

**THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF, GUDIYATTAM,**  
**VELLORE DISTRICT.**

**Present: Tr.K.Karthick Asath, B.A.,B.L.,(Hons),LLM.,**  
District Munsif,  
Gudiyattam.

Wednesday, this the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April 2026

**O.S.No.112/2017**  
**(CNR.No.TNVL10-000192-2017)**

Munirathinam

.... Plaintiff

// Versus //

1. Govindasami (Died)  
(Amended as per IA.01/2022 allowed on 13.12.2021)
2. Sundaram
3. Gandhammal (Died)  
(Amended as per IA.02/2025 allowed on 14.08.2025)

.... Defendants

This suit came up before this court on 08.04.2026 for final hearing in the presence of Thiru.K.Loganathan, Advocate for the plaintiff and Thiru.K.Rajini, Advocate for the 2, 3 defendants and upon perusing the case records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following.

**JUDGMENT**

Suit filed Under Order 7, Rule 1 and Section 26 of Code of Civil Procedure to granting permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their men and agents from interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the schedule property and for cost.

**1. The Brief averments of the Amended Plaintiff :-**

The plaintiff submit that the suit property belonging to one Seenan he obtained the property through family partition. On that patta transferred in his name. The plaintiff purchased the suit property from him on 24.11.2008 by way of registered sale deed. After purchase the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the same. Subsequently the plaintiff sold part of the suit property to one Saraswathi by way of registered sale deed vide 5519/2013. The said Seenan died on 22.12.2016 in the plaintiff house. On 04.07.2017 with false averments the defendants sent notice to the plaintiff and Saraswathi. They also sent suitable reply to the defendants on 13.07.2017. On 10.08.2017 the defendants tried to trespass into the suit property and interfere in the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff hence the plaintiff filed the present suit for permanent injunction against the defendants.

**2. The Brief Averments of Written Statement filed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant and adopted by the other defendants:-**

The defendants submit that they denying the plaintiff case and submit that the suit property originally belongs to Duraisamy gounder after his death his wife Kaliyammal and Sons Kasinathan, Chinna Durai, Subramani and Srinivasan are partitioned the properties on 01.12.1964. The suit properties allotted to the Srinivasan and till his death on 22.12.2016 he is in enjoyment of the same and died without marriage leaving behind the defendants as 2<sup>nd</sup> class legal heirs of deceased Srinivasan. After that while verifying the revenue records the plaintiff and

his wife by created sale document as purchased the suit property from Srinivasan. The plaintiff himself changed the name of Srinivasan as Seenan. All revenue records stands in the name of Srinivasan by forgery the plaintiff created documents hence prayed to dismiss the suit.

### **3. Issues:-**

On the basis of plaint and written statement filed by both parties the following issues were framed on 07.03.2018.

- i) Whether the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the suit property ?
- ii) Whether the plaintiff is entitled the relief of permanent injunction as prayed for ?
- iii) To what other reliefs entitled ?

### **4. Evidence :-**

On plaintiff side the plaintiff Munirathinam examined himself as PW1 and marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A10 and one Chandran examined as PW2 on the cross examination of PW2, Ex.B1 marked and one Vijayabarath examined as PW3 through him Ex.C1 to Ex.C7 are marked. On defendants side 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant Sundaram examined as DW1 and marked Ex.B2 to Ex.B9 and one Ramesh examined as DW2 through him Ex.C8 and Ex.C9 marked and one Saravanan examined as DW3 and marked Ex.C10 and Ex.X1 to Ex.X6.

## **5. Arguments:-**

### **5.1. Plaintiff side Argument**

The plaintiff counsel argued that the plaintiff purchased the suit property on 24.11.2008 from one Seenan. Subsequently plaintiff sold 20 cents infavour of one Saraswathi vide Doc.No.5519/2013. The said Seenan in the plaintiffs house on 22.12.2016. Subsequently the third party defendants are tried to trespass and interfere with the plaintiffs peaceful possession and enjoyment on that he filed the present suit. The plaintiff examined himself as PW1 and marked Ex.A1 to Ex.A10 and also examined PW2 and PW3. The plaintiff filed Ex.A1 patta stands in the name of Seenan not in the name of Srinivasan. The plaintiff also filed Ex.A6 to Ex.A8 documents to prove the name of the plaintiff vendor Seenan. The plaintiff proved his vendors title and his title and possession also. He further argued that the plaintiff wife Usha is the sole legal heir of deceased Seenan but the defendants falsely pleaded that the owner of suit property is died without marriage. For that the Ex.A10 legal heir certificate also filed. He further argued that at the time of execution of Ex.A2 sale deed the name Seenan only stands in the patta and revenue records hence the sale deed also executed in that name only. Without challenging the sale deeds and legal heir certificate the defendants does not having right to question the title of plaintiff. The defendants also failed to prove their possession inrespect of suit property. The plaintiff side through PW3 marked the revenue records as Ex.C1 to Ex.C7 and proved that the said Seenan name is stands in the revenue records and after the plaintiffs purchase all documents transferred in the name of plaintiff. He further

argued that by producing witnesses and documents the plaintiffs side proved his title and possession over the suit property hence prayed to decreed the suit.

**5.2.** The defendants side failed to submit their side arguments.

## **6. Discussion:-**

This court after considering the argument of plaintiff side and perusing the pertinent records this court proceed to delineate the findings based on the following discussion.

For better discussion and decision this court discussing issue No.1 and 2 together.

### **Issue No.1 and 2:-**

- i) Whether the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the suit property ?
- ii) Whether the plaintiff is entitled the relief of permanent injunction as prayed for ?

**6.1.** The case of the plaintiff is that suit property belonging to one Seenan he obtained the property through family partition. On that patta transferred in his name. The plaintiff purchased the suit property from him on 24.11.2008 by way of registered sale deed. After purchase the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the same. Subsequently the plaintiff sold

part of the suit property to one Saraswathi by way of registered sale deed vide 5519/2013. The said Seenan died on 22.12.2016 in the plaintiff house. On 04.07.2017 with false averments the defendants sent notice to the plaintiff and Saraswathi. They also sent suitable reply to the defendants on 13.07.2017. On 10.08.2017 the defendants tried to trespass into the suit property and interfere in the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff hence the plaintiff filed the present suit for permanent injunction against the defendants.

**6.2.** The case of the defendants is that the suit property originally belongs to Duraisamy gounder after his death his wife Kaliyammal and Sons Kasinathan, Chinna Durai, Subramani and Srinivasan are partitioned the properties on 01.12.1964. The suit properties allotted to the Srinivasan and till his death on 22.12.2016 he is in enjoyment of the same and died without marriage leaving behind the defendants has 2<sup>nd</sup> class legal heirs of deceased Srinivasan. After that while verifying the revenue records the plaintiff and his wife by created sale document as purchased the suit property from Srinivasan. The plaintiff himself changed the name of Srinivasan as Seenan. All revenue records stands in the name of Srinivasan by forgery the plaintiff created documents hence prayed to dismiss the suit. Pending suit the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant and 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant are died and the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant alone contest the suit.

**6.3.** For proving the plaintiff case he examined himself as PW1. For proving the title and possession the plaintiff filed and marked the Ex.A1 to Ex.A10. The Ex.A1 is the Original separate patta for the

suit S.No.12/A1 and other properties stands in the name of Seenan, S/o.Duraisamy Gounder dated 19.09.1995. The Ex.A2 is the original registered sale deed dated 24.11.2008, on perusal it is shows that the plaintiff Munirathinam purchased the suit property and other properties from Seenan S/o.Duraisamy Gounder. The Ex.A3 is the Chitta for the properties.

**6.4.** It is further submit that while the defendants specifically denied that property belonging to one Srinivasan but plaintiff obtained property in the name of Seenan, there is no body in that name and the said Srinivasan not executed any sale deed infavour of the plaintiff. But the plaintiff filed documents to prove the existence of a person in the name of Seenan. On perusing the Ex.A6 is the Aadhar card of Seenan S/o.Duraisamy, the Ex.A7 is the Voter ID stands in the name of Seenan S/o.Duraisamy issued on 23.3.2007, the Ex.A8 is the Bank passbook stands in the name of Seenan S/o.Duraisamy, the Ex.A9 is the medical checkup book issued in the name of Seenan ,S/o.Duraisamy. The Ex.A10 is the legal heir certificate of Seenan S/o.Duraisamy, on perusing the Ex.A10 one Usha W/o.Munirathinam is shown as daughter of deceased Seenan.

**6.5.** The plaintiff himself examined as PW1 to prove the plaint pleadings. In his chief examination he deposed that the averments regarding the said Srinivasan died without marriage and the defendants are the 2<sup>nd</sup> class legal heirs of deceased Seenan are false. He deposed that Seenan also called as Srinivasan but the name Seenan alone stands in the Patta, Aadhar card, Voter ID, Bank passbook and Medical records on that

only sale deed executed in the name of Seenan. His wife Usha alone the 1<sup>st</sup> class legal heir of deceased Seenan and there is no other legal heirs for him. The defendants alone tried to grab the suit property. The PW1 cross examined by the defendants counsel, the relevant deposition of PW1 cross examination is extracted here below,

'நான் காக்காதோப்பில் எனக்குரிய 2 ஏக்கர் நிலத்தில் விவசாயம் செய்து வருகிறேன். காக்காதோப்பு எனது அம்மா பிறந்த ஊரும் எனது பாட்டியின் ஊரும் மற்றும் எனது மனைவியின் ஊரும் ஆகும். எனது நிலத்தில் சுந்தரம் மற்றும் மற்ற பிரதிவாதிகள் வரக்கூடாது என்று அடித்து பிரச்சினை செய்வதால் இந்த வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளேன். எனக்குரிய சொத்தினை நான் வாங்கி 11 வருடங்கள் ஆகிறது. சீணன் என்பவரிடம் இருந்து நான் வாங்கினேன். சீணன் எனது மாமனார் அவரிடமிருந்து தான் நான் 24.11.2008-ல் 2-1/2 ஏக்கர் சொத்து வாங்கினேன். எனது மாமனாரின் தகப்பனார் பெயர் துரைசாமி ஆகும். துரைசாமிக்கு 5 ஆண் பிள்ளைகள், ஒரு பெண் பிள்ளை என்றால் சரிதான். சீணன் மூத்த அண்ணன் பெயர் காசி. அவரது இரண்டாவது அண்ணன் பெயர் சின்னதுரை, மூன்றாவது அண்ணன் சுப்பிரமணி, நான்காவது அண்ணன் கோவிந்தசாமி, ஐந்தாவது எனது அம்மா காந்தம்மாள் கடைசியாக தான் எனது மாமனார் சீணன். தாய் மாமா காசிக்கு ஒரே ஒரு பையன் அவர் பெயர் சுந்தரம். அவர் இந்த வழக்கில் 2வது பிரதிவாதி. எனது அம்மா உடன்பிறந்த சகோதரர் தான் முதல் பிரதிவாதி. மூன்றாவது பிரதிவாதி எனது அம்மா."

On perusing the deposition of PW1 he clearly deposed that he purchased property from his father in law Seenan. While the plaintiff disclosed the relationship between the plaintiff and defendants by stating that the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant is his mother, the 1<sup>st</sup> defendant is the uncle of plaintiff and the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant is the son of plaintiff uncle Kasi and the said Seenan is the father in law of plaintiff and brother of 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> defendants. But the defendants not specifically denied the relationship of plaintiff and defendants. The defendants not extracted contrary evidence in respect of the title and possession of suit property by cross examination.

6.6. On plaintiff side one Chandran examined as PW2 and he deposed that the Seenan sold the suit property infavour of the plaintiff and the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the same. The said PW2 cross examined by the defendants side, the relevant portion of his deposition is extracted here below,

*'தாவா சொத்து சீணனுக்கு எப்படி வந்தது என்றால் பூர்வீக சொத்து என்பதால் அவருக்கு பாகப்பிரிவினைப்படி பாத்தியப்பட்டதாகும். சீணனுக்கு, சீனிவாசனுக்கு என்று முன்னோர்கள் வைத்த பெயர் தெரியுமா என்றால் தெரியும் ஆனால் அவர் சீணன் என்று தான் கையொப்பமிடுவார்.'*

It is further submit that the plaintiff also examined one Vijaybarath on behalf of the Gudiyattam Tahsildar as PW3. Through him Ex.C1 to Ex.C7 are marked. The relevant portion of his chief examination is extracted here below,

*'சர்வே எண்.12எ/1 உண்டாக சிட்டா 1984-ல் இருந்து 2013 வரை துரைசாமி மகன் சீணன் என்பவர்கள் பெயரில் இருந்தது. தற்போது சர்வே எண்.12எ/1எ சிட்டா முனிரத்தினம் பெயரில் உள்ளது. பட்டா சர்வே எண்.12எ/1 1997-ல் இருந்து 2013 வரை துரைசாமி மகன் சீணன் என்பவர் பெயரில் உள்ளது. பட்டா எண்.166 சர்வே எண்.12எ/1 2000 முதல் 2001 வரை துரைசாமி கவுண்டர் மகன் சீணன் என்பவர் பெயரில் உள்ளது. 04.11.2009 முதல் பட்டா எண்.166 சர்வே எண்.12எ/1 ராஜாகவுண்டர் மகன் முனிரத்தினம் என்பவரது பெயரில் உள்ளது. 16.12.2013 முதல் பட்டா எண்.166 சர்வே எண்.12எ/1-ல் இருந்து சர்வே எண்.12எ/1எ, சர்வே எண்.12எ/1பி, சர்வே எண்.12எ/1சி ஆக பிரிக்கப்பட்டது. சர்வே எண்.12எ/1எ பரப்பு 70.5 ஏர்ஸ், பட்டா எண்.166 ராஜாகவுண்டர் மகன் முனித்தினம் என்பவர் பெயரில் உள்ளது.'*

The PW3 also specifically deposed that adangal for the year 2008 to 2009 stands in the name of Seenan, from 16.12.2013 to 2016 the S.No.12A/1A stands in the name of Munirathinam. He further deposed that A Register for the S.No.12A/1 from 1984 to 2013 stands in the name of

Seenan from 16.12.2013 to 2017 stands in the name of Munirathinam in respect of S.No.12A/1A. On considering the deposition of PW3 he clearly deposed that the revenue records namely patta, chitta, adangal and A register in respect of suit S.No.12A/1 stands in the name of Seenan from the year 1984 and subsequently transferred in the name of Munirathinam (plaintiff), Kirubakaran and Saraswathi. At the time of cross examination by the defendants counsel no contrary evidence in respect of revenue records is extracted. On perusing the Ex.C1 to Ex.C7 documents, in that the Ex.C3 chitta stands in the name of plaintiff Munirathinam from 04.11.2009. On perusing the Ex.C5 is also shows that S.No.12A/1A stands in the name of Munirathinam and Saraswathi. On perusing the Ex.C6 adangal from the year 2008 clearly shows that S.No.12A/1 stands in the name of Seenan alone and from 04.11.2009 the adangal for the suit property stands in the name of plaintiff Munirathinam till 2022. The Ex.C7 is the A register copy. On perusal from initially it is stands in the name of Seenan and subsequently transferred in the name of Munirathinam and Saraswathi. On perusing the evidence of PW3 and Ex.C1 to Ex.C7 it is clearly proved that the suit S.No.12A/1 stands in the name of Seenan from 1984 and after the purchase of plaintiff on 24.11.2008 the revenue records in respect of suit property transferred in the name of plaintiff Munirathinam.

6.7. For disprove the plaintiff case the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant Sundaram examined himself as DW1 and chief examined and deposed as pleaded in the written statement. In particularly the DW1 deposed that they are in

possession and enjoyment of the property allotted to the Seenan. Through him Ex.B2 to Ex.B9 are marked. The DW1 cross examined by the plaintiff counsel and the relevant portion of his deposition in cross examination is extracted here below,

'சீணன் (எ) சீனிவாசன் 22.12.2016 அன்று இறந்துவிட்டார். சீணன் (எ) சீனிவாசன் எனது சித்தப்பா. சீணனின் வாரிசு சான்றிதழ் யார் யார் பெயர்கள் உள்ளது என்று தெரியுமா என்றால் எனக்கு ஞாபகமில்லை. வா.சா.ஆ.10 சீணன் (எ) சீனிவாசனின் வாரிசு சான்றிதழில் உஷா மகள் என்று குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். உஷாவின் கணவர் தான் வாதி என்றால் சரிதான். வா.சா.ஆ.10 தாக்கல் செய்தபின்பு தான் சீணனின் வாரிசு உஷா என்று தெரியவந்தது, வா.சா.ஆ.10 வாரிசு சான்றிதழில் சீணன் லேட்.துரைசாமி மகன் 22.12.2016 அன்று இறந்ததாக குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். இதில் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ள துரைசாமியின் மகன் சீணன் எனது சித்தப்பா என்றால் சரியல்ல. சீனிவாசன் தான் எனது சித்தப்பா. எனது சித்தப்பா சீனிவாசனின் இறப்பு சான்றிதழ் உள்ளதா என்றால் உள்ளது அதை நீதிமன்றத்தில் தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளேன். நான் சொல்வதுபோல் சீனிவாசனின் இறப்பு சான்றிதழ் தாக்கல் செய்யவில்லை என்றாலும் இவ்வழக்கிற்காக தாக்கல் செய்தேன் என்று பொய்யாக சாட்சியம் அளிக்கிறேன் என்றால் சரியல்ல. நான் தான் எனது சித்தப்பா சீனிவாசனின் இரண்டாம் நிலை வாரிசு என்பதை நிரூபணம் செய்வதற்காக ஏதேனும் ஆவணம் நீதிமன்றத்தில் தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளேனா என்றால் இல்லை. வா.சா.ஆ.3 முதல் விசாரணையில் 1984-ல் இருந்து 2013 வரை சர்வே எண்.12/எ1-க்கு சம்மந்தப்பட்ட ஆவணங்கள் சீணன் பெயரில் உள்ளதாக சாட்சியம் அளித்துள்ளார்கள் என்றால் சரிதான். எனது சித்தப்பா இறந்தபின்பு வாதி தாக்கல் செய்த இந்த வழக்கிற்கு பின்னிட்டு சீணன் வாதிக்கு எழுதிக்கொடுத்த வா.சா.ஆ.2 கிரயப்பத்திரத்தை ரத்து செய்யும்படி ஏதேனும் வழக்கு தாக்கல் செய்துள்ளேனா என்றால் இல்லை. பி.சா.ஆ.9 வில்லங்க சான்றிதழில் 24.11.2008 சீணன் முனிரத்தினத்திற்கு எழுதி வைத்துள்ள விவரம் அதில் குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது என்றால் சரிதான். வாதி என்னுடைய மச்சான் அவருடைய தங்கையை நான் திருமணம் செய்துள்ளேன். வாதியின் தாயார் எனது அப்பாவுடன் பிறந்த தங்கை."

On perusing the evidence of DW1 he himself admitted that Seenan @ Srinivasan is his fathers younger brother and the plaintiffs wife Usha is shown as Seenans legal heir in Ex.A10 legal heir certificate. More

particularly the Dw1 deposed that he is married the sister of plaintiff Munirathinam. On that he admitted the relationship between the plaintiff. While the plaintiff plead and proved that deceased Seenan is his uncle and the DW1 also admitted that the said Seenan @ Srinivasan is his fathers younger brother, on that the plaintiff proved his case that the said Seenan and the Srinivasan are same persons. The DW1 also given contrary evidence regarding the identification of deceased Seenan in Ex.A2 sale deed and intentionally escaped from identifying the deceased Seenan in Ex.A6 and Ex.A7. The attitude of DW1 is clearly shows that he intentionally evaded from denying the identification of deceased Seenan and he failed to file documents to prove the death of alleged Srinivasan.

**6.8.** It is further submit that the defendants also examined one Ramesh as DW2 in his chief examination he does not adduce any evidence to prove the defendants case but at the time of cross examination by plaintiff side he deposed that adangal for S.No.12/1A for fasali 1418 stands in the name of Seenan, from fasali 1419 adangal stands in the name of Munirathinam. On that through DW2 the plaintiff once again proved his possession of suit property. One Saravanan also examined as DW3 by defendants side through him Ex.X1 to Ex.X5 are marked. In his chief examination he deposed that through partition deed vide Doc.No.318/965 properties partition between Kasinatha Gounder, Chinnadurai Gounder, Subramani, Govindasamy, Srinivasan and Kaliyammal, In that document E schedule property allotted to Srinivasan. At that time of cross examination the DW3 deposed that no identity card would be received at

the time of executing the Ex.X1 to Ex.X3. Without identity card the other names of Srinivasan will not be known. On defendants side through DW3 they tried to prove that revenue records only stands in the name of Srinivasan and partition deed also executed in the name of Srinivasan alone. But on perusing the Ex.X1 to Ex.X4 those are the deeds executed by the parties, for proving the identity of said Srinivasan no document is filed by the defendants. The defendant also failed to prove that the alleged Seenan is not the Srinivasan mentioned in the Ex.X1 to Ex.X4. The defendants failed to prove that the name of Srinivasan only mentioned in the revenue records.

**6.9.** It is further submit that while the defendant specifically pleaded that his uncle Srinivasan is died without marriage on 22.12.2016 leaving behind his brother and sisters are the 2<sup>nd</sup> class heirs and the plaintiffs created the sale deed dated 24.11.2008 as executed by Seenan then the burden upon the defendants to prove the same by adducing necessary documents and examining witnesses. But the defendants failed to file death certificate of said Srinivasan and failed to prove that he died without marriage. While the defendants claiming title over the suit property as 2<sup>nd</sup> class legal heirs but they failed to file document to prove that they are the 2<sup>nd</sup> class legal heirs of said person. Even the DW1 himself admitted that "வா.சா.ஆ.10 தாக்கல் செய்த பின்பு தான் சீணனின் வாரிசு உஷா என்று தெரியவந்தது". On that the DW1 accepting the legal heir certificate hence the 1<sup>st</sup> class legal heir Usha having more interest than the 2<sup>nd</sup> class legal heirs. On that defendants does not having any right over the suit property. It is further submitted that on considering the evidence of

PW3 and Ex.C1 to Ex.C7 documents it is clearly proved that after purchase of suit property on 24.11.2008 the revenue records transferred in the name of plaintiff from in the year 2009 itself. While so the said Seenan @ Srinivasan only died on 12.02.2016 till his lifetime the said person was not taken any steps to challenge the revenue records. The defendants without challenging the revenue records, sale deeds and legal heirs certificate they have no right to question the title of plaintiff by mere averments. The defendants failed to prove that the alleged sale deed is created one and failed to disprove the execution of registered sale deed. The defendants failed to plead and prove better title and possession to disprove the plaintiff case.

**6.10.** As already discussed above the plaintiff through PW1 to PW3 and by marking of Ex.A1 to Ex.A10 and Ex.C1 to Ex.C7 clearly proved his title, possession and enjoyment of the suit property even particularly the existence of one Seenan. On perusal it is came to know that due to personal dispute with in the relations the title of plaintiff is denied and his possession is interfered by the defendants. Hence it is necessary to grant injunction to safeguard the interest of plaintiff in respect of the suit property. Accordingly the issues 1 and 2 decided infavour of the plaintiff.

**7. Issue No.3:-** To what other reliefs entitled ?

Since the issue No.1 and 2 decided infavour of the plaintiff then on considering the nature of the suit the plaintiff is not entitled for any other relief.



Ex.A5	13.07.2017	Reply Notice sent by the plaintiff
Ex.A6	-	Xerox copy of the Aadhar card of Seenan
Ex.A7	-	Xerox copy of the Voter ID card of Seenan
Ex.A8	-	Xerox copy of the Bank Passbook of Seenan
Ex.A9	-	Seenan's Notebook for Treatment at the Kanchipuram A.A.M.C.H & RCC Government Hospital
Ex.A10	-	Certified copy of Legal heir certificate of Seenan

**Defendants side witnesses:-**

DW1	Sundaram
DW2	Ramesh
DW3	Saravanan

**Defendants side Exhibits :-**

Ex.B1	-	Xerox copy of the High Court order copy
Ex.B2	01.12.1965	Certified copy of partition deed (Doc.No.318/1965)
Ex.B3	11.10.1966	Certified copy of sale deed (Doc.No.3470/1966)
Ex.B4	06.10.1971	Original Partition deed (Doc.No.4191/1971)
Ex.B5	31.07.1974	Patta Passbook No.605 stands in the name of Srinivasan
Ex.B6	29.04.1987	Patta Passbook No.171 stands in the name of Srinivasan
Ex.B7	16.10.1987	Attachment Notice

- Ex.B8 - Online copy of Encumbrance certificate  
01.07.1975 – 06.09.2018
- Ex.B9 - Online copy of Encumbrance certificate  
01.07.1975 – 03.03.2020

**Court Exhibits:-**

- Ex.C1 - Authorization Letter
- Ex.C2 - Certified copy of the Manual Chitta
- Ex.C3 - Certified copy of the Computer Chitta
- Ex.C4 - Certified copy of the Computer Chitta
- Ex.C5 - Certified copy of the Tamil Nilam Chitta
- Ex.C6 - Certified copy of Adangal
- Ex.C7 - Certified copy of A Register
- Ex.C8 - Authorization letter given by the Tahsildar to  
VAO Melmuttukur Village
- Ex.C9 - Certified copy of the Adangal & Fasali
- Ex.C10 - Authorization Letter

**Other Exhibits:-**

- Ex.X1 01.02.1965 Registered Partition deed (Doc.No.318/1965)
- Ex.X2 09.10.1996 Registered Sale deed (Doc.No.3470/1996)
- Ex.X3 06.10.1971 Registered Sale deed (Doc.No.4191/1971)
- Ex.X4 - Attachment summon in EP.302/87 copy of the  
District Munsif Court, Gudiyattam.

Ex.X5 - Encumbrance Certificate  
Ex.X6 - Encumbrance Certificate

Sd/- K.Karthick Asath,  
**District Munsif,**  
**Gudiyattam.**