



**IN THE COURT OF THE IX ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE &
X JMFC, AT TUMAKURU**

:Present:

SMT. GAYATHRI N. B.Com. LL.B,
IX Addl. Civil Judge & X JMFC.,
Tumakuru.

Dated this the 27th day of July, 2026

O.S No.808/2024

Plaintiff : Fayaz Ahamed,
Son of late Pyare Jan,
Aged about 51 years,
Residing at G.C.R. Colony,
Santhepete, Tumakuru.

(By Sri. H.R., Advocate)

V/s

Defendant : Halima Sadiya,
Daughter of A.M.Mohammed Sadiq,
Aged about 28 years,
Residing at 1st Main Road,
Vinobhanagar, Tumakuru.

(By Sri. H.G.B., Advocate)

Date of Institution of suit	:	23.10.2024
Nature of suit	:	Permanent Injunction
Date of commencement of trial	:	22.07.2025
Date of Judgment Pronounced	:	27.07.2026



Total Duration	:	Year/s	Month/s	Day/s
		1	9	4

Sd/-
(GAYATHRI.N)
IX Addl. Civil Judge & X JMFC
Tumakuru.

J U D G M E N T

The plaintiff has filed the present suit against the defendant seeking the relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendant, her agents, servants or any persons acting on her behalf from interfering with the plaintiff's possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property.

2. Description of the suit schedule property:

The part and parcel of the vacant site bearing Tumakuru Mahanagara Palike, old katha No.1488, new katha No.1488/1226/10337, site No.35, PID No.120551, measuring East – West : 11.88719 meters (39 feet), North-South : Eastern side 6.70559 meters (22 feet) Western side 4.87679 meters (16 feet), in total 68.84057 square meters (741 square feet), situated at Ward No.29, Maraluru, Tumakuru town with boundaries;



East by : The property measuring 1 x 41 feet
given to school
West by : 30 feet road
North by : Park and
South by : Property of defendant

3. **The Averments of the Plaint are as Follows:**

The property bearing Tumakuru Mahanagara Palike old katha No.1488, new Katha No.1488/1226, site No.35 PID No.25731, measuring East – West : 40 feet, North – South : Eastern side 41 feet, Western side 35 feet, totally measuring 1520 square feet was originally belongs to one Shivamma and her family and they have got sold the Northern side half portion of the said site in favor of Fahim Ahmed i.e., the brother of the plaintiff through a registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022 and they have got sold the Southern side half portion of the said site in favor of the defendant. Further, as per the registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022, the property purchased by Fahim Ahamed in the above said property i.e., the suit schedule property was got transferred in the name of Fahim Ahamed i.e., the brother of the plaintiff at Tumakuru Mahanagara Palike and accordingly he was in possession and enjoyment of the said property by paying the taxes to the government.



4. It is further stated that the brother of the plaintiff namely Fahim Ahamed has got gifted the suit schedule property in favor of the plaintiff out of love and affection towards him through a registered gift deed dated 12.06.2024 and the said registered gift deed was registered at the office of the Sub-Registrar, Tumakuru in book No.1, as a document No.TMK-1-05853/2024-25 and registered on 05.07.2024. Further, as per the registered gift deed dated 12.06.2024 the khatha of the suit schedule property is yet to be transferred in the name of plaintiff at Tumakuru Mahanagara Palike, Tumakuru and accordingly since from then the plaintiff is in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property and he is paying the taxes to the government with respect to suit schedule property, all the documents with respect to to suit schedule property are standing in the name of the plaintiff. Further, the defendant is the adjacent property holder towards the Southern side of the suit schedule property and she is not having any right, title, much less possession over the suit schedule property and with a malafide intention the defendant is attempting to encroach the suit schedule property taking advantage of the fact that the plaintiff is residing away from the suit schedule property. Further, the plaintiff has given a complaint against the defendant to the Jurisdictional police, but the police have not taken the complaint of the plaintiff, stating that the matter is civil in



nature and hence the plaintiff has to approach the civil court for the remedy and to curtail the illegal act of the defendant.
Hence, the plaintiff prays to decree the suit.

5. After due service of suit summons, the defendant appeared before the court through her counsel and filed the written statement.

6. **The Averments of the Written Statement of Defendant are as Follows:**

The defendant has denied the case of the plaintiff as false and further contended that the defendant purchased the site measuring East-West : 39 feet, North-South:19 feet, total extent 741 square feet out of site No.35 totally measuring East – West : 40 feet, North-South on Eastern side 41 feet, North-South on Western side : 35 feet totally measuring 1520 feet bounded by East : 1x 41 feet site belongs to School, West : 30 feet road, North : plaintiff's site, South : site No.34, which is called written statement schedule property. From her vendor SriShivamma wife of Basavarajaiah, under a registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022. On the basis of registered sale deed, the katha was made out in the name of defendant by Tumakuru Mahanagara Palike, Tumakuru. Further, subsequently defendant has obtained building



license from Tumakuru Mahanagara Palike and approved plan from competent Authority. As per said house building license and approved plan, defendant as started construction of the basement by leaving set back on four sides of the site as per the terms and conditions of the license and approved plan. Hence the defendant encroach the plaintiff site does not arise at all. Further, the defendant is constructing the building as per terms and condition of the license and approved plan issued by Tumakuru Mahanagara Palike. The defendant has not violation any of the conditions mentioned in the license. But, the plaintiff this false suit only with an intention to cause trouble to the defendant and also to prevent further construction in her site. Further, the plaintiff does not disclose the measurement of the encroachment in the plaint; it shows that the defendant does not encroach the plaintiff property and he intentionally filed this false suit to harass the defendant. Further, the defendant being a educated lady she knows the consequence of violation any of the condition of the license. **On these grounds, the defendant prays to dismiss the suit.**

7. Based upon the pleadings and documents, this court has framed the following:

**ISSUES**

1. Whether the plaintiff proves that he is in possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as on date of filing the suit?
2. Whether plaintiff proves the alleged interference by the defendant with respect to suit schedule property?
3. Whether the plaintiff is entitle to the relief as sought for?
4. What order or decree ?

8. In order to prove the case, the plaintiff examined himself as PW-1 and got marked some documents as Ex.P1 to Ex.P6. The plaintiff further examined an independent witness as PW-2 and both PW-1 and PW-2 were subjected to cross-examination by the learned counsel for the defendant.

9. On the other hand, in order to disprove the case of the plaintiff and to establish her own case, defendant was examined herself as DW-1, got marked some documents as Ex.D1 to Ex.D10. The defendant further examined an independent witness as DW-2, and both DW-1 and DW-2 were subjected to cross-examination by the learned counsel for the plaintiff.



10. Heard arguments advanced both side and perused the entire material available on record.

11. After examination of the entire material, the findings of this Court to the aforesaid issues are as follows:

Issue No.1 : In the Negative
Issue No.2 : In the Negative
Issue No.3 : In the Negative
**Issue No.4 : As per the final order,
for the following:**

: REASONS :

12. **Issues No.1 to 3**: Since these issues are interconnected with each other, they are taken up together for common discussion in order to avoid repetition of facts and for better appreciation of evidence.

13. The specific case of the plaintiff is that the suit schedule property forms part of Site No.35 originally belonged to Shivamma and her family. The Northern half portion was sold to the plaintiff's brother, Fahim Ahmad under a registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022. Thereafter, Fahim Ahmad gifted the said property to the plaintiff under a registered gift deed dated 12.06.2024. On the strength of the gift deed, the plaintiff claims to be in possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. According to the



plaintiff, the defendant owns the adjoining southern portion and has no right over the suit schedule property. However, the defendant allegedly attempted to encroach upon and interfere with the plaintiff's possession. Hence, the plaintiff has filed this suit seeking permanent injunction restraining the defendant from interfering with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property.

14. On the other hand, the defendant contends that she purchased the Southern portion of Site No.35, measuring 741 square feet from Shivamma and her family members under a registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022. Pursuant to which, the katha was transferred to her name. She obtained the necessary building license and sanctioned plan from Tumkur Mahanagara Palike and commenced construction in her property by maintaining the prescribed setbacks. She denies having encroached upon or interfered with the plaintiff's property. She further contends that the plaintiff has not specified the extent or measurement of the alleged encroachment and has filed the suit only to obstruct her construction and she seeks dismissal of the suit.

15. In order to substantiate the case, the plaintiff stepped into the witness box and examined himself as PW-1 by filing an affidavit-in-lieu of examination-in-chief, wherein he reiterated the averments made in the plaint. The plaintiff



also examined an independent witness as PW-2 and both PW-1 and PW-2 were subjected to cross-examination by the learned counsel for the defendants.

16. In support of the oral evidence, the plaintiff has produced certain documents, which were marked as Ex.P1 to Ex.P6. Ex.P1 is the Form No.2, Ex.P2 is the Tax Paid Receipt, Ex.P3 is the Registered Gift Deed dated 12.06.2024, Ex.P4 is the Registered Sale Deed dated 28.09.2022, Ex.P5 is the Registered Sale Deed dated 12.11.1990, Ex.P6 is the Book No.4 Page No.12 for the year 2001-02.

17. On the other hand, in order to disprove the case of the plaintiff and to establish her own case, the defendant stepped into witness box and examined herself as DW-1 by filing an affidavit in lieu of examination-in-chief, wherein she reiterated the averments of written statement. In support of her oral evidence, she produced certain documents, which were marked as Ex.D1 to Ex.D10, and further examined an independent witness as DW-2 and both witnesses were subjected to cross-examination by the learned counsel for the plaintiff. Ex.D1 to D4 are the Photographs, Ex.D5 is the Form No.3, Ex.D6 is the Form No.1, Ex.D7 is the Tax Paid Receipt, Ex.D8 is the Form No.2, Ex.D9 is the Registered Sale deed dated 28.09.2022, Ex.D10 is the Building License.



18. This court has examined entire material of the case. After going through the same, on careful consideration of the pleadings and the oral and documentary evidence placed on record, certain material facts are not in dispute between the parties. It is an admitted fact that the larger property bearing Site No.35, measuring East-West 40 feet and North-South 41 feet on the Eastern side, and 35 feet on the Western side, in all measuring 1520 square feet, originally belonged to Shivamma and her family members. It is also not in dispute that the plaintiff and defendant are claiming their respective portions out of the very same Site No.35 and that their properties are adjoining each other.

19. The plaintiff traces his right through his brother/donor. According to him, his brother purchased the Northern portion of Site No.35 from Shivamma and her family members under the registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022 and thereafter, gifted the said property in favor of the plaintiff under the registered gift deed dated 12.06.2024. The defendant, on the other hand, purchased the Southern portion of the same Site No.35 under a separate registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022. Thus, both parties trace their respective rights through a common vendor.

20. There is also no serious dispute regarding the fact that the defendant's property is situated towards the



Southern side of the plaintiff's property. Therefore, the real controversy between the parties is not regarding the original ownership of Site No. 35 or the fact that separate portions thereof were sold. The real question for consideration is whether the plaintiff has established that he was in lawful and exclusive possession of the entire suit schedule property as on date of institution of the suit and whether the defendant merely attempted to interfere with or encroach upon such possession, as pleaded by him.

21. Coming to the documentary evidence of the plaintiff, Ex.P5 is the registered sale deed dated 12.01.1990, through which the title of Shivamma over the larger property site No.35 is traced. Ex.P6, the tax demand register extract, also shows that the larger property bearing Katha No.1488 stood in the name of Shivamma. These documents lends support to the source of title of the common vendor.

22. Further, Ex.P4 is the registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022 executed in favor of the plaintiff's donor. A perusal of the schedule at Ex.P4, shows that the property conveyed thereunder is a portion of Site No.35 measuring East-West 39 feet, North-South 22 feet on the Eastern side and 16 feet on the Western side, in all measuring 741 square feet. Thereafter, under Ex.P3, the registered gift deed dated 12.06.2024, the plaintiff's donor gifted the very same



property in favor of the plaintiff. The schedule contained in Ex.P3 also describes the property as measuring East-West 39 feet, North-South 22 feet towards the East, and 16 feet towards the West, with a total extent of 741 square feet. Its boundaries also shown as the property given to the school 1 x 41 feet site towards East, 30 feet road towards West, park towards North and the defendant's property towards South.

23. Therefore Ex.P3 and Ex.P4 are consistent with each other regarding the extent and description of the property conveyed to the plaintiff and his donor. These documents establish the manner in which the plaintiff derives his title to the property described therein. However, merely establishing the source or derivation of title does not, by itself, conclude the controversy in the present suit. The plaintiff has instituted the suit for bare injunction. Therefore, apart from showing the manner in which he acquired the property, he must establish his possession over the suit schedule property, as on the date of institution of the suit, and the alleged interference or threatened invasion of such possession by the defendant.

24. In this regard, Ex.P1 assumes significance. Ex.P1 is Form No.2 issued by the Municipal Authority. When the measurements reflected in Ex.P1 are compared with the measurements contained in the registered sale deed at Ex.P4



and the registered gift deed at Ex.P3, they do not exactly correspond with each other.

25. While Ex.P3 and Ex.P4 consistently describes the plaintiff's property as measuring East-West 39 feet and North-South 22 feet on one side and 16 feet on the other side. Ex.P1 reflects the measurements in meters in a manner which does not exactly tally with the measurements found in the registered title documents. Thus, there is a discrepancy regarding the extent reflected in the Municipal Record.

26. The significance of this discrepancy cannot be ignored in the facts of the present case. The parties are owners of adjoining portions of the very same Original Site No.35, and the plaintiff's specific grievance is that the defendant, being the Southern adjoining owner, attempted to encroach upon his property. Therefore, when an allegation of encroachment is made between adjoining owners, the exact identity, measurement, and common boundary of their respective properties assume considerable importance.

27. More importantly, PW-1, himself has admitted during his cross-examination that there is a discrepancy in Ex.P1 and has voluntarily stated that the same requires rectification. Despite being aware of such discrepancy, no rectified document has been produced before the court.



Another material circumstance is that, PW-1 has admitted that Ex.P1 was obtained after institution of the present suit. The suit was instituted in the year 2024, whereas, Ex.P1 was obtained in the year 2025. Therefore, Ex.P1 cannot, particularly in view of its admitted discrepancy, be traced as conclusive evidence establishing the exact extent and possession of the plaintiff as on the date of institution of the suit. At the same time, the discrepancy in Ex.P1, by itself, cannot extinguish the plaintiff's title derived under the registered gift deed at Ex.P3. However, it certainly affects the evidentiary value of Ex.P1 insofar as the plaintiff relies upon it to corroborate his possession over the exact extent claimed in the suit.

28. The next and more important aspect is the allegation of interference and encroachment. The specific case pleaded by the plaintiff is that defendant is the owner of the adjoining property situated towards the Southern side and that taking advantage of the plaintiff residing away from the suit schedule property, the defendant attempted to encroach upon the suit schedule property and interfere with the peaceful possession and enjoyment. Thus, the plaint proceeds on the clear factual foundation that the plaintiff continued to be in possession of the entire suit schedule property and that what was complained of was only an attempt or threat of encroachment by the defendant.



29. The defendant specifically denied the said allegation. Her case is that she purchased the Southern portion of Site No.35 totally measuring 741 square feet, under Ex.D9 obtained the necessary building license and sanctioned plan from the competent Municipal Authority and commenced construction within her own property. According to her, she has not encroached upon any portion of the plaintiff's property and the present suit was filed only to obstruct the construction undertaken by her.

30. In this background, the evidence elicited from PW-1, during his cross-examination assumes considerable importance. PW-1 has categorically admitted in his cross-examination that even prior to institution of the present suit, the defendant had constructed a sump and had commenced construction of the building. More importantly, according to PW1, the sum constructed by the defendant is situated within the suit schedule property.

31. This is not an insignificant admission. It goes to the very root of the plaintiff's case. If according to PW-1 himself, the defendant had constructed a sump within the suit schedule property prior to filing of the suit, then the alleged act complained of was no longer merely an attempt to encroach. According to the plaintiff's own evidence, the alleged



encroachment had already taken place before the institution of the suit.

32. In other words, if the statement of PW-1 is accepted, the defendant had already entered upon and occupied at least the portion over which the sump was constructed. Therefore, the plaintiff could not simultaneously contend that on the date of institution of the suit, he was in exclusive possession of the entire suit schedule property and that the defendant was merely attempted to encroach upon it. There is a material difference between the case pleaded in the plaint and the case emerging from the evidence of PW1. The plaint speaks of an apprehended or attempted encroachment, whereas PW1's evidence discloses an alleged completed encroachment existing even before the suit was instituted.

33. Further, Ex.D1 to Ex.D4, being the photographs confronted to PW-1 during his cross-examination also have to be considered in the light of this admission. The plaintiff's own evidence regarding the existence of the sump prior to suit materially affects his assertion of exclusive possession over the entire suit schedule property. This distinction is material because the nature of relief available to a person who is in possession and merely apprehends interfere is different from the relief recovered by a person who alleges that he has already been dispossessed from a portion of the property.



34. A decree for permanent injunction is essentially preventive in nature. It protects an existing possession against unlawful interference. It does not by itself restore possession of property which has already passed into the possession of another person. Therefore, if the defendant had already constructed a sump within a portion of the suit schedule property prior to institution of the suit as asserted by PW-1 himself, a decree merely restraining the defendant from interfering with plaintiff's possession would not result in recovery of the portion already allegedly occupied by the defendant.

35. Here, in such circumstances, it was necessary for the plaintiff to seek an appropriate relief for recovery of possession of the alleged encroached portion along with consequential relief as warranted by the facts. If there existed a genuine cloud or dispute regarding his title over that particular portion, declaratory relief would also become necessary. However, the plaintiff has not sought recovery or possession of any portion of the property.

36. Further, the plaint itself does not specify the exact extent, dimensions or location of the portion allegedly encroached upon. Even PW-1's statement regarding the sump does not cure this fundamental deficiency in the pleadings. No



survey sketch or other convincing evidence has been produced identifying the exact location and extent of the alleged encroachment vis-a-vis the property conveyed under Ex.P4 and Ex.P9.

37. This becomes all the more important when both parties have purchased adjoining portions incurred out of the same Site No. 35 from the same vendor. Without proper identification of the common boundary and the alleged encroached portion, the court cannot merely on the basis of a general allegation conclude that the construction undertaken by the defendant falls within the plaintiff's property.

38. The defendant has produced Ex.D9. Her registered sale deed dated 28.09.2022 in support of her acquisition of the Southern portion in site No.35. Ex.D10 consists of the building license and sanctioned sketch. Her defense is that she has undertaken construction only within the property purchased by her after obtaining permission from the competent authority.

39. Certainly, the mere fact that their building license or sanctioned plan has been issued in favor of the defendant does not by itself establish that every part of the construction is necessarily within her title or that no encroachment is possible. A Municipal Building license cannot decide title or the exact boundary between adjoining owners. However, the



burden of establishing the alleged interference or encroachment remains upon the plaintiff. The weakness, if any, in the defendant's case cannot substitute the plaintiff's obligation to prove the essential ingredients necessary for the relief sought by him.

40. The plaintiff has certainly produced registered documents showing the manner in which he acquired the property. However, the question in the present suit is not confined to acquisition of title. He must establish his lawful possession over the entire suit schedule property on the date of institution of suit and the alleged unlawful interference by the defendant.

41. In this regard, the plaintiff's own evidence creates difficulty. On the other hand, he seeks injunction on the footing that he is in possession of the entire property and that the defendant was attempting to encroach. On the other hand, in cross-examination, he admits that even prior to the suit, the defendant had constructed a sump which, according to him, lies within the suit schedule property.

42. These two factual positions cannot comfortably stand together. If the sump is in fact within the plaintiff's property and was constructed before the suit, then the plaintiff was not in exclusive possession of that portion when



the suit was filed. Conversely, if the defendant's sump and construction are within her own property, then the plaintiff's allegation of encroachment is not established.

43. In either situation, the evidence has presently placed does not establish the pleaded case that the plaintiff was in peaceful and exclusive possession of the entire suit schedule property and that the defendant merely attempted to interfere with such possession. It is a settled principle that the parties are required to establish the case pleaded by them. A party cannot obtain a decree on a materially different factual case emerging for the first time in evidence.

44. Here, the foundation of the plaintiff's suit is threatened interference with his existing possession. However, his evidence indicates a completed encroachment prior to institution of the suit. This is not merely a minor inconsistency as to an incidental fact; it materially affects the nature of possession claimed by the plaintiff and consequently the nature of relief required. Therefore, the court cannot ignore such admission and grant a decree for bare permanent injunction merely because the plaintiff has produced the title documents.

45. On an overall appreciation of the evidence, Ex.P3 to Ex.P6 may establish the chain through which the plaintiff



claims title to the property. The defendant also does not seriously dispute that the plaintiff has acquired the adjoining Northern portion through the gift deed executed by his donor. Thus, the plaintiff's acquisition of a portion of Site No.35 is not the real issue in controversy. However, proof of title and proof of the ingredients necessary for permanent injunction are distinct matters.

46. The plaintiff was required to establish that, on the date of filing of suit, he was in lawful possession of the entire suit schedule property and that the defendant was threatening or attempting to interfere with such possession. On this crucial aspect, his own evidence creates serious doubt. Firstly, there is an admitted discrepancy in Ex.P1 regarding the measurements, and PW-1 himself admits that it requires rectification. Secondly, Ex.P1 was obtained only after institution of the suit. Thirdly, the exact extent and location of the alleged encroachment have not been pleaded or established by reliable evidence. Most importantly, PW-1 has categorically admitted that the defendant had already constructed a sump, allegedly within the suit schedule property, before the suit was filed. Therefore, on the plaintiff's own version, the dispute had already progressed beyond a mere threatened interference before the institution of the suit. If a portion had already been encroached upon, the appropriate remedy was to seek recovery of that portion with



consequential relief and, where necessary, declaration. A bare injunction cannot restore possession of a portion which, according to the plaintiff himself, was already occupied by the defendant.

47. Thus, after considering the pleadings, oral evidence and documentary evidence in there entirely, though the plaintiff has established the manner in which he derives title under Ex.P3, he has failed to establish that he was in exclusive possession of the entire suit schedule property as on the date of institution of the suit and that there was merely an attempted interference by the defendant as pleaded in the plaint.

48. In the material admissions of PW-1 regarding the construction of sump prior institution of the suit, the discrepancy in the Municipal Record at Ex.P1, the absence of clear identification of the alleged encroached portion and the variance between the pleadings and evidence are sufficient to hold that the plaintiff has failed to discharge the burden cast upon him for grant of the relief of permanent injunction.

49. It is well settled that a plaintiff must succeed on the strength of his own case and cannot obtain a decree merely on the weakness of the defendant's case. Since permanent injunction is an equitable and preventive relief,



the plaintiff must establish the factual foundation necessary for such relief. In the present case, the evidence does not establish such foundation. Accordingly, the plaintiff is not entitled to the relief of permanent injunction as sought for and the relevant issue regarding entitlement to permanent injunction is liable to be answered in the Negative. With these reasons by considering the oral and documentary evidence on record, this court is of the considered opinion that the plaintiff has miserably failed to prove his case and consequently, the suit liable to be dismissed. **Accordingly, this court answers issue Nos.1 to 3 in the Negative.**

50. **Issue No.4:** In view of the aforesaid discussions and findings given on issue Nos.1 to 3, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

The suit of the plaintiff is hereby
dismissed with costs.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer, typed by him, corrected, and signed by me, then pronounced in the Open Court on this the 27th day of June, 2026).

Sd/-
(GAYATHRI.N)
IX Addl. Civil Judge & X JMFC
Tumakuru.

**ANNEXURE****List Of Witnesses Examined For Plaintiff/s:**

PW-1 : Fayaz Ahamed S/o late Pyare Jan
PW-2 : Jakir Pasha S/o Aman Ulla

List of documents marked on behalf of plaintiff/s:

Ex.P1 : Form No.2
Ex.P2 : Tax Paid Receipt
Ex.P3 : Registered Gift Deed dated 12.06.2024
Ex.P4 : Registered Sale Deed dated 28.09.2022
Ex.P5 : Registered Sale Deed dated 12.11.1990
Ex.P6 : Book No.4 Page No.12 for the year 2001-02

List of witnesses examined for defendant/s:

DW-1 : Halima Sadiya W/o Abdul Rahim
DW-2 : Kamal Pasha T.A. S/o late P. Abdul Rehman

List of documents marked on behalf of defendant/s:

Ex.D1 to D4 : Photographs
Ex.D5 : Form No.3
Ex.D6 : Form No.1
Ex.D7 : Tax Paid Receipt
Ex.D8 : Form No.2

KATK030101212024



- 26 -

OS No.808/2024

Ex.D9 : Registered Sale deed dated 28.09.2022

Ex.D10 : Building License.

Sd/-
(GAYATHRI.N)
IX Addl. Civil Judge & X JMFC
Tumakuru.