

**IN THE COURT OF THE I ADDITIONAL SUBORDINATE JUDGE,
VILLUPURAM.**

PRESENT : Tmt.M.S.Varalakshmi, B.A., B.L.,

I Additional Subordinate Judge, Villupuram

Monday the 23rd day of March 2026

O.S. No.88/2013

(CNR No.TNVP02-000645-2013)

Hemamalini

.....

Plaintiff

//Vs//

1. K. Rajangam (Died)
2. K. Krishnan
3. Rajeswari
4. K. Srinivasan (Died)
5. S. Sathish
6. N. LakshmiNarayanan
7. K. Boopalan (Died)
8. M. Kannan
9. Kasthuri ammal
10. R. Thirumurugan
11. R. Jayamurthy
12. R. Vanamurali
13. B. Murugan
14. B. Muthukrishnan
15. Krishnaveni
16. Babu
17. Prabu
18. Shanthi
19. Vasanthi
20. Ananthi
21. S. Sulochana
22. S. Sathish
23. S. Suganthi

.....

Defendants

(After filing the suit, the 7th defendant died and his legal heirs were added as 13 and 14th defendants as per Order in IA.472/2014 dated 07.08.2017 and the 1st defendant died and his legal heirs were added as 15 to 20 defendants as per Order in IA.408/2022 dated 15.09.2022 and the 4th defendant died and his legal heirs were added as 21 to 23 defendants as per Order in IA.17/2025 dated 12.06.2025)

This suit is filed on 25.03.2013, 01.04.2013 and taken on file on 01.04.2013 and coming on 16.03.2026 for final hearing before me in the presence of Mr.K.S.Subramanian, Counsel for plaintiff and Mr.C.K.Desinguraja, Counsel for defendant no.6 and the defendants no.2, 3, 5, 8 to 15, 17 to 23 called absent and set exparte and the suit against defendant no.16 given up and the defendants no.1, 4 and 7 died and heard both side and perused the case records and stood over for consideration till this date before this Court, this court delivers the following.....

JUDGMENT

This suit is filed to pass a decree and judgment in favour of plaintiff by declaring that the plaintiff is the vested remainder holder in respect of all the suit properties and granting a permanent injunction restraining the 2nd defendant from alienating the suit properties further and directing the defendants to pay the costs of the suit.

2. The amended plaint averments in brief is as follows:-

The suit properties described in the schedule hereunder originally belonged to Kesava Kounder the paternal grandfather of the plaintiff and the said Kesava Kounder had four sons by names, Rajangam, Srinivasan, Krishnan and Semmaneri Kounder and the said Kesava Kounder even during his life time executed four settlement deeds in favour of his four sons on 14-12-1954 separately and settled the properties to them to be enjoyed by them for their life time and the vested remainder to their male heirs and one such settlement deed was executed by Kesava Kounder in favour of his son Krishna Kounder, the 2nd defendant on 14-12-1954 (the father of the plaintiff) and the registration copy of the settlement deed is produced and as per the terms of the settlement deed the 2nd defendant was only allowed to enjoy the suit properties for his lifetime and without any power of alienation and after him his male heirs should take the properties absolutely and settlement deed is silent and failed to state that in the absence of male heirs who should take the properties and therefore

the condition is "ambiguous" and therefore the intention of the settlor Viz. Kesava Kounder has to be looked into or to be ascertained by reading of the document as a whole and if there is any ambiguity, the circumstances under which the document came to be executed and also if necessary to the subsequent conduct of the parties which might throw some light on the intention of the settlor and she is the only daughter born to the 2nd defendant and the 3rd defendant and therefore taking into consideration of the terms of the settlement deed and the intention of the settlor, though the settlement states that the vested remainder should be taken by the male heirs, there is nothing to state what if there are no male heirs born to Krishna Kounder and therefore it should be only construed that if there are no male heirs, then the female heirs should take the properties absolutely and therefore as envisaged by the various judgments by various High Courts, it should read only "subsequent interest to take effect upon failure of prior interest" and at the instigation of the 1st defendant, the 2nd defendant, her father taking advantage of the absence of the further option in the settlement deed, has been going on selling the properties without providing anything for the plaintiff and the 3rd defendant, her mother and the plaintiff cannot be deprived of her rights in the properties of her grandfather Kesava Kounder and apart from the fact that the 2nd defendant is an addict to alcoholic drinks and spending the sale proceeds lavishly for his sole enjoyment and comforts without providing anything for the plaintiff and her mother and he is only a puppet in the hands of his elder brother the 1st defendant who is going on misleading and mismanaging the properties of the 2nd defendant under the pretext that he is the eldest son of the family and as such everybody should obey him in an authoritative manner and in fact sold some of the properties given to the 2nd defendant under the settlement deed and the 2nd defendant has already subdued by the 1st defendant and he cannot be allowed to sell the properties indiscriminately without following the directions given under the settlement deed and the plaintiff and her mother have been kept in lurch and uncared for by the 2nd defendant and the Plaintiff and her mother are being taken

care of by the maternal uncle of the plaintiff Mr. Ramadoss at Pondicherry and in fact the maternal uncle educated the plaintiff and made her ways to earn some money for her livelihood and as a daughter of Krishna Kounder the 2nd defendant herein and as the granddaughter of Kesava kounder, the plaintiff is entitled to have the right to succeed to the properties as a vetted remainder holder and the vested remainder holder entitled to the suit properties as per the intention of the settlor Kesava Kounder in the settlement deed dated 14-12-1954 and for permanent injunction restraining the 2nd defendant from alienating the properties further and the 2nd defendant lately realized that the plaintiff is the vested remainder holder and thereafter on 26-11-2007 the plaintiff along with defendants 2 and 3 executed a sale deed in favour one Murugan and Muthukrishnan in respect of the 1st item of suit property and as such she is not havinit any claim in respect of the 1 item of the suit property and as far as the 2nd item of the suit property is concerned, the 2nd defendant has sold the property to the 6th defendant N. Lakshminarayanan on 09-03-2009 and hence the 6th defendant is impleaded as a party to the suit and again on 11-03 2011 the 2nd defendant who has no right at all to alienate the suit properties executed a sale deed in favour of the 6th defendant in respect of the suit 3rd item and hence he is impleaded as a party to the suit and the 2nd defendant has sold the properties items 5 to 8 to the 6th defendant on 28-12-2012 and hence the 6th defendant is impleaded in the suit to have proper adjudication and the defendants 2, 4 and 5 have sold the suit 9th item to the 9th defendant on 29-12-1990 and hence impleaded as parties to the suit and the first defendant who has not been given any right in the suit item No.11 has sold the property S.No. 281/1 Ac. 0.32 to the defendants 10 to 12 on 23-08-1999 and thus appropriated the entire sale proceeds for himself and hence the defendants 10 to 12 are impleaded as parties to the suit and on 19-04-1989 the plaintiff's father Krishnan the 2nd defendant herein along with the 1st defendant executed a sale deed in favour of the 8th defendant in respect of the 12th item of the suit property and hence the 8th defendant is impleaded in the suit as defendant and not content with the alienations

and almost depleted the holdings, the 2nd defendant also executed a settlement deed on 04-01-2013 in favour of the mother of the plaintiff in respect of the 13th item of the suit property in which the 2nd defendant has no right of alienation and hence the plaintiff has impleaded her mother as 3rd defendant in the suit and the alienations made by the defendants 1 and 2 in favour of the other defendants are not valid for the reason that Kesava Kounder, the grandfather of the plaintiff has given only a life interest to the 2nd defendant in the settlement deed and therefore the alienations made by the defendants 1 and 2 will not bind the plaintiff and the alienations made by the 1 and 2 defendants will not clothe the defendants 3 to 10 with any right or title and the 3rd defendant and defendants 6 to 10 will not get any valid title to the suit properties and all the transactions will become non-est in the eye of law and the 7th defendant died leaving behind the defendants 13 and 14 to succeed him and hence they are impleaded as parties to the suit to have proper adjudication and the 1st defendant died leaving behind the defendants 15 and 20 to succeed him and hence they are impleaded as parties to the suit to have proper adjudication and the 4th defendant died leaving behind the defendants 21 and 23 to succeed him and hence they are impleaded as parties to the suit to have proper adjudication.

3. The written statement averments of defendant no.6 in brief is as follows :-

The suit filed by the plaintiff for declaration that she is the vested remainder holder in respect of the suit properties and for permanent injunction restraining the 2nd defendant from alienating the suit properties further is neither just nor proper and the same is liable to be dismissed in limine and it is true that the suit properties originally belonged to Kesava Konder the paternal grandfather of the plaintiff and it is also true that the said Kesava Founder had four sons by names, Rajangam, Srinivasan, Krishnan and Semmaneri Kounder and it is true that the said Kesava Kounder even during his life time executed four settlement deeds in favour of his four sons on 14.12.1954 separately and settled the properties to them to be enjoyed

by them for their life time and the vested remainder to their male heirs and it is true that the settlement deed was executed by Kesava Kounder in favour of his son Krishna kounder the 2nd defendant herein on 14.12.1954 (the father of the plaintiff) and the allegations in the plaint that as per the terms of the settlement deed, the 2nd defendant was only allowed to enjoy the suit properties for his lifetime and without any power of alienation and after him his male heirs should take the properties absolutely that settlement deed is silent and failed to state that in the absence of male heirs who should take the properties and therefore the condition is "ambiguous" that the intention of the settlor viz. Kesava Kounder has to be looked into or to be ascertained by reading of the document as a whole and if there is any ambiguity, the circumstances under which the document came to be executed and also if necessary to the subsequent conduct of the parties which might throw some light on the intention of the settlor are all not correct and specifically denied by the 6th defendant and the plaintiff is put to strict proof that she is only daughter born to the 2nd defendant and the 3rd defendant and the allegations in the plaint that the terms of the settlement deed and the intention of the settlor, though the settlement states that the vested remainder should be taken by the male heirs, there is nothing to state what if there are no male heirs, then the female heirs should take the properties absolutely and therefore as envisaged by the various judgments by various High Courts, it should read only "subsequent interest to take effect upon failure of prior interest" are all not true and specifically denied by the 6th defendant and it is not true to state that at the instigation of the 1st defendant, the 2nd defendant, her father taking advantage of the absence of the further option in the settlement deed, has been going on selling the properties without providing anything for the plaintiff and the 3rd defendant her mother and the allegations in the plaint that the plaintiff cannot be deprived of her rights in the properties of her grand father Kesava Kounder that the 2nd defendant is an addict to alcoholic drinks and spending the sale proceeds lavishly for his sole enjoyment and comforts without providing anything for the plaintiff and her mother

that the 2nd defendant is only a puppet in the hands of his elder brother the 1st defendant herein who is going on misleading and mismanaging the properties of the 2nd defendant under the pretext that he is the eldest son of the family and as such everybody should obey him, should act as directed by him and no questions to be asked that the 1st defendant is only acting in an authoritative manner and in fact sold some of the properties given to the 2nd defendant under the settlement deed and that the 2nd defendant has already subordinated by the 1st defendant and he cannot be allowed to sell the properties indiscriminately without following the directions given under the settlement deed are all not true and specifically denied by the 6th defendant and the plaintiff is put to strict proof that she and her mother have been kept in lurch and uncared for by the 2nd defendant, plaintiff and her mother are being taken care of by the maternal uncle of the plaintiff Mr. Ramadoss at Pondicherry and in fact the maternal uncle educated the plaintiff and made her ways to earn some money for her livelihood and the allegations in the plaint that as a daughter of Krishna Kounder the 2nd defendant herein and as the grand-daughter of Kesava Kounder, the plaintiff is entitled to have the right to succeed to the properties as a vested remainder holder is not true and specifically denied by the 6th defendant and the allegations in the plaint that the alienations made by the defendants 1 and 2 in favour of the other defendants are not valid for the reason that Kesava Kounder, the grand father of the plaintiff has given only a life interest to the 2nd defendant in the settlement deed and therefore the alienations made by the defendants 1 and 2 will not bind the plaintiff that the alienations made by the 1 and 2 defendants will not clothe the defendants 3 to 10 with any right or title and that the 3rd defendant and defendants 6 to 10 will not get any valid title to the suit properties and all the transactions will become not-est in the eye of law are all not true and specifically denied by 6th defendant and the 2nd defendant had been in possession and enjoyment of the properties in pursuance of the settlement deed dated 14.12.1954 and it is represented by the 2nd defendant that he is the absolute owner of the suit properties since he had no male issues and the 3rd

defendant had been living in her parents house at Pondicherry inception of marriage and she may visit to Vadakuchipalayam since from the once in six months for some years and thereafter she had deserted her husband namely 2nd defendant and lived at Pondicherry along with her daughter namely plaintiff and the 6th defendant had purchased the suit 2nd item under a registered sale deed dated 09.03.2009 for valuable consideration executed by the 2nd defendant for renovation of house, for educational expenses of the plaintiff and also for family expenses and that 6th defendant has been in possession and enjoyment of the said property and the 6th defendant had purchased the suit 3rd item under a registered sale deed dated 11.3.2011 for valuable consideration executed by the 2nd defendant and that 6th defendant has been in possession and enjoyment of the said item and the 6th defendant had purchased the suit items 5 to 8 for valuable consideration under a registered sale deed dated 28.12.2012 to meet out family expenses and that 6th defendant has been in possession and enjoyment of the said items and he has purchased an extent of 0.05.875 cents with 2/4th share in the well situated in Survey No.172/1, the agricultural service connection, 5 H.P. electric motor and pumpset and also 2/4th right to take water in the well from the defendants 1 and 2 under a registered sale deed dated 05.01.2011 for valuable consideration and that 6th defendant had been in possession and enjoyment of the same and the plaintiff has no right in the suit properties and that her father 2nd defendant alone is entitled to the suit properties absolutely and he had become the absolute owner of the properties purchased by him and that he has been in possession and enjoyment of the same and the plaintiff has no locus standi to file the suit and the plaintiff has no cause of action to file the suit and the alleged cause of action is false and the suit as framed is not maintainable in law and the suit is not properly valued for the purposes of Court fees and jurisdiction and the 6th Defendant specifically denies all the allegations in the plaint except those that are admitted herein and the 6th defendant therefore prays that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to dismiss the suit with costs.

4. After service of summon, the defendants no.3 to 5 called absent and set exparte on 07.06.2023. After service of summon, the defendants no.2, 8 to 12 appeared through Advocate and then they called absent and set exparte on 06.03.2018. After service of summon, the defendnats no.13, 14, 15, 17 to 20 called absent and set exparte on 05.01.2023. The suit against defendant no.16 was given up on 18.02.2025. After service of summon, the defendants no.21 to 23 called absent and set exparte on 25.10.2025. The defendants no.1, 4 and 7 died.

5. Issues :-

Based upon the pleadings the followings issues are framed on 06.08.2021 for trial.

1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of Declaration to declare that she is the vested remainder holder in respect of all suit schedule properties as sought for ?
2. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief of permanent injunction restraining 2nd defendant from alienating the suit properties further ?
3. Whether the suit is maintainable or not ?
4. To what other relief ?

6. On the side of the plaintiff, the plaintiff is examined herself as PW1 and marked Ex.A1. No further plaintiff side witness is examined. The plaintiff side evidence is closed. Though opportunity given, 6th defendant not produced any evidence and the defendant side evidence. Available case records are perused.

7. Issue No. 1 to 3 :-

The plaintiff filed the present suit for the relief of declaration to declare that the plaintiff is having the vested remainder holder right in respect of all the suit properties. To prove her contention, the plaintiff herein had stated that the suit

properties were originally belonged to one Kesavan, the paternal grandfather of the plaintiff. The said Kesavan had four sons by name, Rajangam, Srinivasan, Krishnan and Semmaneri. The said Kesavan during his life time executed four settlement deeds in favour of his four sons on 14-12-1954 respectively and settled the properties to them with the condition that they had to be enjoyed by them for their life time and raised the vested remainder to their male heirs and one such settlement deed was executed by Kesavan in favour of his son Krishnan namely the plaintiff's father, the 2nd defendant on 14-12-1954. The certified copy of the settlement deed is marked as Ex.A1. Other 4 settlement deeds have been executed by the Kesavan in favour of his 3 other sons were not filed by the plaintiff. However, those documents were not disputed in this present suit.

8. On perusal of Ex.A1, it was dated 14.12.1954 executed by one Kesavan in favour of his 5 years old son by appointing himself as guardian of the minor son. The recitals in the documents runs as follows :-

“4வது குமாரர் உன் பெயரில் எனக்கு உள்ள அன்பினாலும் பிரியத்தினாலும் எனக்கு பிறகு என சொத்துக்களும் நீயும் உன் சகோதரர்களும் பிரித்துக்கொள்வதில் சச்சரவு ஏற்படாமல் இருக்கும் பொருட்டு எனக்கு எனக்கு சுயாஜித பாத்தியமான ரூ.5,000/- மதிப்புள்ள இதனடியில் கண்ட சொத்துக்களை இதன் மூலமாய் தான செட்டில்மெண்ட் செய்து மேற்படி சொத்துக்களையும் இன்னும் உன் சுவாதீனம் ஒப்புக்கொடுத்திருப்பதுடன் பட்டாவும் இன்று உன் பேரில் மாற்றிக்கொடுத்திருப்பதால் நீ மேஜராகும் வரையில் கார்டியன் பொருப்பில் சொத்துக்களை நான் பரிபாலித்து வந்து மேஜரானதும் உன்னிடம் ஒப்புக்கொடுத்து விடுகிறேன். இந்த சொத்துக்கள் பராதீனம் ஆக்காமல் நீண்ட காலத்திற்கு நீ வாரிசுகளுடன் அனுபவிக்க வேண்டும் என்ற நல்ல எண்ணத்துடன் நான் எழுதி வைத்திருப்பதால் நீ எவ்வித பராதீனமும் செய்யாமல் அனுபவித்து வந்து பிறகு உன் ஆண் சந்ததிகள் இதன் அடியில் கண்ட சொத்துக்களை சம பாகமாய் சர்வ சுதந்திரமாய் அனுபவித்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும்”

9. On perusal of Ex.A1, the suit mentioned survey number has been stated. On perusal of above recitals in the Ex.A1 only lifetime enjoyment has been given by Kesavan to his son Krishnan. Whereas the unconditional enjoyment (i.e.) to sell and other encumbrance could be made by male legal heirs of the said Krishnan. The plaintiff further stated as per the terms of the settlement deed namely Ex.A1, the 2nd defendant herein has enjoyed only the properties mentioned in the Ex.A1. He has no power to alienate or to make any encumbrance over the suit properties.

10. The plaintiff further stated that the settlement deed is silent and failed to state that in the absence of male legal heirs who should take the properties thereby the condition implies in Ex.A1 is ambiguous as such the intention of the settlor namely the Kesavan has to be looked into or to be ascertained by reading of the document as a whole and if there is any ambiguity, the circumstances under which the document came to be executed and also if necessary to the subsequent conduct of the parties which might throw some light on the intention of the settlor.

11. Admittedly the plaintiff is the only daughter of the 2nd defendant. The 2nd defendant has no male legal heirs. In order to add support to his contention the plaintiff counsel has relied on the decision rendered by the Hon'ble High court of Madras in the case of S. Narayana Doss Vs. Arumugathammal (1962(1)MLJ 401 and Ratnam Pillai Vs. Ganapathi Subramaniya Aiyar (1952 (2) MLJ 679).

12. After the perusal of the above rulings and also the case in the hand, the intention of the settlor is that his son to enjoy his properties in his lifetime. After the life time of Krishnan, the same has to be enjoyed absolutely by Kesavan

grand children. However, the words included in the Ex.A1 is the male heir. In the absence of male heir, the female legal heir is having the absolute right over the suit properties after the lifetime of the Krishnan. The learned counsel appearing for the plaintiff has also cited the Section 88 of Indian Succession Act of 1925 as follows :-

“88. The last of two inconsistent clauses prevails.

Where two clauses of gifts in a will are irreconcilable, so that they cannot possibly stand together, the last shall prevail.

Illustrations

(i) The testator by the first clause of his will leaves his estate of Ramnagar "to A," and by the last clause of his will leaves it "to B and not to A". B will have it.

(ii) If a man, at the commencement of his will gives his house to A, and at the close of it directs that his house shall be sold and the proceeds invested for the benefit of B, the latter disposition will prevail.”

13. In view of the above section, the learned counsel had stated that the intention of the settlor has to be taken into consideration as such the intention of the settlor is to give his properties to his grand children and the grand children has to enjoy the properties absolutely. On perusal of Ex.A1, it clearly emphasized that only lifetime estate is given to the 2nd defendant (i.e.) only lifetime enjoyment is given to the 2nd defendant and the absolute right has been given to the grand children probably the male legal heirs. At present the 2nd defendant has no male legal heirs thereby the plaintiff is having the right over the suit property after the lifetime of the said Krishnan.

14. The 6th defendant alone filed written statement by admitting the settlement deed executed by Kesavan in favour of his four sons and also Ex.A1. The 6th defendant denied the fact that after the lifetime of the 2nd defendant, the

plaintiff is having the absolute right over the suit properties and further stated that the plaintiff has to prove the fact that she is the only daughter born to the 2nd defendant and 3rd defendant for which the plaintiff has not filed any documents to prove the same. The 6th defendant further stated that the 6th defendant purchased the 2nd item of the suit schedule mentioned property by means of registered sale deed dated 09.03.2009 for valuable consideration executed by 2nd defendant for renovation of his house and for educational expenses of plaintiff and also for family expenses. Therefore the 6th defendant has been in possession and enjoyment of the 2nd item of the suit schedule mentioned property. The 6th defendant further added that he purchased the 3rd item of the suit schedule mentioned property on 11.03.2011 and item no.5 to 8 of the suit schedule mentioned property on 28.12.2012 and also the 2/4th right to take water in the Well by means of the registered sale deed dated 05.01.2011. All the above said sale deeds were executed for the valuable consideration and they were properly registered. After the purchase of the same, the 6th defendant have been in possession and enjoyment of the same.

15. The 6th defendant filed the written statement stated the fact that he is the bonafide purchaser for value of the suit property. However on perusal of present suit the plaintiff has not sought the relief of declaration that the sale deed executed by the 2nd defendant in favour of other defendant with respect to the suit properties is void and not binding on the plaintiff. The plaintiff has not valued the suit property for the above prayer and paid the Court fee. In order to support to her contention the plaintiff counsel has relied on the decision rendered by the Hon'ble High court of Madras in the case of Ratnam Pillai Vs. Ganapathi Subramaniya Aiyar (1952 (2) MLJ 679). On perusal the same is not related to this case.

16. The 6th defendant denied the fact that the plaintiff has right in the suit property. As per the case of the 6th defendant, the 2nd defendant is having the absolute right over the suit property as such he purchased the suit property from the 2nd defendant and the same is valid and it binds over the plaintiff and the plaintiff have no locus standi to file this suit. As per the case of the plaintiff, the 2nd defendant and the 3rd defendant is still alive. During the lifetime of the 2nd defendant, the 2nd defendant is having the lifetime enjoyment over the suit property and not the absolute enjoyment over the suit property. However, the plaintiff herein has not filed any documents to prove the fact that she is the only legal heir of the 2nd and 3rd defendant. The 2nd defendant during the lifetime may adopt the son to enjoy the properties given under Ex.A1. During the lifetime of the 2nd defendant, the plaintiff is not having any right over the suit property. After the lifetime of the suit property if the plaintiff is the only legal heir of the 2nd defendant she is having the vested remainder right in respect of all the suit properties. At present it could not be decided due to the change of circumstances that might be taken place between the legal heirs status of plaintiff, the 2nd defendant and 3rd defendant.

17. The plaintiff herein filed the suit much earlier for the declaration to declare the vested remainder holder right in respect of the suit schedule mentioned properties. On the other hand, the plaintiff now stands in the capacity of the legal heir of the 2nd and 3rd defendant and the same was not denied by the 2nd defendant, thereby she is also having right in respect of all the suit properties untill the contrary of surviving male legal heir after the lifetime of 2nd defendant. As such the plaintiff is entitled for the relief of permanent injunction against the 2nd defendant from alienating the suit properties as the 2nd defendant is having only the lifetime enjoyment over the suit properties.

18. In view of above this Court comes to the conclusion of dismissing the prayer for the declaration that the plaintiff is the only vested remainder holder in respect of all the schedule mentioned property as the same is premature in nature. On the other hand, the suit is decreed in favour of the plaintiff with regard to the relief of permanent injunction restraining the 2nd defendant from alienating the suit properties.

19. Issue No.4 :-

No other relief the plaintiff is entitled.

ORDER

In the result, this suit is partly decreed without cost. The suit with regard to the prayer of declaration that the plaintiff is the vested remainder holder in respect of all the suit properties is dismissed as the same is premature in nature. With regard to the relief of Permanent injunction, Permanent Injunction is granted in favour of plaintiff by restraining the 2nd defendant from alienating the suit properties.

Dictated to the Steno-typist, directly and typed on the computer, corrected, print out was taken and pronounced by me in Open Court, on this the 23rd day of March 2026.

I Additional Subordinate Judge,
Villupuram.

Enclosure:-

List Of Plaintiff's Witness:-

PW1 - Tmt. Hemamalini (Plaintiff)

List Of Plaintiff's Exhibits:-

Ex.A1	14.12.1954	Settlement deed executed by Kesavan in favour of Krishnan (Certified copy) (Doc.No.3128 of 1954of Villupuram Joint II Sub Registrar Office)
-------	------------	---

List Of Defendants Side Witness and Exhibits :-

(Nil)

I Additional Subordinate Judge,
Villupuram.