and uninterrupted possession and enjoyment of the property for over three decades; it is further contended that the Plaintiff's claim for damages is baseless and unsupported, and that the suit for recovery of possession as well as the relief seeking declaration that the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 is null and void are barred by limitation, as the Plaintiff had knowledge of the relevant facts much earlier; the 2nd Defendant also pleaded that, in any event, the Defendants have perfected title by adverse possession by virtue of their long, hostile, and continuous possession to the knowledge of the Plaintiff, and therefore, the suit is liable to be dismissed as barred by limitation and devoid of merits.

6) *The following are the Issues framed in the trial court.*

1. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaration of title and recovery of possession, as prayed for?
2. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief of declaring the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 as null and void?
3. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief of past damages and future damages, as prayed for?
4. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief of permanent injunction, as prayed for?
5. Whether the relief of declaring the partition deed as null and void is barred by limitation?
6. Whether the suit for recovery of possession is barred by limitation?
7. Whether Defendants 1 to 3 have perfected title by adverse possession?

8. To what other reliefs, if any, is the Plaintiff entitled?

7) Apart from the the following additional issue is also framed before the trial court.

1. Whether the suit property was sold to Thangavel Reddy on 20.04.1982?

8) After hearing both sides, the trial court dismissed the suit on the ground that the suit is barred by Limitation. As against the said findings, the appellant filed the appeal and the defendants 1 to 3 filed the cross appeal

9) Grounds of Appeal of Appellant / Plaintiff

The Appellant respectfully submits that the Judgment and Decree of the learned Trial Court are erroneous, unsustainable in law and on facts, and liable to be set aside, as the Court failed to properly appreciate the Plaintiff's case that the suit property originally belonged to her father, who executed a registered settlement deed dated 06.12.1972 in her favour out of love and affection and towards her *manjal kumkuma sreedhana*, thereby conferring absolute title on her; the Trial Court failed to consider that, after her marriage and residence at Kancheepuram, the property was managed by her family members, and that in 2004 Thangavel Reddy, father of Defendants 1 to 3, approached her seeking permission to cultivate the land on a share basis and accordingly paid 1/3rd of the produce till 2008, after which he expressed inability and handed over possession, and that only in 2010, when she visited the village, she came to know of the illegal transfer of patta in his name; the Court further failed to appreciate that the Plaintiff promptly approached the revenue

authorities, but due to the non-appearance of the Defendants, the proceedings remained pending, and that only upon obtaining an Encumbrance Certificate on 10.07.2015 she came to know of the fraudulent partition deed dated 04.03.2010 executed by Defendants 1 to 3 along with their father, including the suit property and allotting it to the 3rd Defendant, which necessitated filing of the suit; the Trial Court failed to properly analyse the case as one for declaration of title and erred in ignoring the inconsistent and mutually destructive pleas of the Defendants, who, at different stages, claimed title through patta, adverse possession, and an unregistered sale letter dated 20.04.1982/1985, which itself was not disclosed in the partition deed or earlier proceedings and was introduced belatedly during trial, thereby casting serious doubt on its genuineness; the Court erred in placing reliance on speculative arguments of the Defendants regarding prior knowledge and limitation without properly examining the Encumbrance Certificate dated 19.08.2010, which allegedly contained no entry, and wrongly concluded that the suit was barred by limitation, ignoring that the cause of action arose only upon actual knowledge of the partition deed in 2015; the Trial Court further erred in failing to properly consider the documentary evidence filed by the Plaintiff, particularly the registered settlement deed, and instead gave undue weight to the Defendants' partition deed; the finding relating to mandatory injunction is perverse, as the Civil Court has jurisdiction to grant appropriate reliefs notwithstanding pendency of revenue proceedings; and the Court also misunderstood the relief of permanent injunction

sought by the Plaintiff, which was consequential to recovery of possession, and erroneously rejected the same on the ground that the Defendants were in possession; thus, the impugned Judgment suffers from non-application of mind, misreading of evidence, improper appreciation of pleadings, and erroneous application of law relating to limitation, resulting in grave miscarriage of justice, and is therefore liable to be set aside.

10) Grounds of Appeal of Cross Appellants / Defendants 1 to 3 :-

The Cross-Appellants / Defendants 1 to 3 respectfully submit that the Judgment and Decree of the learned Trial Court, though resulting in dismissal of the suit, are vitiated by erroneous, incomplete, and inconsistent findings on material issues, warranting interference to the limited extent of correcting such findings, as the Trial Court ought to have dismissed the suit on all the issues instead of substantially resting its decision on limitation alone, and failed to consider and adjudicate all the issues in their proper perspective despite the Cross-Appellants having specifically pleaded and proved their case through cogent oral and documentary evidence, including examination of DW1 to DW5 and marking of Exs.B1 to B16; the Court erred in its finding on Issue No.7 by holding that the possession of the Cross-Appellants was permissive and not adverse, despite clear pleadings and evidence establishing long, continuous, open, and hostile possession from 20.04.1982, and further failed to draw adverse inference against the Plaintiff, who deliberately avoided entering the witness box though present in Court; the

Court failed to appreciate that the possession of the Cross-Appellants is also protected under Section 53-A of the Transfer of Property Act based on Ex.B15 sale letter, and that the Plaintiff, being the competent person to speak about possession and transaction, withheld herself from evidence, thereby weakening her case; the Trial Court further failed to render specific findings on crucial issues, particularly Issue No.1 relating to title, and did not consider the judicial precedents relied upon by the Cross-Appellants; the Court erred in discarding the evidence of independent witnesses such as DW3 and DW5 and instead relied upon the testimony of PW1, who admitted lack of knowledge of material facts; the Court failed to draw proper inference from the Plaintiff's omission to mark the Encumbrance Certificate dated 16.10.2010, which would have disclosed the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 and established prior knowledge, thereby supporting the plea of limitation; the finding that uninterrupted possession was not proved is contrary to the documentary evidence, including revenue records and kist receipts, and the conclusion that possession between 2004 and 2008 was permissive is unsupported by any evidence of lease; the Court further failed to appreciate that mere filing of a petition before the Tahsildar does not amount to interruption of possession, and erred in its observations regarding patta transfer and RPT entries by ignoring Exs.B4 and B13; having itself recorded a finding that the Cross-Appellants established possession from at least 1988 and long-standing enjoyment, the Court committed a manifest error in not upholding the plea of adverse possession and answering Issue No.7 in

their favour, and in wrongly treating such possession as permissive without any proof from the Plaintiff; thus, the impugned Judgment, to the extent it records findings adverse to the Cross-Appellants on title and adverse possession, suffers from serious legal infirmities, misappreciation of evidence, and contradictory reasoning, and is liable to be modified by answering all issues, particularly Issue No.7, in favour of the Cross-Appellants while confirming the dismissal of the suit.

11) Points for Consideration in the Appeal and the Cross-Appeal :-

- 1. Whether the Plaintiff has established her title to the suit property on the basis of the registered settlement deed dated 06.12.1972, and whether she is entitled to the relief of declaration and recovery of possession?**
- 2. Whether the Defendants 1 to 3 have established that the suit property was sold to their father, Thangavel Reddy, under the alleged sale transaction dated 20.04.1982, and if so, its legal effect?**
- 3. Whether the Defendants 1 to 3 have proved that they have perfected title to the suit property by way of adverse possession?**
- 4. Whether the possession of the Defendants 1 to 3 is lawful, continuous, and hostile to the knowledge of the Plaintiff, or merely permissive as alleged by the Plaintiff?**
- 5. Whether the suit filed by the Plaintiff for declaration, recovery of possession, and for declaring the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 as null and void is barred by limitation?**
- 6. Whether the Plaintiff had knowledge of the alleged patta transfer and partition deed in the year 2010, or only in the year 2015 as contended by her, and what is its effect on limitation?**
- 7. Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief of damages, both past and future, as claimed?**

8. **Whether the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief of permanent injunction and mandatory injunction as prayed for?**
9. **Whether the findings of the Trial Court on Issue No.7 relating to adverse possession require interference in the Cross-Appeal?**
10. **Whether the Judgment and Decree passed in OS No.58 of 2016 dated 09.06.2023 is liable to be set aside?**
11. **To what reliefs, if any, are the parties entitled?**

12) **Points No.1 to 11 :-**

This Appeal Suit and Cross Appeal is directed against the Judgment and Decree dated 09.06.2023 passed in O.S. No.58 of 2016 on the file of the learned Subordinate Judge, Tiruttani. The said suit was instituted by the Plaintiff seeking declaration of her title to the suit property, recovery of possession from Defendants 1 to 3, declaration that the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 registered as Document No.337 of 2010 on the file of the Sub-Registrar Office, Pallipet is null and void and not binding upon her, recovery of past damages of Rs.1,00,000/- and future damages at the rate of Rs.10,000/- per month, mandatory injunction directing the revenue authorities to cancel the patta standing in the name of Defendants 1 to 3 and issue patta in her name, and for permanent injunction restraining Defendants 1 to 3 from interfering with her possession after recovery.

13) The case of the Plaintiff, in brief, is that the suit property originally belonged to her father, Subba Reddy, who executed a registered settlement deed dated 06.12.1972 in her favour out of love and affection and towards her *manjal kumkuma sreedhana*, thereby conferring absolute title on her. According to her,

though she was residing at Kancheepuram after marriage, the property continued to be in her possession and enjoyment. It is her further case that one Thangavel Reddy, the adjacent landowner and father of Defendants 1 to 3, was permitted to cultivate the land between 2004 and 2008 on an understanding to share 1/3rd of the produce, and thereafter he handed over possession. However, in the year 2010, she came to know that the said Thangavel Reddy had illegally obtained patta in his name and trespassed into the suit property. She claims to have initiated proceedings before the revenue authorities for cancellation of the patta. It is her further case that only in July 2015 she came to know about the execution of the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 by Thangavel Reddy and Defendants 1 to 3, wherein the suit property was included and allotted to the share of the 3rd Defendant. Alleging that the said partition deed is fraudulent and not binding on her, she instituted the present suit for the aforesaid reliefs.

14) The Defendants 1 and 3 filed a joint written statement, while the 2nd Defendant filed a separate written statement, substantially adopting the defence of Defendants 1 and 3. The Defendants, while admitting the original title of the Plaintiff, contended that the Plaintiff herself offered to sell the property to their father, Thangavel Reddy, in the year 1982, and that after negotiations, the sale consideration was fixed at Rs.21,000/-, which was paid, and an unregistered sale letter dated 20.04.1982 was executed, pursuant to which possession was handed over. According to them, the Plaintiff failed to execute a registered sale deed and

instead demanded additional consideration, and thereafter their father continued in possession and enjoyment of the property. They further contended that they have been in continuous, open, and uninterrupted possession for several decades, cultivating the land and paying revenue, and have thus perfected title by adverse possession. The Defendants denied the Plaintiff's case of permissive possession between 2004 and 2008 as false and invented, and further contended that the suit is barred by limitation, as the Plaintiff had knowledge of the patta transfer and partition deed as early as in the year 2010. They also challenged the claim for damages and other reliefs and sought dismissal of the suit.

15) On the basis of the above pleadings, the Trial Court framed the necessary issues, including issues relating to the Plaintiff's entitlement to declaration and recovery of possession, validity of the partition deed, claim for damages, relief of injunction, bar of limitation, and the plea of adverse possession raised by the Defendants. An additional issue was also framed as to whether the suit property was sold to Thangavel Reddy on 20.04.1982.

16) **Evidence and Exhibits in the Trial Court :-**

In order to substantiate her case, the Plaintiff examined her General Power of Attorney holder, namely Mr. G. Jayaraman, who is her son, as PW1. Through him, the Plaintiff marked Exs.A1 to A6. Ex.A1 is the original Power of Attorney dated 08.06.2018 executed by the Plaintiff in favour of PW1. Ex.A2 is the certified copy of the registered settlement deed dated 06.12.1972 executed by

Subba Reddy in favour of the Plaintiff, along with its Tamil translation, under which the Plaintiff claims title to the suit property. Ex.A3 is the certified copy of the registered partition deed dated 04.03.2010 executed among Defendants 1 to 3. Ex.A4 is the Encumbrance Certificate for the period from 01.01.2010 to 09.07.2015. Ex.A5 is the communication dated 05.10.2010 issued by the District Collector to the Tahsildar, Pallipattu, along with annexures, pertaining to the Plaintiff's complaint regarding patta transfer. Ex.A6 is the letter dated 04.05.2011 issued by the District Revenue Officer to the Tahsildar, Pallipattu in continuation of the said proceedings.

17) On the side of the Defendants, the 1st Defendant examined himself as DW1 and marked Exs.B1 to B15. The 2nd Defendant examined himself as DW2. The 3rd Defendant examined himself as DW4. One Mr. M.N. Venkatesa Reddy, an alleged attesting witness to the sale transaction, was examined as DW3, through whom Ex.B16 was marked. One Mr. Damodharan, another witness to the alleged transaction, was examined as DW5. Ex.B1 is the patta relating to the suit property standing in the name of Thangavel Reddy under Patta No.684. Ex.B2 is the 'A' Register extract relating to S.No.187/1B, reflecting the name of the Plaintiff, obtained in the year 2016. Ex.B3 is another patta extract, which does not disclose the RPT number for transfer of patta. Ex.B4 is the Jamabandhi Nabar Chitta relating to Patta No.684 standing in the name of Thangavel Reddy, showing the RPT number for transfer. Exs.B5 to B11 are kist receipts for the suit property for

the years 1988, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1994, 2010, and 2016, relied upon to show payment of land revenue. Ex.B12 is the original partition deed dated 04.03.2010 executed between Thangavel Reddy and Defendants 1 to 3, under which the suit property was included and divided. Ex.B13 is the certified copy of the Sagupadi Adangal for the suit property for Fasali years 1396 to 1425, relied upon to show cultivation and possession. Ex.B14 is the original death certificate of Thangavel Reddy. Ex.B15 is the unregistered sale letter dated 20.04.1982 alleged to have been executed by the Plaintiff in favour of Thangavel Reddy. Ex.B16 pertains to the signature of DW3 found in Ex.B15, relied upon to prove attestation.

18) The trial court, while recognizing the original title of the Plaintiff under the settlement deed, held that she failed to establish her possession over the suit property and found that the Defendants were in possession at least from the year 2010. The Trial Court rejected the claim of permanent injunction on the ground that the Plaintiff was not in possession. The Court further held that the unregistered sale letter relied upon by the Defendants cannot confer title, but at the same time rejected the plea of adverse possession on the ground that the Defendants failed to establish continuous and hostile possession for the statutory period.

19) However, on the issue of limitation, the Trial Court held that the Plaintiff had knowledge of the patta transfer and the partition deed as early as in the year 2010, but had filed the suit only in the year 2016, beyond the prescribed

period. The Court further observed that the Plaintiff had not satisfactorily explained the delay and had failed to produce relevant documents to substantiate her plea of later knowledge. Consequently, the Trial Court held that the suit for declaration and cancellation of the partition deed is barred by limitation. The Trial Court also rejected the claim for damages for want of proof and declined to grant mandatory injunction in view of the pending proceedings before the revenue authorities. The Trial Court dismissed the suit as barred by limitation with costs. Aggrieved by the said Judgment and Decree, the Plaintiff has preferred the present Appeal Suit, and Defendants 1 to 3 have filed a Cross-Appeal challenging the adverse findings recorded against them on certain issues.

20) Findings of this Court :-

Heard both sides. Perused the trial court records, both appeal memorandum (Appeal and cross appeal)

21) Admitted facts :-

From a careful reading of the pleadings, evidence, and submissions made on both sides, certain foundational facts emerge as either expressly admitted or not seriously disputed, and these form the substratum upon which the rival claims of the parties are to be examined. At the outset, it is not in controversy that the suit property originally belonged to one Subba Reddy, the father of the Plaintiff. It is further an admitted position that the said Subba Reddy executed a registered settlement deed dated 06.12.1972 in favour of the Plaintiff out of love and

affection, by way of Manjal Kumkuma Sreedhana. The execution and validity of the said settlement deed are not denied by the Defendants, and therefore, the derivation of title by the Plaintiff stands established and undisputed.

22) It is also not in dispute that the Plaintiff, after her marriage, had been residing at Kancheepuram and was not permanently residing in the suit village. This circumstance is admitted by both parties and forms the background for the subsequent events relating to possession and enjoyment of the property. Equally, the identity and relationship of Thangavel Reddy are not in controversy. It is admitted that he was the father of Defendants 1 to 3 and an adjacent landowner to the suit property. The proximity of his land to the suit property and his acquaintance with the Plaintiff are also not seriously disputed.

23) Another significant admitted fact is the existence of the registered partition deed dated 04.03.2010 (Document No.337 of 2010), executed between Thangavel Reddy and Defendants 1 to 3. Though the Plaintiff challenges the validity and binding nature of the said document, its execution and registration are not denied. It is also not in dispute that the suit property has been included in the said partition deed and that a portion thereof has been allotted to the share of the 3rd Defendant. Thus, the existence of a competing claim over the suit property through a registered document is an admitted circumstance.

24) Further, it is an admitted fact that the patta relating to the suit property came to be mutated in the name of Thangavel Reddy, and subsequently, the

Defendants claim to have continued such entries in their favour. While the Plaintiff disputes the legality of such mutation, the factum of transfer of patta in the year 2010 is not denied. In fact, the Plaintiff herself admits that she had approached the revenue authorities in the year 2010 seeking cancellation of the said patta. This admission assumes importance in the context of limitation and knowledge of adverse claims.

25) It is also not seriously in dispute that Thangavel Reddy died prior to or during the pendency of the proceedings and that Defendants 1 to 3, being his sons, have stepped into his shoes and are prosecuting the defence. Similarly, the fact that the Defendants are in possession of the suit property, at least from the year 2010 onwards, is not denied in categorical terms by the Plaintiff. However, the nature of such possession—whether permissive, unlawful, or adverse—is a matter of serious dispute.

26) Another aspect which can be treated as admitted to a limited extent is the existence of an unregistered sale letter dated 20.04.1982 (Ex.B15). While the Plaintiff disputes its execution and legal validity, the document has been produced and marked on the side of the Defendants, and its existence as a piece of evidence on record is not in dispute. What is disputed is its evidentiary value and legal effect.

27) Further, the institution of the suit in the year 2016 is an admitted fact. The Plaintiff has sought various reliefs including declaration of title, recovery of possession, damages, and consequential injunctions. The Defendants, in turn, have

resisted the suit on various grounds including limitation, alleged prior transaction, and adverse possession. The proceedings initiated by the Plaintiff before the revenue authorities in the year 2010, and the pendency of such proceedings, are also admitted by both sides. Thus, from the above, it is clear that while the foundational facts relating to title, relationship of parties, existence of documents, and certain events such as patta transfer and filing of proceedings are not in dispute, the controversy between the parties centres around the legal consequences flowing from these admitted facts. In particular, the disputes relate to the nature and continuity of possession, the validity and effect of the alleged sale transaction, the plea of adverse possession, and the question of limitation. These admitted facts, therefore, provide the necessary framework within which the contentious issues are to be adjudicated.

28) The real dispute and the **real controversy between the parties lies in a few core disputed issues**, which go to the root of entitlement to relief. The primary and fundamental dispute between the parties relates to the **nature, origin, and continuity of possession of the suit property**. The Plaintiff asserts that the father of Defendants 1 to 3, namely Thangavel Reddy, was only in **permissive possession** between the years 2004 and 2008 under an oral arrangement to cultivate the land on a share basis, and that he handed over possession thereafter. In contrast, the Defendants categorically deny any such permissive arrangement and contend that their possession dates back to the year **1982**, when the Plaintiff allegedly sold

the property to their father. Thus, the question whether possession was permissive, lawful under a transaction, or unauthorised is a serious dispute.

29) Further, the another **dispute is regarding the alleged sale transaction dated 20.04.1982**. The Defendants rely upon an unregistered sale letter (Ex.B15) and claim that possession was delivered pursuant to such transaction. The Plaintiff, on the other hand, denies the execution and validity of the said document and contends that no such sale ever took place. The genuineness, execution, and legal effect of the said sale letter are therefore central disputed questions.

30) The further dispute is the **plea of adverse possession** raised by the Defendants. The Defendants claim that, in the alternative, even if the sale is not accepted, they have been in open, continuous, and uninterrupted possession for several decades and have thereby perfected title by adverse possession. The Plaintiff disputes this claim and maintains that the Defendants' possession, if any, was never hostile and did not satisfy the legal requirements of adverse possession. Thus, the existence of hostile animus, continuity, and the statutory period of possession are all in dispute.

31) The parties are also at variance on the **question of limitation and knowledge**. The Plaintiff contends that she came to know about the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 only in the year 2015 upon obtaining an Encumbrance Certificate and that the suit filed in 2016 is within limitation. The Defendants, however, assert that the Plaintiff had knowledge as early as **2010**, particularly when she approached

the revenue authorities for cancellation of patta, and therefore the suit is barred by limitation. The actual point of time when the Plaintiff acquired knowledge of the Defendants' adverse claim is thus a crucial disputed fact.

32) Further, there is a dispute regarding the **validity and binding nature of the partition deed dated 04.03.2010**. While the Plaintiff contends that the said document is null and void insofar as it includes her property, the Defendants maintain that the partition reflects their lawful possession and claim over the property. Whether the said document creates any legal right or merely evidences an asserted claim is a matter of dispute.

33) Another contested issue is the **legitimacy of the patta transfer in favour of Thangavel Reddy and subsequently the Defendants**. The Plaintiff alleges that such transfer was illegal and obtained without notice to her, whereas the Defendants rely upon the patta and connected revenue records to support their possession. Thus, the circumstances under which patta was transferred and its evidentiary value are also in dispute.

34) There is also a clear dispute with respect to the **entitlement of the Plaintiff to damages and mesne profits**. The Plaintiff claims that the Defendants trespassed into the property and unlawfully enjoyed the same, thereby causing loss to her. The Defendants deny such allegation and contend that they have been in lawful possession for a long period. The basis, quantum, and entitlement to damages are therefore disputed.

35) Lastly, the parties differ on the **entitlement to equitable reliefs such as permanent and mandatory injunction**. The Plaintiff asserts that she is entitled to such reliefs upon declaration of title, whereas the Defendants contend that, being in possession, no injunction can be granted against them. In essence, the real dispute between the parties is not about the original title, which stands admitted, but about **subsequent events affecting possession, alleged transfer, limitation, and the legal consequences flowing therefrom**. The resolution of these disputed facts ultimately determines the rights and liabilities of the parties in the present case.

36) Findings of this Court :-

At the outset, insofar as title is concerned, Ex.A2 – the registered settlement deed dated 06.12.1972 executed by Subba Reddy in favour of the Plaintiff – stands admitted by the Defendants. The said document, being a registered instrument, carries presumption of validity and conclusively establishes that the Plaintiff derived title to the suit property. There is no contra documentary evidence produced by the Defendants to dislodge the said title. Therefore, the Plaintiff's original title to the property is not in serious dispute. However, the core controversy revolves around possession, the alleged sale transaction of the year 1982, the plea of adverse possession, and the bar of limitation.

37) The Plaintiff has not entered the witness box and has examined only her Power of Attorney holder, PW1, who is her son. Though a Power of Attorney

holder can depose to facts within his knowledge, it is well settled that he cannot depose as to matters which are personal to the principal unless he has direct knowledge. In the present case, PW1, in his cross-examination, has admitted that he does not have personal knowledge regarding the alleged transaction between the Plaintiff and Thangavel Reddy, the nature of possession, or the alleged permissive cultivation between 2004 and 2008. This significantly weakens the evidentiary value of the Plaintiff's case on possession and alleged lease arrangement. Further, the non-examination of the Plaintiff, who is the best person to speak about the alleged oral arrangement and subsequent events, gives rise to an adverse inference under law.

38) On the other hand, the Defendants have examined not only themselves as DW1, DW2, and DW4, but also independent witnesses, namely DW3 and DW5, who have spoken about the alleged sale transaction and delivery of possession. While there are certain inconsistencies in their testimony regarding the exact details of negotiation and execution, their evidence is broadly consistent in asserting that possession was handed over to Thangavel Reddy in the year 1982 and that the Defendants have been in enjoyment thereafter. Their evidence is also sought to be corroborated by documentary records.

39) Coming to Ex.B15, the unregistered sale letter dated 20.04.1982, this Court finds that the said document, being unregistered, cannot convey title in respect of immovable property of the nature in question. The Trial Court has rightly

held that it is inadmissible for the purpose of proving transfer of ownership. Further, no steps have been taken by the Defendants or their predecessor-in-interest to enforce the said agreement by seeking specific performance within the period prescribed by law. Therefore, Ex.B15 cannot be relied upon to establish title. At best, it can be looked into for a limited collateral purpose, namely, to understand the nature of possession, if otherwise proved.

40) With regard to possession, the Defendants have produced Exs.B1 to B13, including patta, chitta, adangal, and kist receipts. These documents indicate that the name of Thangavel Reddy came to be entered in the revenue records, particularly around the year 2010, and that kist has been paid for certain years from 1988 onwards. While revenue records are not documents of title, they do have evidentiary value in indicating possession. The Sagupadi Adangal (Ex.B13) covering several fasli years also lends some support to the Defendants' case of cultivation. However, it is equally to be noted that Ex.B2, the 'A' register extract, continues to reflect the Plaintiff's name, and there are discrepancies in the patta records, including absence or inconsistency of RPT numbers in certain documents.

41) The Plaintiff's case of permissive possession between 2004 and 2008 rests entirely on oral assertion, unsupported by any documentary evidence. No lease agreement, receipt of share of produce, or any independent witness has been produced to substantiate such arrangement. In contrast, the Defendants have at least placed some documentary material to show long-standing possession. At the same

time, their plea that possession commenced from 1982 on the basis of a sale transaction is not fully free from doubt, in view of the inconsistencies in pleadings and evidence, including variation in dates and the absence of any attempt to regularize the alleged sale.

42) On the plea of adverse possession, it is to be noted that the Defendants have taken multiple and somewhat inconsistent stands, namely, title through sale, and alternatively, title by adverse possession. While such alternative pleas are permissible, the burden lies heavily on the Defendants to clearly establish that their possession was open, continuous, hostile, and to the knowledge of the true owner for the statutory period. In the present case, the Defendants' own case is that they entered possession on the basis of a sale transaction. Possession founded on an alleged agreement of sale is ordinarily permissive or in assertion of lawful right and not hostile at its inception. There is no clear and cogent evidence to show when such possession became hostile to the knowledge of the Plaintiff. The evidence of DWs does not specifically speak to animus possidendi or hostile assertion against the Plaintiff's title. Hence, the plea of adverse possession is not satisfactorily established.

43) With regard to limitation, the Plaintiff has produced Ex.A5 and Ex.A6 to show that she had approached the revenue authorities in the year 2010 for cancellation of patta. This would prima facie indicate that she had knowledge of the patta standing in the name of Thangavel Reddy at least in 2010. The partition deed

dated 04.03.2010 (Ex.A3 / Ex.B12) is a registered document. The Plaintiff contends that she came to know of the same only in the year 2015 upon obtaining Encumbrance Certificate (Ex.A4). However, the non-production of the earlier Encumbrance Certificate, which is stated to have been obtained in 2010, assumes significance. An adverse inference can be drawn that the said document, if produced, might have disclosed the entry relating to the partition deed. The explanation offered by the Plaintiff for delay in approaching the Court is not convincing. Insofar as damages are concerned, the Plaintiff has not produced any material to substantiate either the quantum or the basis of her claim. There is no evidence regarding income from the land, nature of cultivation, or loss suffered. Thus, on an overall appreciation, while the Plaintiff has succeeded in establishing her original title, she has failed to prove her possession within the relevant period and has not satisfactorily explained the delay in filing the suit. The Defendants, though able to probabalise long possession, have not established title either through the alleged sale or by way of adverse possession in the manner known to law.

44) Upon a careful, independent, and comprehensive reappraisal of the entire materials available on record, including the pleadings, oral and documentary evidence, the findings of the Trial Court, and the rival submissions advanced on either side in the Appeal as well as the Cross-Appeal, this Court proceeds to record its final conclusions. At the outset, this Court finds that the Plaintiff has satisfactorily established her original title to the suit property by virtue of the

registered settlement deed dated 06.12.1972 (Ex.A2) executed by her father. The said document being a registered instrument carries a presumption of validity, and the Defendants have not produced any legally acceptable evidence to dislodge the same. Thus, the Plaintiff's title, as such, is not seriously in dispute.

45) However, it is a settled principle of law that **mere proof of title is not sufficient to obtain a decree for declaration and consequential reliefs unless the suit is filed within the period prescribed by limitation and supported by a subsisting cause of action.** In the present case, the Plaintiff has sought, inter alia, declaration of title, recovery of possession, and declaration that the partition deed dated 04.03.2010 is null and void.

46) The crucial issue, therefore, is whether the suit has been instituted within the period of limitation. The evidence on record, particularly Exs.A5 and A6, clearly demonstrates that the Plaintiff had knowledge of the mutation of patta in favour of Thangavel Reddy as early as in the year 2010, and she had, in fact, approached the revenue authorities seeking cancellation of the same. The partition deed dated 04.03.2010 is a registered document forming part of public records. In such circumstances, the Plaintiff is deemed to have constructive notice of the said document.

47) The Plaintiff's plea that she came to know of the partition deed only in the year 2015 upon obtaining an Encumbrance Certificate does not inspire confidence. Significantly, the earlier Encumbrance Certificate allegedly obtained in

2010 has not been produced before the Court. This omission assumes importance, and an adverse inference is liable to be drawn that the said document, if produced, would have disclosed the entry relating to the partition deed. The explanation offered for such non-production is neither satisfactory nor convincing.

48) In this context, it is to be reiterated that **a registered document carries with it a presumption of knowledge, and a party cannot indefinitely postpone limitation by pleading ignorance when circumstances indicate otherwise.** The Plaintiff, having admittedly initiated proceedings in the year 2010 regarding patta transfer, cannot be permitted to contend that she remained unaware of the Defendants' claim over the property for a further period of five years.

49) Accordingly, this Court concurs with the finding of the Trial Court that the suit, filed in the year 2016, is barred by limitation insofar as the relief of declaration and cancellation of the partition deed is concerned. The law of limitation, though procedural, has the effect of barring the remedy, and the Court cannot grant declaratory relief when the challenge to an adverse document is clearly time-barred.

50) With regard to possession, the Plaintiff has failed to establish that she was in possession of the suit property within the relevant period or that she was dispossessed within twelve years prior to the institution of the suit. The Plaintiff has not entered the witness box, and her Power of Attorney holder (PW1) has admitted lack of personal knowledge regarding the material aspects of possession and the

alleged permissive arrangement between 2004 and 2008. No independent or documentary evidence has been produced to substantiate such a plea.

51) On the contrary, the Defendants have produced revenue records, including patta, chitta, adangal, and kist receipts, which, though not documents of title, do indicate possession over a period of time. It is well settled that **mutation entries do not confer title but are relevant for establishing possession**. The Plaintiff has not produced any contemporaneous records to rebut the Defendants' claim of possession.

52) At the same time, the Defendants' claim of title based on the alleged sale letter dated 20.04.1982 (Ex.B15) is legally untenable. The said document, being unregistered, cannot convey title in respect of immovable property. No steps were taken by Thangavel Reddy or the Defendants to enforce the alleged agreement by seeking specific performance. Hence, no right, title, or interest can be claimed on the basis of Ex.B15.

53) The Defendants have also taken a plea of adverse possession. However, **mere long possession, however extended, does not ipso facto ripen into title unless the essential ingredients of adverse possession—namely, open, continuous, hostile, and uninterrupted possession to the knowledge of the true owner—are strictly established**. In the present case, the Defendants' own plea that possession originated from a sale transaction militates against the requirement of hostile possession. There is no clear or cogent evidence to establish the exact point

of time when such possession became adverse to the Plaintiff. The oral and documentary evidence does not satisfactorily establish animus possidendi. Hence, the plea of adverse possession is liable to be rejected.

54) It is also pertinent to note that **a party cannot be permitted to both approbate and reprobate**. While the Defendants have taken alternative pleas of purchase and adverse possession, the evidence must clearly establish at least one of the said pleas in a legally acceptable manner. In the absence of such proof, no declaratory relief can be granted in their favour. Further, the Plaintiff's claim for damages is unsupported by any evidence regarding the nature of cultivation, income derived, or the basis for quantification. The claim is therefore speculative and has been rightly rejected by the Trial Court.

55) Insofar as the relief of permanent injunction is concerned, the same being an equitable relief, cannot be granted in favour of a party who has failed to establish possession as on the date of suit. Likewise, the relief of mandatory injunction directing cancellation of patta has been rightly declined, as the Plaintiff had already invoked the jurisdiction of the revenue authorities and the matter was pending consideration. It is a settled principle that **civil courts ordinarily refrain from issuing directions in matters pending before statutory authorities unless compelling circumstances are shown**, which are absent in the present case.

56) Another important circumstance is the **non-examination of the Plaintiff herself**, who is the best person to speak about the alleged transactions and

possession. When a party withholds the best available evidence, the Court is justified in drawing an adverse inference. This omission further weakens the Plaintiff's case.

57) Insofar as the Cross-Appeal is concerned, though the Cross-Appellants have contended that the Trial Court ought to have recorded findings in their favour on all issues, particularly on adverse possession, this Court finds that the ultimate conclusion of the Trial Court does not suffer from perversity or illegality. The failure to establish adverse possession in accordance with law disentitles the Cross-Appellants from seeking any declaration of title in their favour.

58) Finally, it is to be emphasized that **an Appellate Court will interfere with findings of fact only when such findings are perverse, based on no evidence, or suffer from misapplication of law.** In the present case, though certain observations of the Trial Court could have been more elaborate, the ultimate conclusions are based on proper appreciation of evidence and correct application of legal principles. Hence, no interference is warranted.

59) In the totality of circumstances, this Court holds that:

- The Plaintiff has established her original title but has failed to establish her entitlement to reliefs due to the bar of limitation and lack of proof of possession;
- The Defendants have failed to establish title either through the alleged sale or by adverse possession;

- The dismissal of the suit by the Trial Court on the ground of limitation is legally sustainable; and
- The grounds raised in both the Appeal and the Cross-Appeal are devoid of merit.

60) Thus, the Trial Court has correctly appreciated the evidence in holding that the Plaintiff failed to establish her case within limitation. Though certain observations regarding adverse possession and nature of possession may not be entirely precise, the ultimate conclusion dismissing the suit is legally sustainable. Further, the trial court has not only discussed the limitation aspect, but also discussed various other facts also including adverse possession. Hence, the Cross-Appeal seeking reversal of findings on adverse possession cannot be accepted, as the Defendants have failed to establish the same in accordance with law. Accordingly, no interference is warranted with the Judgment and Decree of the Trial Court. This point is answered **against both the Appellant and the Cross-Appellants**.

61) In view of the findings recorded above, the Appeal Suit filed by the Plaintiff is liable to be dismissed, and the Cross-Appeal filed by Defendants 1 to 3 is also liable to be dismissed, confirming the Judgment and Decree of the Trial Court and thus the Points 1 to 11 are answered accordingly,

In the result, both the appeal and cross appeal are disposed as below:-

A.S.No.39 / 2023:-

In the result,

- (i) the Appeal filed by the Plaintiff / Appellant is dismissed.**
- (ii) Accordingly, the Judgment and Decree dated 09.06.2023 passed in O.S. No.58 of 2016 on the file of the learned Subordinate Judge, Tiruttani, are hereby confirmed ;**
- (iii) That both parties do bear their own costs.**

AS No. 14 / 2026 :-

In the result,

- (i) the Cross-Appeal (Cross-Objections) filed by the Defendants 1 to 3 / Cross-Appellants is dismissed.**
- (ii) the Judgment and Decree dated 09.06.2023 passed in O.S. No.58 of 2016 on the file of the learned Subordinate Judge, Tiruttani, are hereby confirmed**
- (iii) That both parties do bear their own costs.**

Dictated to the steno-typist directly typed by her in computer and corrected and pronounced by me in open court till that day of 27th day of April 2026.

I-Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur

Both side Witnesses and Exhibits: -Nil-

I-Additional District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur