

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF AT TIRUTTANI

Present : Tmt. R.D. Gurulakshmi, M.A., M.L., P.G.D.I & C.L.,

District Munsif, Tiruttani.

Dated this Wednesday the 3rd day of June 2026

OS.No.47 OF 2024

(CNR.No.TNTR21-000060-2024)

Rajammal

...

... Plaintiff

/Versus/

1. Narasimman

2. Babu

3. Vasantha (died) (Amended as per order in IA.No.5/2025, Dated:23.07.2025)

4. Devan

5. Rajamma

6. Saroja

... Defendants

This suit came up before me for final hearing on 30.04.2026 in the presence of M/s. S. Barath, K. Baskar, Counsels for plaintiff, D3 died, M/s.C.A. Natarajan, Counsel for D1, D5, written statement not filed on the side of D1, D5, hence D1, D5 were set exparty. D2, D4, D6 were remained exparty. Upon hearing Plaintiff's side, upon perusing the records, and having stood over for consideration till this day this court delivered the following:-

JUDGMENT

This suit has been filed by the plaintiff for permanent injunction restraining the defendants 1 to 5, their men and agents from in any manner interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property and for the costs of the suit.

1. Plaint averments in brief as follows:-

(a) The Plaintiff purchased the Grama Natham Punjai land in S.No.186 from one Narasimha Pandithar under the registered sale deed dated 11.12.1973. Prior to that the 6th defendant acquired interest in the suit property through a sale deed dated 17.04.1973. The 6th defendant is the elder sister of this plaintiff. The plaintiff and 6th defendant have been in peaceful possession of the said property. The Special Tahsildar, Tiruttani issued a Manavari patta in patta No.341 in respect of the suit property in the name of plaintiff and 6th defendant.

(b) The Plaintiff constructed a small house upon the land, obtained electricity service connection and has been residing in the said house with her family members including the 6th defendant. The defendants 1 to 5 have no right or interest over the suit property. The defendants 1 to 5 have been attempting to disturb the suit property. The plaintiff put up a compound wall in order to protect the property. On 2014 again the defendants tried to interfere over the suit property. The defendants are influenced people. Hence this suit is filed for permanent injunction.

2. After service of summons, D1 and D5 appeared through their counsel but they failed to file written statement. Consequently they were set exparty. D2, D4, D6 were called absent and were set exparty.

3. **Point for determination:**

Whether the the suit is to be decreed as prayed for? Or not?

4. According to the plaintiff, plaintiff purchased the Grama Natham Punjai land in S.No.186 from one Narasimha Pandithar under the registered sale deed dated 11.12.1973. The Assignment joint patta in patta No.341 stands in the name of plaintiff. The 6th defendant is the elder sister of this plaintiff. The Plaintiff constructed a house in the suit property, obtained electricity service connection and residing the said house with her family members including the 6th defendant. The defendants 1 to 5 tried to interfere over the suit property. Hence the counsel for plaintiff prays to decreed the suit.

5. The plaintiff in order to substantiate her case has examined herself as Pw1 and marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A3.

6. The plaintiff purchased the suit properties through Ex.A1 sale deed from one Narasimha Pandithar. Ex.A2 is the Assignment patta in patta No.341 issued by the Special Tahsildar, Tiruttani in respect of the suit property in the name of plaintiff and one Desammal. Ex.A3 is the Property tax and House tax receipts standing in the name of plaintiff. The above said documents are proved the plaintiff's lawful possession over the suit property.

7. The defendants have not chosen to contest the case and deny the right of the plaintiffs over the suit property. Therefore, the plaintiffs' contention is that the 1 to 5 defendants are attempting to interfere over the suit property is acceptable. In these circumstances, the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of permanent injunction against the defendants 1 to 5 in respect of the suit property.

In the result, suit is decreed by granting permanent injunction restraining the defendants 1 to 5, their men and agents from in any manner interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, both parties are directed to bear their own costs.

Dictated to my steno-typist, typed by her directly, corrected and pronounced by me in open Court, the 3rd day of June 2026.

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.

Plaintiff's side Witness:-

Pw1 – M/s. Rajammal

Plaintiff's side Exhibits:-

1	Ex.A1	11.12.1973	The registered sale deed with Tamil translation
2	Ex.A2	30.06.2014	The Assignment Patta in Patta No.341
3	Ex.A3	--	The house tax and Property tax receipts

Defendants' side Witness and Exhibits:- Nil

District Munsif,
Tiruttani.