

**IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF, PONNERI.**

**PRESENT:** Selvi. **R.M. Subathra**, B.A.B.L.(Hons.), M.L.(IPR),,  
District Munsif, Ponneri.

Tuesday, the 28th day of January, 2020

**O.S.No.170/2014**

B. Hakkim Sait

...Plaintiff

-Vs -

1. P.S. Mani Nadar
2. Brammasakthi
3. Jayashree
4. Latha
5. Bhavani
6. Chandra
7. V. Suresh

....Defendants

This suit having been finally heard on 04.01.2020, in the presence of Mr. R. Manikavelu, the learned counsel for the Plaintiff and Mrs. K. Selvakumari, the learned counsel for the defendants 1 to 6 and Mr. R. Dillibabu, the learned counsel for the 7<sup>th</sup> defendant. The defendants having been called absent set exparte and upon hearing the arguments of plaintiff and after perusal of the entire records and having stood over for my consideration till this day, this court delivers the following:

**JUDGMENT**

This is the suit for the relief of declaration that the sale deed dated 26.07.2013 executed in favour of 7<sup>th</sup> defendant by the defendants 1 to 6 is null and void and for the relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendants their men, agents, servants and others authorised by them from interfering with plaintiffs peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule mentioned property and for costs.

*District Munsif,*

**2. The averments set out in the amended plaint filed under Order VII Rule 1 of C.P.C. are as follows:**

a) The suit property in Survey No.178/2 extents Acre 0.19 cents and Survey No.179/7 extents Acre 0.07 cents total extents 0.26 cents at Sembulivaram Village, Ponneri Taluk, Thiruvallur District was owned by Gopalakrishnan son of Perumal Naidu of Sembulivaram Village. The said Gopalakrishnan's wife Sampath Rani filed a suit against the said Gopalarishnan in O.S.344/1970 before District Munsif Court, Thiruvallur for claiming maintenance. The said Court passed an order dated 02.08.1972 in favour of Sampath Rani to obtain Gopalakrishnan's half share in the suit property described in the schedule in O.S.344/1970. The said suit property also one of the item in O.S.344/1970.

b) The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant in the present suit, filed a suit against the said Sampath Rani in O.S.575/1981 before this court claiming right in the suit property and stated that he purchased the said property from the said Sampath Rani's husband Gopala Krishnan dated 25.05.1971 and he had right over the property and in that suit it was clearly stated that the sale deed by Gopalakrishnan to the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is hit by the Doctrine of lispence and it is not valid and not binding on Sampath Rani.

c) The said Tmt. Sampath Rani and her husband Goapala Krishnan executed a registered deed of General Power of Attorney in favour of D. Suresh S/o. Dilli of Thirunagar, Villivakkam, Chennai dated 27.09.2013 with Sub Registrar Office Redhills in Document No.11437/2013 in the suit property and other property.

d) The said D. Suresh as a power Agent of Tmt. Sampath Rani and Gopalakrishnan executed a registered sale deed in favour of the plaintiff on 01.10.2013 in Document No.11520/2013 in the suit property. After the purchase, the plaintiff obtained a patta in his name bearing Patta No.310 to the suit property and enjoying peaceful

*District Munsif,*

possession. The plaintiff is having right, title and interest over the suit property.

e) The defendants 1 to 6 are knowing fully well that they are not having any right over the suit property and they fraudulently colluded with 7<sup>th</sup> defendant and executed a registered sale deed in favour of the 7<sup>th</sup> defendant regarding the suit property dated 26.07.2013 at Sub Registrar Office Redhills without having any valid right. Hence, the execution of sale deed is null and void and not binding on the plaintiff.

f) The defendants are not having any right to claim the suit property and always giving trouble to enjoy the suit property. Again and again the defendants trespassing the suit property and giving more trouble. Finally on 20.06.2014 the defendants tried to trespass into the suit property with some rowdy elements but the plaintiff successfully prevented. At any moment the defendants may trespass and occupy the suit property. The defendants can be restrained only through an order of permanent injunction by this court. Hence, the suit.

**3. The averments set out in the written statement filed by 1st defendant is as follows:**

a) The suit property measuring 0.07 cents comprised in Survey No.179/7 and another piece of land measuring 0.19 cents comprised in Survey No.178/2 were earlier owned by one Mr. P. Gopalakrishnan. These two lands and other lands were his ancestral properties. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant herein purchased the above said two piece of lands from him for valid consideration under a sale deed dated 25.05.1971, which was registered as Document No.1339/1971 in the office of the Sub Registrar at Ponneri. The said Mr. Gopalakrishnan handed over the possession of these two lands to this defendant on the date of this sale deed itself and since then this defendant continued to remain in possession of the said lands till he parted with the same. In a similar fashion the above said Mr.P. Gopalakrishnan has also sold his other lands to various third parties.

b) Prior to the execution of the above said sale deed in favour of this defendant, the said Mr. P. Gopalakrishnan and his wife Sambathrani have collusively schemed a plan to defraud the purchasers of the said lands, including this defendant and thereby enriched themselves unjustly. Accordingly, Sambathrani filed a suit against her husband in O.S.344/70 on the file of District Munsif Court, Thiruvallur claiming maintenance from him on the alleged ground that he has deserted her. She claimed a charge on the lands owned and held by her husband, which were included in the said suit. This defendant was not aware of this suit. During the pendency of this suit and without disclosing the pendency of the same, Mr. P Gopalakrishnan sold the above said 0.07 cents + 0.19 cents to this defendant as mentioned above. Both Goplakrishnan and his wife mislead the court and also the public at large as if the said suit was really a contested one. Whereas the said suit O.S.344/1970 was a sham and nominal one and brought out collusively by them, who have stage managed this suit. Accordingly, they conducted the proceedings of this suit in such a manner that a compromise decree was passed by the District Munsif Court, Thiruvallur in this suit. Once again as schemed by them the said Gopalakrishnan deliberately defaulted in complying with the terms of the compromise decree and thereupon his wife executed the said compromise decree and brought all the ancestral lands of her husband for sale, to realize her alleged maintenance dues. In the court auction she herself purchased 50% of the said properties and adjusted the same towards her maintenance claims. Meanwhile, on behalf of her minor son by name Ravi alias Ravichandran she filed a suit for partition in O.S.575/1981 against her husband claiming 50% share in the joint family properties. In this suit also the court was also misled and an exparte Decree was passed. This exparte decree for partition was executed and a division was effected through the court and a paper delivery was also taken by the said minor son. It is submitted that the delivery of possession effected in O.S.344/1970 to Sambathrani and also the delivery of possession effected in the partition suit O.S.575/1981 to her minor son are only paper deliveries. Actual and physical delivery

*District Munsif,*

of possession was not at all effected.

c) Later on this defendant filed a suit against the said Sampathrani for the relief of declaration of his title and also for the consequential relief of permanent injunction in O.S.575/1981 on the file of this court. Two other third party purchasers had also filed similar suits against her. A joint trial were conducted for all the three suits mentioned above and ultimately by its common judgment and decree dated 22.08.1982, this court was pleased to dismiss all the three suits on the ground that the sale deed executed in favour of the purchasers including this defendant are hit by section 52 of Transfer of Property Act.

d) Subsequent to the dismissal of the above said suit O.S.575/1981, the said Sambathrani and her son approached this defendant for a compromise settlement. As they were in need of money they demanded and received a sum of Rs.2,000/- from this defendant and executed a Release deed dated 07.10.1988 in favour of this defendant. Though this release deed was not registered, yet the executants have categorically and unequivocally acknowledged the sale of the suit land as well as the above said 0.19 cents of land to this defendant and his continuous possession and enjoyment of the same since then. It is submitted that notwithstanding the disposal of the said suit O.S.575/1981 by this court, this defendant continuously remained in actual and physical possession of the above said two items of properties since the date of his purchase till he parted with these lands. In fact in recognition of his title to these two items of lands, patta bearing No.67 was issued to him by the Revenue Authorities of the Government of Tamil Nadu and this defendant has also paid the land revenue (kist) to the Government. It is well settled law that the sale deed executed pendent e lite is not annulled by section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act.

e) Hence the sale deed dated 25.05.1971 executed by P. Gopalakrishnan in favour of my vendor, this defendant is valid in law and the said sale is only sub servient to the

*District Munsif,*

above said maintenance suit allegedly filed by Sambathrani. In view of the above position of law, the said sale deed executed by the said Gopalakrishnan in favour of this defendant still holds good and as acknowledged by his wife and son in their above said Release Deed, this defendant herein has been in continuous possession and enjoyment of the suit property for a period of more than 12 years. The possession of the defendant was open and adverse to the alleged rights of Gopalakrishnan, his wife Sampathrani and their son Ravi @ Ravichandran. Hence the defendant has also prescribed title to the above said two items of properties by adverse possession. In these circumstances also any right claimed by the vendor of the plaintiff got extinguished. In view of the above no valid title has passed on the plaintiff.

f) The above said fraudulent scheme of the said Gopalakrishnan and his wife to file a false suit for maintenance and subsequent collusive nature of the court auction sale have become exposed now by their own conduct. In order to enrich themselves again, long after the disposal of the above said maintenance suit as well as the partition suit, they have jointly executed a deed a General Power of Attorney to and in favour of one D. Suresh thereby empowering him to sell the suit property as well as the above said 0.19 cents in survey NO.178/2. This deed of General Power of Attorney has been registered as Document No.11437/2013 in the office of the Sub Registrar at Redhills. In this deed of General Power of Attorney both the executants/principals have categorically admitted the truth that the above said two items of lands, including the suit land, continues to be in their joint possession and enjoyment, notwithstanding the above said court decrees and subsequent execution of the same. This admission of the above said Gopalakrishnan and his wife clearly establishes that the delivery allegedly effected through the process of court in O.S.433/1970 as well as O.S.575/1970 were not true and real and that only a paper delivery was created by them as part of their scheme to defraud the purchasers of these lands. The recitals of this deed of General Power of Attorney also clearly

*District Munsif,*

establish the collusive and farce nature of the above mentioned two suits and securing ex parte decrees in the above mentioned suits in a fraudulent manner and by misleading the courts. In other words both Gopalakrishnan and his wife sampathrani have abused the process of the court of law to achieve their illegal objectives. Empowered by the above said deed of General power of attorney, on behalf of his principals namely Gopalakrishnan and his wife Sampathrani, D. Suresh has executed a sale deed in favour of the plaintiff. However, not only a valid title has been conveyed to the plaintiff the actual possession of the suit property has also not been given to the plaintiff.

g) The defendant and the defendants 2 to 6 have jointly executed the sale deed dated 26.07.2013 to and in my favour 7<sup>th</sup> defendant and thereby sold him the suit property for a valid consideration and possession of the suit property has also been handed over to him. This sale deed was registered as document No.9025/2013 in the office of the Sub Registrar at Redhills and this sale deed is valid in law. Thus a valid and absolute title has been conveyed to the 7<sup>th</sup> defendant. Though they do not have any right in the suit property, by way of abundant caution and at the request, the 7<sup>th</sup> defendant. Though they do not have any right in the suit property, by way of abundant caution and at the request of the 7<sup>th</sup> defendant, the defendants 2 to 6 have jointed in the execution of the above said sale deed in favour of the 7<sup>th</sup> defendant . It is respectfully submitted that since the date of purchase of the suit property as mentioned above this defendant is in actual possession and enjoyment of the suit property. In view of the above the plaintiff is not entitled to the reliefs of Declaration and permanent injunction as prayed for by him.

h) This suit has been filed by the plaintiff with ulterior motives and with active collusion of his vendors. As he is not in actual possession of the suit property and has no valid title has devolved on him, the plaintiff is not entitled to any reliefs prayed for

*District Munsif,*

by him. Hence, this suit is not maintainable both on law and on facts and as such it is liable to be dismissed.

**4.The averments set out in the written statement filed by 7th defendant is as follows:**

a) This defendant denies all the allegations made by the plaintiff as false and frivolous save those that are specifically admitted hereunder and the plaintiff is strictly bound to prove the same. The suit property measuring 0.07 cents comprised in Survey No.179/7 and another piece of land measuring 0.19 cents comprised in Survey No.178/2 were earlier owned by one Mr. P. Gopalakrishnan. These two lands and other lands were his ancestral properties. The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant herein purchased the above said two piece of lands from him for valid consideration under a sale deed dated 25.05.1971, which was registered as Document No.1339/1971 in the office of the Sub Registrar at Ponneri. The said Mr. Gopalakrishnan handed over the possession of these two lands to this defendant vendor the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant on the date of this sale deed i.e. on 25.05.1971 itself and since then this defendant vendor, the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant continued to remain in possession of the said lands till he parted with the same. In a similar fashion the above said Mr.P. Gopalakrishnan has also sold his other lands to various third parties.

b) Prior to the execution of the above said sale deed in favour of this defendant, the said Mr. P. Gopalakrishnan and his wife Sampathrani have collusively schemed a plan to defraud the purchasers of the said lands, including the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and thereby enrich themselves unjustly. Accordingly Sambathrani filed a suit against her husband in O.S.344/70 on the file of District Munsif Court, Thiruvallur claiming maintenance from him on the alleged ground that he has deserted her. She claimed a charge on the lands owned and held by her husband, which were included in the said suit. During the pendency of this suit and without disclosing the pendency of the same, Mr. P Gopalakrishnan sold the above said 0.07 cents + 0.19 cents to the 1<sup>st</sup>

defendant as mentioned above. Both Goplakrishnan and his wife misled the court and also the public at large as if the said suit was really a contested one. Whereas the said suit O.S.344/1970 was a sham and nominal one and brought out collusively by them, who have stage managed this suit. Accordingly they conducted the proceedings of this suit in such a manner that a compromise decree was passed by the District Munsif Court, Thiruvallur in this suit. Once again as schemed by them the said Gopalakrishnan deliberately defaulted in complying with the terms of the compromise decree and thereupon his wife executed the said compromise decree and brought all the ancestral lands of her husband for sale, to realize her alleged maintenance dues. In the court auction she herself purchased 50% of the said properties and adjusted the same towards her maintenance claims. Meanwhile on behalf of her minor son by name Ravi alias Ravichandra she filed a suit for partition in O.S.575/1981 against her husband claiming 50% share in the joint family properties. In this suit also the court was also misled and an ex parte Decree was passed. This ex parte decree for partition was executed and a division was effected through the court and a paper delivery was also taken by the said minor son. It is submitted that the delivery of possession effected in O.S.344/1970 to Sambathrani and also the delivery of possession effected in the partition suit O.S.575/1981 to her minor son are only paper deliveries. Actual and physical delivery of possession was not at all effected.

c) Later on the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant filed a suit against the said Sambathrani for the relief of declaration of his title and also for the consequential relief of permanent injunction in O.S.575/1981 on the file of this court. Two other third party purchasers had also filed similar suits against her. A joint trial were conducted for all the three suits mentioned above and ultimately by its common judgment and decree dated 22.08.1982, this court was pleased to dismiss all the three suits on the ground that the sale deed executed in favour of the purchasers including 1<sup>st</sup> defendant are hit by section 52 of Transfer of Property Act.

*District Munsif,*

d) Subsequent to the dismissal of the above said suit O.S.575/1981, the said Sambathrani and her son approached 1<sup>st</sup> defendant for a compromise settlement. As they were in need of money they demanded and received a sum of Rs.2,000/- from the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and executed a Release deed dated 07.10.1988 in favour of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant. Though this release deed was not registered, yet the executants have categorically and unequivocally acknowledged the sale of the suit land as well as the above said 0.19 cents of land to the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and his continuous possession and enjoyment of the same since then. It is submitted that notwithstanding the disposal of the said suit O.S.575/1981 by this court, the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant continuously remained in actual and physical possession of the above said two items of properties since the date of his purchase till he parted with these lands. In fact in recognition of his title to these two items of lands, patta bearing No.67 was issued to him by the Revenue Authorities of the Government of Tamil Nadu and the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant has also paid the land revenue (kist) to the Government. It is well settled law that the sale deed executed pendente lite is not annulled by section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act.

e) Hence the sale deed dated 25.05.1971 executed by P. Gopalakrishnan in favour of my vendor, the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is valid in law and the said sale is only subservient to the above said maintenance suit allegedly filed by Sampathrani. In view of the above position of law, the said sale deed executed by the said Gopalakrishnan in favour of the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant still holds good and as acknowledged by his wife and son in their above said Release Deed, the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant herein has been in continuous possession and enjoyment of the suit property for a period of more than 12 years. The possession of 1<sup>st</sup> defendant was open and adverse to the alleged rights of Gopalakrishnan, his wife Sampathrani and their son Ravi @ Ravichandran. Hence the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant has also prescribed title to the above said two items of properties by adverse possession. In these circumstances also any right claimed by the vendor of

*District Munsif,*

the plaintiff got extinguished. In view of the above no valid title has passed on the plaintiff.

f) The above said fraudulent scheme of the said Gopalakrishnan and his wife to file a false suit for maintenance and subsequent collusive nature of the court auction sale have become exposed now by their own conduct. In order to enrich themselves again, long after the disposal of the above said maintenance suit as well as the partition suit, they have jointly executed a deed a General Power of Attorney to and in favour of one D. Suresh thereby empowering him to sell the suit property as well as the above said 0.19 cents in survey NO.178/2. This deed of General Power of Attorney has been registered as Document No.11437/2013. In this deed of General Power of Attorney both the executants/principals have categorically admitted the truth that the above said two items of lands, including the suit land, continues to be in their joint possession and enjoyment, notwithstanding the above said court decrees and subsequent execution of the same. This admission of the above said Gopalakrishnan and his wife clearly establishes that the delivery allegedly effected through the process of court in O.S.433/1970 as well as O.S.575/1970 were not true and real and that only a paper delivery was created by them as part of their scheme to defraud the purchasers of these lands. The recitals of this deed of General Power of Attorney also clearly establish the collusive and farce nature of the above mentioned two suits and securing ex parte decrees in the above mentioned suits in a fraudulent manner and by misleading the courts. In other words both Gopalakrishnan and his wife Sampathrani have abused the process of the court of law to achieve their illegal objectives. Empowered by the above said deed of General power of attorney, on behalf of his principals namely Gopalakrishnan and his wife Sampathrani, D. Suresh has executed a sale deed in favour of the plaintiff. However not only a valid title has been conveyed to the plaintiff the actual possession of the suit property has also not been given to the plaintiff.

*District Munsif,*

g) The 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and the defendants 2 to 6 have jointly executed the sale deed dated 26.07.2013 to and in my favour 7<sup>th</sup> defendant and thereby sold him the suit property for a valid consideration and possession of the suit property has also been handed over to him. This sale deed was registered as document No.9025/2013 and this sale deed is valid in law. Thus a valid and absolute title has been conveyed to this defendant. Though they do not have any right in the suit property, by way of abundant caution and at my request, the defendants 2 to 6 have joined in the execution of the above said sale deed in this defendant favour. It is respectfully submitted that since the date of purchase of the suit property as mentioned above this defendant is in actual possession and enjoyment of the suit property. In view of the above the plaintiff is not entitled to the reliefs of Declaration and permanent injunction as prayed for by him.

h) This suit has been filed by the plaintiff with ulterior motives and with active collusion of his vendors. As he is not in actual possession of the suit property and has no valid title has devolved on him, the plaintiff is not entitled to any reliefs prayed for by him. Hence, this suit is not maintainable both on law and on facts and as such it is liable to be dismissed.

**Framing of Issues:-**

5. Based upon the above said pleadings and the documents produced along with the pleadings the following issues were framed on 15.10.2014.

1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get declaration as prayed for?
2. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled to get the permanent injunction as prayed for?
3. To what other reliefs?

6. On the side of plaintiffs, the plaintiff was examined as PW1 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A12 were marked through him. On the side of defendants no oral and documentary evidences was let in.

*District Munsif,*

7. **Ex.A1** is the certified copy of the sale deed dated 25.05.1971 in the name of Mani Nadar. **Ex.A2** is the certified copy of the decree in O.S.575/1981. **Ex.A3** is the certified copy of the decree in O.S.84/1982. **Ex.A4** is the certified copy of the Judgment in O.S.84/1982. **Ex.A5** is the certified copy of the decree in O.S.344/1970. **Ex.A6** is the original Power of attorney deed dated 27.09.2013 in the name of Suresh. **Ex.A7** is the certified copy of the sale deed dated 01.10.2013 in the name of Hakkim Sait. **Ex.A8** is the original patta dated 08.11.2013 in the name of Hakkim Sait. **Ex.A9** is the certified copy of the judgment in O.S.575/1981. **Ex.A10** is the original kist receipt dated 11.11.2013 in the name of Hakkim Sait. **Ex.A11** is the certified copy of the sale deed dated 26.07.2013 in the name of Suresh. **Ex.A12** is the original sale deed dated 01.10.2013 in the name of Hakkim Sait.

8. From the evidence of PW1 and from the Ex.A1 to Ex.A12 plaintiff has proved that the plaintiff is the owner of the suit property. The plaintiff had purchased the suit property from Suresh through Ex.A7 and Ex.A12. It is settled that possession follows title. Ex.A8 and A10 are the original patta and kist receipt also in the of plaintiff. The defendants though had filed their written statement had not come forward to combat the allegation of the plaintiff. The act of the defendants having chosen to remain silent and not cross examine the witness of the plaintiff makes the claim of the plaintiff remain untouched, undisturbed and unperturbed.

9. From the evidence of PW1 and from the Ex.A1 to Ex.A10 plaintiff has proved that the plaintiff is the owner of the suit property. The plaintiff father had purchased the suit property from Sakkubaiammal on 07.08.1955 through Ex.A3 and A4. It is settled that possession follows title. The defendants Further Ex.A9 is the legal notice issued by the plaintiff to the defendants. Ex.A5 to A8 are the death and kist receipts and sale agreement deed. The defendant though had filed his written statement had not come forward to combat the allegation of the plaintiff. The act of the defendant having chosen to remain silent and not cross examine the witness of the

plaintiff makes the claim of the plaintiff remain untouched, undisturbed and unperturbed. Further the plaintiff has proved his interest over the suit property by the documents submitted in support of the same.

10. It is pertinent to note the averments in the Plaint and the evidence of PW1, regarding the possession and enjoyment of the suit property by the Plaintiff. Therefore, as per Ex.A1 to A12 the plaintiff has proved the possession and title over the suit property.

11. Further the plaintiff has proved his interest over the suit property by the documents submitted in support of the same. From the date of purchase the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of suit property. As the plaintiff have proved that he is the owner of the suit property, he is entitled to get the relief of declaration and permanent injunction as prayed for.

In the result, this suit is decreed without costs and that the plaintiff is entitled to (a) the relief of declaration that the sale deed dated 26.07.2013 executed by the defendants 1 to 6 in favour of 7<sup>th</sup> defendant as null and void; and

(b) granted the relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their men, agents, servants and others authorised by them from interfering with the plaintiffs peaceful possession and enjoyment of the schedule mentioned property.

Judgment directly dictated to Steno-Typist, Typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this, the 28th day of January 2020.

**District Munsif,  
Ponneri.**

*District Munsif,*

**List of witnesses on the side of the plaintiffs**

**PW 1 Hakkim Sait**

**List of documents on the side of the plaintiffs**

Ex.A1	25.05.1971	Certified copy of the sale deed in the name of Mani Nadar.
Ex.A2		Certified copy of the decree in O.S.575/1981.
Ex.A3		Certified copy of the decree in O.S.84/1982.
Ex.A4		Certified copy of the Judgment in O.S.84/1982.
Ex.A5		Certified copy of the decree in O.S.344/1970.
Ex.A6	27.09.2013	Original Power of attorney deed in the name of Suresh.
Ex.A7	01.10.2013	Certified copy of the sale deed in the name of Hakkim Sait.
Ex.A8	08.11.2013	Original patta in the name of Hakkim Sait.
Ex.A9		Certified copy of the judgment in O.S.575/1981.
Ex.A10	11.11.2013	Original kist receipt in the name of Hakkim Sait.
Ex.A11	26.07.2013	Certified copy of the sale deed in the name of Suresh.
Ex.A12	01.10.2013	Original sale deed in the name of Hakkim Sait.

**List of witnesses on the side of the defendants**

**NIL**

**List of documents on the side of the defendants**

**NIL**

**DM,  
PNI.**

*District Munsif,*

Fair/Draft Judgment  
O.S.170/2014  
Date:28.01.2020  
DMC, PNI.

*District Munsif,*

