Regular Civil suit No.	: 93 of 2005
Institution of Civil Suit	: 08/12/2005
Date of Judgment	: 30/03/2019
Duration	: YY/MM/ DD
	: 13 / 03 / 22
Ex.	: 187

In the Court of Additional Civil Judge ,Mundra.Kutchchh

RCS No. 93 of 2005

Plaintiff:

1. AminaBai Noormamad Mahothi

   Age:52 Years, Occupation: Farming&household,

   R/o Madhapar, Talluka-Mundra.Kachchh.

2. Ibrahim Noormamd Majothi

   Age:35 Years, Occupation: Farming&Labour,

   R/o Madhapar, Talluka-Mundra.Kachchh.

3. Mamad Noormamad Majothi

   Age:22 Years, Occupation: Farming&Labour,

R/o Madhapar, Talluka-Mundra.Kachchh.

Vs.

Defendants:

1. Vacchhiya Devdas Gadhvi

   Age:Major, Occupation:Labourer,

   R/o Madhapar, Talluka-Mundra.Kachchh.

Appereances:

Ld. Advocate Shri Pravin V. Ganatra for Plaintiffs

Ld. Advocate Shri Vishram R. Gadhvi for Defendant

Suit for : Declaration & Permanent Prohibitory Injunction.

Judgment

[1] The suit of plaintiff is that plaintiffs are the owners & possessors of revenue survey no.173(Hereinafter referred as suit property) through succession.On the death of deceased great grandfather of plaintiff no.2, suit property fell into the share of only grandson Noormamad(Father of plaintiff no.2) as a succession.In order to sell suit property, plaintiffs on 28/05/2005 published a public notice in a widely circulated newspaper inviting an objections from public at large.Defendant on 02/07/2005 replied to the public

notice so published & raised objections which are not only baseless but also false & vexatious.Despite possessing no leagl right in suit property, defendant by taking an advantage of rising prices in immovable properties due to industrialisation in Mundra has set up bogus objection against the peaceful enjoyment of suit property with a view to extort money from plaintiffs.

Cause of action to the suit arises on 02/07/2005 when defendant has raised a false objection in widely circulated local newspaper against publication of plaintiff made on 28/05/2005.

Plaintiff prays for ; Declaration that defendant or any of his agent,guardian,heir,servants,agents,attorney holders, executors, administrators etc doesnot has the right to interfere, obstruct or resist in the peaceful enjoyment of suit property; Permanent prohibitory injunction restraining the defendants or any of his agent,guardian,heirs,servants,agents,attorney holders, executors, administrators to enter into or attempt to take away, the suit property.

[2] That on service of process of the Court, the defendant is represented by the lawyer through Ex.10 and filed written statement via Exh.23 .In written statement so filed defendant has contended that, the suit is false, frivolous and

vexatious; the plaintiff suit is liable to be dismissed on the ground that defendant is in possession of suit property for the last 60 years; Defendant comes to the possession of suit property in the capacity of heirs of mortgagee revealed from entry no.9 made some 60 years before and since then defendant is possession of suit property.Succession Entry no.417 is illegal & not as accordance to law.Plaintiff's suit is bound to fail as it is away from real facts & contratry to law.

[3] In this suit, issues have been framed through Exhibit 69 on 30/03/2007 as below :-

(1) Whether it is proved by the Plaintiffs that suit property owned & possessed through succession is situated in Mundra Talluka ?

(2) Whether it is proved by the Defendant that suit property is obtained in succession as a mortgagee from his deceased father since 60 years ?

(3) Whether plaintiff's suit is barred by law of limitation ?

(4) Whether plaintiff's suit is barred by any law ?

(5) Whether plaintiff is entitled for the relief claimed in para-9 of plaint ?

(6) What shall be the order & decree ?

[4] My findings on the above issues are as under :-

(1) In the Negative ;

(2) In the Negative ;

(3) In the Affirmative ;

(4) In the Affirmative ;

(5) In the Negative ;

(6) As per Final Order.

[5] Before assigning any reasons for arrival of conclusion above, it is in the interest of justice to narrate the evidence of the parties.

[6] That the plaintiff has produced oral and documentary evidence as under :-

Evidence of the Plaintiff :-

Exh.No.	**Description**
111	Deposition of Plaintiff no.2
116	Succession Entry no.417 in the Noormamad Fakirmamad (Father of plaintiffs)
117	Village form no.7&12; name of Noormamad Fakirmamad (Father of plaintiffs) as the possessor
118	Village form no.8A in the name of Noormamad Fakirmamad (Father of plaintiffs)
119	Public notification in widely circulated newspaper inviting objections with regard to intent to sale suit property from public at large
121	Reply by defendant in widely circulated newspaper denying the possession & ownership of title
122	Notice sent by plaintiffs to defendant
123-124	Reciepts of RPAD addressed to defendant

125	Village form no.7/12; Name of possessor as Noormamad
126	Village form no.8A ; Name of possessor as Noormamad
131	Village form no.8A ; Name of plaintiff as possessor
132	Succession entry no.598; in the name of plaintiffs
133	Complaint given to PSI Mundra
167	Deposition of Talati-cum-mantri
169	Entry no.139 in Village form no.7,7A&12 under section 7(6) of Inam Abolition Act wherein Devdas Ashariya is mortgagor & Manjothi Ibrahim as mortgagee
170	Village form no.7&12 for the year 1976-78 name of possessor Noormamad
171	Village form no.7&12 for the year 1986-88 name of possessor Noormamad
172	Village form no.7&12 for the year 1996-98 name of possessor Noormamad
173	Village form no.7&12; name of possessors as plaintiff
174	Village form no.8A; name of possessors as plaintiff
175	Succession entry no.417 on 07/11/1977 in village form no.6 in the name of Ibrahim Alu Majhothi
177	Village form no.6; succession entry of deceased Noormamad
179	Closing Pursis

[7] **Evidence of the Defendants:**

Exh.No.	**Description**
170	Deposition of Defendant
178-179	Revenue Tax reciepts paid by defendant
181	Deposition of clerk of executive magistrate; application made by defendant not found
183	Closing pursis

[8] Learned Advocate for Defendant Shri Vishram R. Gadhvi submit

arguments which are as follows:

1) Whenever there is a suit for declaration of immovable property,plaintiff has to prove the suit upon his own strength rather than the weakness of the defendant and relies upon 1996(2) GLR 501 for the same cause.

2) Plaintiff is relying on entry 9 for the title of suit property but this title has been mortgaged to defendant since 60 years before.

3) Defendant has clearly asserted that he has possession of suit property since 60 years or else posession is disputed by defendant even then plaintiff has not prayed for the possession of suit property. As per section 34 of the Specific Relief Act, suit for declaration without praying for possession is not maintainable as per law.In support of this argument Ld. Advocate relies upon the ratio of AIR 1972 SC 2685 & AIR 2017 SC 1034.

4) Defendant has produced revenue rent reciepts to show his posseion over suit property and it is corroborated with the entry no.9 under 7(6) of Inam Abolition Act.

5) In this way defendant proves his possession & plaintiff fails to establish his case, consequently suit shall be dismissed.

Learned Advocate for plaintiff Shri Pravin V. Ganatra argued as following:

1) Defendant is resting his alleged possession over revenue tax reciepts which cannot be taken as an evidence for possession of suit property.

2) Talati-cum-mantri is the person who holds all the revenue records & he admitted in his cross-examination that in village form no.7/12 plaintiff's name is recorded as a owner & possessor of suit property.

3) Plaintiff's descendants were the mortgagor's and plaintiff being legal heir possess an inalienable right to protect his possession.

4) At the time of mortgage plaintiff's right to title were very much present and same can be claimed in the form of declaration.

5) Not a single document is produced by the defendant to establish his possession & tries to prove his cause upon the documents of plaintiff.

Whole of the facts asserted by defendant are concocted versions & shall be burdened with heavy cost.

-: R E A S O N S :-

[9] The universal acceptability while dealing in the rival claims came from the admitted facts.These facts are clothed with legal authenticity in section 58 of the Indain Evidence Act and such facts not only reduces the friction at lowest but also provides an opportunity to courts of law to form an opinion with regard to broad contours of suit while adjudging the legality of such facts.Any deviation from the admitted facts is also restrained by the law in the form of section 115 of the Indian Evidence Act.Following facts are admitted

by both the parties :

i) Suit property is mortgaged in the year not known to either of the party to suit.

ii) Plaintiff is solely for his title relying on revenue entry no.9 made under section 7(6) of Inam Abolition Act.Except this entry plaintiff has neither produced any conveyance deed conferring title to plaintiff nor produce the mortgage deed.

iii) Defendant has not produced any documentary evidence in his name showing the possession of suit property.Only payment reciepts of revenue rent are submitted for inspection of court.

iv) Plaintiff has neither prayed for the declaration of title nor asked for the redemption of suit proeprty though plaintiff's suit is based on mortgage revenue entry 9.

ISSUE No. 1:-

[10] Possession and title to suit property are two different things and plaintiff in the suit at present is relying on revenue entry no.9 made under section 9 of Inam Abolition Act, which is basically a mortgage entry wherein plaintiff's asecendants are mortgagor & defendant's descendants are morgagees.Law is settled in regard to the revenue entries to the prove of title.

Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **State of Himachal Pradesh Vs. Keshav Ram And Ors (1996) 11 SCC 257** held that : *“ The entries in the revenue papers, by no stretch of imagination can form the basis for declaration of title in favour of the plaintiff”.*

Hon'ble Apex court in **Union Of India & Ors Vs. Vasavi Co-op. Housing Society Civil Appeal No.4702 of 2004** through division bench of Hon'ble Justice Mr. K.S. Radhakrishnan & A.K. Sikri held in para 20 that :

“ We are of the view that even if the enteries in the record of rights carry a evidentiary value, that itself would not confer any title upon the plaintiff on the suit land in question.Ext.X”-1 is a classer register of 1347 which according to the trial court, speaks of the ownership of the plaintiff's vendor's property.We are of the view that these enteries, as such, would not confer any title.The plaintiffs have to show , independent of those enteries, that the plaintiff's predecessors had title over the property in question and it is that property which they have purchased. The only document that has been produced before the court was the registered family settlement and partition deed dated 11.12.1939 of their predecessor in interest, wherein admittedly , the suit land in question has not been mentioned.”

It was held by Hon'ble Apex court in the case of **Maran Mar Basselios**

Catholicos V. Thukalan Paulo Avira (1995) 3 SCC 426 that :

"In a suit for declaration if the plaintiffs are to succeed, they must do so on the strength of their own title".

The guidence imparted by *parens patriae* makes is ample obvious that in a suit for declaratory reliefs, plaintiff has to prove independent of the revenue entries showing the conveyance of title of suit property to him.Plaintiff has neither produced any conveyance deed in his favour nor submitted a mortgage deed whereby a fact of title to suit property can be ascertained with certitude. Court is made aware with the facts of revenue entries only without submission of any fact conferring title to suit property

[11] Second fold of the relief as prayed by the plaintiff is intermingled question of permanent injunction & declaratory relief.The settled position upon such intermingled relief reached by Hon'ble Apex Court in the cae of **Anathula Sudhakar Vs. Buchi Reddy(dead) by Lrs & others in Appeal (Civil) 6191 of 2001** wherein para 11,11.1,11.2&11.3 conclusively determines the fate of such reliefs as under:

11.The general principles as to when a mere suit for permanent injunction will lie,and when it is necessary to file a suit for declaration and/or possession with injunction as a consequent relief,are well settled.We refer *them briefly.*

11.1 where a plaintiff is in lawful & peaceful possession of property & such possession is interfered or threatened by the defendant,a suit for an injunction simpliciter will lie.A person has a right to protect his possession against any person who doesnot prove a better title by seeking a prohibitory injunction.But a person in wrongful possession is not entitled to an injunction against the rightful owner.

11.2 Where the title of the plaintiff is not dispute,but he is not in possession,his remedy is to file a suit for possession and seek in addition,if necessary,an injunction.A person out of possession,cannot seek the relief of injunction simpliciter,without claiming the relief of possession.

11.3 Where the plaintiff is in possession,but his title to the property is in dispute,or under a cloud,or where the defendant asserts title thereto and there is also a threat of dispossession from defendant,the plaintiff will have to sue for declaration of title and the consequential relief of injunction.Where the title of plaintiff is under a cloud or in dispute and he is not in possession or not able to establish possession,necessarily the plaintiff will have to file a suit for declaration,possession & injunction.

As it is has now been established from the admitted facts that plaintiff does not have title descendency & in itself running under a cloud.Plaintiff is relying on revenue entry no.9 passed under section 7(6) of Inam abolition Act and this entry of mortgage reveals that possession has been lost from plaintiffs & rests with defendant but the revenue entries passed thereafter shows the possession with plaintiffs, this controversy implies a uncertainity over the possession, thus remedy of second part of para 11.3 of the above judgment is applicable and plaintiff shall pray for the declaration of title, injunction along with the possession of suit property but plaintiff omits the relief of declaration of possession & title and prays only for the injunction.Suit for injunction simpliciter without the declaration of title & possession cannot give rise to the cause of action to the plaintiffs.

As far as relief of permanent injunction to restrain the defendants from interfering with plaintiff's possession is concerned, same is answered in para 13 as :

In a suit for permanent injunction to restrain the defendant from interfering with plaintiff's possession, the plaintiff will have to establish that as on the date of the suit he was in lawful possession of the suit property and defendant tried to interfere or disturb such lawful possession.Where the property is a building or building with appurtenant land,there may not be much difficulty in establishing possession.The plaintiff may prove physical or actual possession,either of himself or by him through his family members or agents or lessees/licensees.Even in respect of a land without structures,as for *example an agricultural land,possession may be established with reference to the actual use and cultivation.The question of title is not in issue in such a suit,though it may arise incidentally or collaterally.*

How defendant is interfering with the possession of suit property has not been established by the plaintiff.Cause of action stated in the plaint rests its premises on the fact that it accrued on 02/07/2005 when defendant raised objections to the notice published by plaintiffs declaring the intention to sell the suit property.Cause of action to bring this suit is primarily based on the publication of public notice made by plaintiff on 28/05/2005, if defendant raises objection in response to *invitation to objections* at the desire of plaintiff himself then it does not tantamount to obstruction in the enjoyment of suit property.After the raising of objection by defendant, plainttiffs filed a suit against defendant and defendant contested the suit till conclusive determination of objections raised by him.Defendant simlpy defends objection raised by him & exercise his inalienable right of self defence against the plaintiffs.An injunction cannot be granted against the defendant preventing him to contest the suit.Once it is established that plaintiffs are not entitled to file a suit, either for injunction simpliciter without declaration for title & possession or claiming predecessor in title in absence of title independent of revenue entries, then it becomes infructious to decide that suit property lies in Mundra Talluka.Thus, it is not proved by the Plaintiffs that suit property owned & possessed through succession is situated in Mundra Talluka.

ISSUE No.2

[13] This issue requires adjudication of court, declaring him to be the possessor of suit property in the capacity of mortgagee.Defendant to prove this issue in his favour has neither submitted a mortgage deed nor any document showing the suit property in his possession through any mode of conveyance authorised by law.Defendant is also relying on mortgage revenue entry no.9 wherein possession is alleged to have been obtained by his predecessors as a mortgagee.Without producing the mortgage deed, it cannot be ascertained with certainity the terms,conditions or duration of valid possession.Revenue entries merely enters a fact but defendant has to prove the documents on the basis of which such entry is made.Moreover this revenue entry doesnot have the date of its creation.If defendant is declared as possessor of suit property in the capacity of mortgagee then it by corollory ipso facto declaring the title to suit property in favour of plaintiffs. Analytically, in absence of mortgage deed defendant cannot be declared to have obtained the possession of suit property in the capacity of mortgagee.

Another fact which need attention of court is the validity of revenue rent reciepts submitted by defendant as a prove of possession.Payment of land revenue is meant only for fiscal purposes and receiept so obtained after paying revenue is only a prove of fact that revenue has been duly submitted.

It was held in the case of **Dolla Subbarao and Another V/s Eeda Amrutharao and Two Others 2017 CJ (HYD) 619** in para 14 that :

“14. It is settled law that tax reciepts are not evidence of possession.Also bank passbooks, pension passbook and ration card also cannot be treated as evidence of possession of the plaint schedule property by the appellants.The appellants had not examined any neighbours or revenue officials or marked any revenue record which establishes their possession of the plaint schedule site ”.

This reciept in itself cannot be made a basis to prove a possession.One of the worth discussing fact for not considering a payment reciept as a prove of possession is that revenue can be submitted by any person on behalf of actual owner or possessor.Revenue agency shall not decline to accept the revenue on the ground that it shall be paid by owner or possessor only.So, accodingly any person paying the revenue cannot be held to be a owner or possessor of suit property.

Defendant apart from revenue reciepts has not submitted any document for the inspection of court showing legal conveyance of possession into the hands of defendant.Independent of revenue reciepts defendant fails to establish the possession in his favour.

Hence, it is not proved by the Defendant that suit property is obtained in succession as a mortgagee from his deceased father since 60 years.

<u>Issue No.3,4&5</u>

[14] Though the plaintiff is relying on revenue enry no.9 made under section 7(6) of Inam Abolition Act but the plaint doesnot disclose the principal amount secured,rate of interest & usufruct which has to be appropriated in lieu of interest or in payment of mortgage money.Both the rate of interest & usufruct are the integral features of an usufructury mortage which distinguish it from rest of the mortages.Mere pleading that possession of suit property has been been handed down to defendant & expecting to consider it as an usufruct mortgage without mentioning the usufruct amounts to vague pleadings beacause it is the simple mortgage, english mortgage, mortgage by conditional sale apart from usufructury mortgage wherein possession of immovable has to be parted with the mortgagee.Mere use of word usufructury mortgage shall not suffice the cause of plaintiffs rather specific pleading ought to have been pleaded touching all the essentials of usufructury mortgage like rate of interest, usufruct which has to be appropriated in lieu of interest or in payment of mortgage money in this suit.

Pleadings of the plaint reveals the particulars rather then the material facts &

thus patently breach the provision of Order VI Rule 2 of the Civil Procedure Code which provided that Pleading to state material facts and not evidence.What are material facts & how they differ from particulars is very well established in the case of ***Sopan Sukhdeo Sable Vs. Asstt. Charity Commissioner.(2004) 3 SCC 137*** by stating that *There is a distinction between "material facts" and "particulars".The words material facts show that the facts necesaary to formulate a complete cause of action must be stated.Omission of a single material facts leads to an incomplete cause of action and the statement or plaint becomes bad.The function of particulars is to present a full picture of the cause of action with such further information in detail as to make the the opposite party understand the case he will have to meet.*

Omission to plead material facts in this suit is leading the court in a perplexed condition either to consider the said mortgage as simple mortgage, english mortgage, mortgage by conditional sale or usufructury mortgage, hencefroth plaintiffs set up a incomplete cause of action.

Once it has been established from *Sopan Sukhdeo Sable Vs. Asstt. Charity Commissioner* case **supra** that this suit cannot be a suit for redemption of usufructury mortgage, the only alternative which remains open for the plaintiffs is to consider the suit for possession of immovable property & even if this fact is considered as true then also plaintiffs have admitted evasively owing to reliance on revenue entry no.9 that possession of suit property has been lost since the date of entry, so there comes the deemed knowledge for its dispossession.The irony of the pleading in plaint is that though plaintiff is banking his relief on revenue entry no.9 but miserably fails to provide date of entry.In such a circumstances of facts, even date of succession entry of his father i.e.17/12/1977 is taken as the date of mortagage and 12 years, if counted from the date of such mortgage then plaintiffs suit is barred by period of limitation.

In order to provide more linient interpretation of period of limitation in the favour of plaintiff.It is pertinent at this juncture to read section 60 of the Transfer of property Act which provides for the unfettred right of the mortgagor to redeem as:-

60. Right of mortgagor to redeem.—At any time after the principal money has become due, the mortgagor has a right, on payment or tender, at a proper time and place, of the mortgage-money, to require the mortgagee (a) to deliver to the mortgagor the mortgage-deed and all documents relating to the mortgaged property which are in the possession or power of the mortgagee, (b) where the mortgagee is in possession of the mortgaged property, to deliver possession thereof to the mortgagor, and (c) at the cost of the mortgagor either to retransfer the mortgaged property to him or to such third person as he may direct, or to execute and (where the mortgage has been effected by a registered instrument) to have registered an acknowledgement in writing that *any right in derogation of his interest transferred to the mortgagee has been extinguished:*

Provided that the right conferred by this section has not been extinguished by act of the parties or by decree of a court.

The right conferred by this section is called a right to redeem and a suit to enforce it is called a suit for redemption.

It means mortgagor has the right to redeem at any time the principle money has become due, thus immediately after the execution of the mortgage-deed the right of redemption of the mortgagor starts to run when there is no time period prescribed in the mortgage deed.

The period of limitation for the redemption is provided in the article 61 of the Limitation act as
Art. 61 By a mortgagor

a) To redeem or recover possession of immovable property mortgaged	Thirty years	When the right to redeem or to recover possession accrues
b) xxxxxxx	xxxxxxxx	xxxxxxxx

The pleadings in the present suit are silent as to the terms, conditions,usufruct to be appropriated while mortagagee in possession of suit property,period of mortagage or the principal amount secured by the mortgage-deed.Entry no.9 only mentions the fact of possession being delivered to predecessors of defendant.In absence of specific pleading of usufruct, it can be any mortgage other than usufructury mortgage. The basic idea to differentiate the usufructury mortgage from other mortgages is that in usufructury mortgage the period of limitation shall start to run from the date, the mortgagor is ready & willing to repay the mortgage money but before the foreclosure. In such a scenario it is well established that the date of the mortgage-deed shall be the date from when the mortgagor has the right to redeem.The plaintiff in this suit relies upon the entry no.9 in the revenue records and this fact of the plaintiff if taken as true then the date of entry in the revenue record in absence of mortgage deed shall be the date of the execution of mortgage-deed & the right of the plaintiff to redeem shall start to run from such entry i.e. Year 1977(Succession entry no.417 is deemed as date of mortgage) & 30 years from 1977 clearly debarred the plaintiff to institute the suit for redemption.

The discussion on the period of limitation for the right of redemption shall be vague & unfruitful without discussing the landmark decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of

Sampuran Singh & Ors. vs. Smt. Niranjan Kaur(smt.) & Ors., (1999) 2 SCC 679 as follows:- *“14. Submission was, as aforesaid, that right to redeem only accrues when either the mortgagors tender the amount of mortgage or the mortgagees communicate satisfaction of the mortgage amount through the usufruct from the land. This submission is misconceived, as aforesaid, if this interpretation is accepted, then till this happens the period of limitation never start running and it could go on for an infinite period. We have no hesitation to reject this submission. The language recorded above makes it clear that* *right of redemption accrues from the very first day unless restricted under the mortgage deed. When there is no restriction the mortgagors have a right to redeem the mortgage from that very date when the mortgage was executed. Right accruing means, right either existing or coming into play thereafter. Where no period in the mortgage is specified, there exists a right to a mortgagor to redeem the mortgage by paying the amount that very day in case he receives the desired money for which he has mortgaged his land or any day thereafter. This right could only be restricted through law or in terms of a valid mortgage deed. There is no such restriction shown or pointed out. Hence, in our considered opinion the period of limitation would start from the very date the valid mortgage is said to have been executed and hence the period of limitation of 60 years would start from the very date of oral mortgage, that would be from March 1893. In view of this, we do not find any error in the decision of the first appellate court or the High Court holding that the suit of the present appellants is time-barred."*

As no usufruct & rate of interest is pleaded by the plaintiff in addition to the absence of specific pleading of usufructury mortgage, it can be simply a mortagage with transfer of possession.In any of the mortagages other than the usufructury mortgages where no time period of mortgage is described then in such cases as per the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the right to redeem has been held to accrue on the date of mortgage resulting in extinguishment of right of redemption after 30 years.Here in the suit at hand even the date of mortgage is not mentioned then in such a case the date of entry in the revenue records upon which the plaintiff heavily relies be taken as the date of mortgage & if 30 years are counted from the year 1977(date of succession entry no.417) even then palintiff's suit is time-barred by his own admitted date.

[16] Upon the strength of above discussed facts,circumstances,provisions of law and judgments pronounced by Hon'ble Apex Court, I answer the Issue nos. 1& 2 in Negative,3&4 in Affirmative and 5 negative and for issue no.6, I pass the following order :

-: F i n a l O r d e r :-

1. Suit of the Plaintiff is hereby Dismissed.

2. All the interim orders are hereby stands vacated.

4. Accordingly decree shall be prepared.

Pronounced in the open Court today on this 30th day of the Month of March, 2019 at Mundra.

Mundra.
Dt. 30/03/2019.

Arya Ram Kumar
Additional Civil Judge
Mundra.Kutchchh
(GJ 01324)