

IN THE COURT OF THE DISTRICT MUNSIF AT AMBATTUR.

PRESENT: TMT. FANNY RAJAN, B.A., B.L(Hons.),
DISTRICT MUNSIF, AMBATTUR.

Monday, the 28th day of October 2024.

ORIGINAL SUIT NO. 217 OF 2010

CNR.No.TNTR22 – 000109 - 2010

Tmt.A.Katheeja Bivi

.....Plaintiff

Vs

1. Mr.Mukundan.K.P.,

2. Murali

.....Defendants

This suit having come on 27.09.2024 before me for final hearing in the presence of M/s.M.Vivekanandan, V.C.Rakshitha, S.Narendramoorthy, J.Jeevan Kumar, R.Srikanth, S.Aji kumar and Bakcyaraj, learned counsels for the Plaintiff, M/s.E.Murugesan and S.Janarthanan, learned counsels for the Defendant 1, the suit is already dismissed as not pressed against 2nd Defendant on 19.07.2010, upon hearing the arguments made by the learned counsel for the plaintiff and perusal of the records, this suit having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court delivers the following:

J U D G M E N T

1. This suit is filed by the plaintiff seeking to grant permanent injunction restraining the defendants, their men, agents or any one acting on their behalf from in any way interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property by the plaintiff and to award costs.

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE PLAINT FILED BY THE PLAINTIFF:

2. The plaintiff submits that she is the absolute owner of the suit property having purchased the same through a registered Sale Deed dated 31.5.1999. Ever since the purchase, she in peaceful enjoyment and possession by paying necessary revenue tax to the revenue department and also by incorporating her name in the revenue records of the suit schedule property. Originally the suit schedule property belonged to one Mr.V.Munusamy Achari, who appointed Mr.K.Abdul Salam as the Power of Attorney Agent with absolute rights of alienation. The said Power of Attorney Agent further sub-divided the two plots bearing Nos.1 and 2 measuring 1191 sq.ft., 1504 sq.ft. and 1478 sq.ft. respectively.

3. The defendants 1 and 2 being the neighbours of the suit property taking undue advantage of the vacant site tried to put up huts by illegally trespassing into the suit property on 25.05.2010. The said illegal attempt of the defendants was defeated by the plaintiff by the aid of the local police and police complaint was lodged. As they advised to approach the Civil Court and as plaintiff apprehends threat of illegal trespass. Hence the suit for permanent injunction.

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE WRITTEN STATEMENT FILED BY THE
1st DEFENDANT :

4. It is pertinent to note that though 2nd defendant is mentioned as the rank in the written statement, the verification clearly indicates that the written statement is

signed by the 1st defendant. Hence, this court is satisfied that the written statement is filed by the 1st defendant. Further, the suit was already dismissed as not pressed against the 2nd defendant.

5. The 1st defendant denied the allegations and stated that the suit is devoid of any merits either in Law or on fact and liable to be dismissed. Especially the flow of conveyance of title to the Plaintiff and her possession. The title deed of the Plaintiff is fraudulent, fabricated and forged.

6. Originally 0.25 cents and 0.12 cents of vacant land in S.No.90/2 was purchased by the Defendant's father namely K.B.Padmanabhan through two registered Sale Deeds dated 04.02.1966 and 16.02.1966 and since in his possession. The said K.B.Padmanabhan during his life time had formed an unapproved Lay out of house plots and the suit property is a part of the same. The said K.B.Padmanabhan died intestate on 29.11.1971, leaving behind the Defendant and his mother and his brothers, sisters as his legal heirs to succeed all his properties. Thus, they became absolute owners of the suit property and in possession. When the plaintiff attempted to encroach the suit property, this Defendant has filed O.S. No.184 of 2010 and Status Quo was ordered. However, the Plaintiff suppressing the same, had filed this suit and obtained interim injunction concealing the caveat. The suit is improperly valued and there is no cause of action as against this defendant. Hence, the suit has to be dismissed with exemplary costs.

7. Upon perusal of records, it is noted that the suit is already dismissed as not pressed against 2nd defendant on 19.07.2010 based on the endorment of the Plaintiff's counsel.

8. On perusal of the plaint and written statement filed by the defendants, this Court framed the following issues on 09.06.2011:

ISSUES

1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled for permanent injunction against the defendant from interfering with the possession and enjoyment of the suit property?

2. To whatever relief plaintiff is entitled to?

9. **Evidences:** On the side of plaintiff, the 2nd plaintiff herself is examined as PW1 and Ex.A1 to Ex.A17 documents were marked. The 1st defendant is examined as DW1 and Ex.B1 to B15 documents were exhibited on the side of defendants.

Contentions of the Learned counsel for the Plaintiff:

10. The learned counsel for the Plaintiff has contended that the layout of the Plaintiff is not within the 1st Defendant property. The 1st Defendant has not disputed the layout in respect of Survey No.90/3. The entire issue revolves around Survey No.90/2 though the plaintiff claims 37 cents in survey no.90/2. The 1st defendant had power only for 25 cents in Survey No.90/2 and converted into a layout by him. However, he seems to have formed a layout for property more than that was allotted to him. The property claimed by the 1st defendant is different from that purchased by

the Plaintiff without identifying their property. The 1st defendant under wrong impression is attempting to interfere with the Plaintiff possession in the suit property. The layout developed by the 1st defendant is Banu Nagar. The possession of the Plaintiff is duly established by the Patta, Chitta and Adangal in the name of their predecessors and now the Plaintiff. The urban land tax receipts have also been duly paid. The suit property in Survey No.90/2 is already been subdivided but the 1st defendant for the reasons failed to duly described by the subdivision. In fact, the 1st Defendant have suppressed the fact that a portion of the property has been already sold but claims right over the entire Survey No.90/2. There is no cloud over title. Hence the suit has to be decreed.

Contentions of the learned counsel for the 1st Defendant:

11. The learned counsel for the 1st defendant has contended that the entire extent of land in Survey No.90/2 admeasuring 37 cents belongs to Mr.K.B.Padmanaban having purchased the same through registered Sale deed. After his demise, his legal heirs inherited the property. They are in possession of the suit property. While so, the 1st defendant allegedly claimed title in the suit property. In light of the judgment in *Anathulla Sudhara case*, the 1st defendant's father being the earlier purchaser has valid title and property has been duly conveyed to Mr.K.B.Padmanaban, his predecessor. The Plaintiff being subsequent purchasers cannot maintain the suit for permanent injunction without seeking declaration of title. The suit property is in possession of the 1st Defendant and the Plaintiff have no right in the suit property. The revenue documents in the name of the Plaintiff does not prove their title as per

the plaint. Hence the suit has to be decreed.

Discussions and Findings:

12. This Court considers the submissions of the Learned Counsel for the Plaintiff and 1st Defendant and also perused the materials on record. The Ex.A1 to Ex.A17, Ex.B1 to Ex.B15 have been produced either as original or certified copies. Hence, the said exhibits are all admissible in evidence as primary or secondary evidence under Section 64 or 65 of the Indian Evidence Act.

13. This court finds that the PW1 is the Plaintiff herself and the DW1 is the 1st defendant himself in the suit. After thorough reading of the ocular evidence of the PW1 and DW1, there is no material on record to test their reliability. Hence, this court finds that the ocular evidence of PW1 and DW1 is reliable and the evidentiary value of PW1, DW1, Ex.A1 to Ex.A17 and Ex.B1 to Ex.B15 are discussed hereinbelow.

Issue No.1: Permanent Injunction

14. It is the case of the Plaintiff that a larger extent of the suit properties were purchased by Mr.Munusamy Achari from the legal heirs of Mr.Ramalingam, vide Ex.A8/B8 Sale Deed dated 04.04.1984. He had duly executed a power of attorney to Mr.Abdul Salam, through the Ex.A9. The said power agent sold the suit properties to the Plaintiff, vendor and neighbour, through Ex.A10, Ex.B11, Ex.B10. While so, the Plaintiff's vendor having purchased through Ex.A10 Sale Deed sold it to the Plaintiff through the Ex.A3/B 10 Sale Deed dated 31.05.1999. The suit property is a vacant

land and the 1st Defendant is trying to grab the property which is in their possession. The 1st Defendant has no right in the suit property and all the sale deeds, revenue documents are in the name of the Plaintiff and their predecessors hence the 1st Defendant cannot disturb their possession.

15. On the other hand, It is the case of the 1st Defendant that his father K.P.Padmanaban had purchased 1 acre 62 cents land in Survey No.90/3 vide sale deed dated 01.09.1965 Ex.B1. Subsequently, he purchased 25 cents, 12 cents in Survey no.90/2 through Ex.A6/B14, Ex.A7/B2/B15, sale Deeds respectively. Since then, his father was in possession of the suit property without any interference. Thereafter, he formed it into a layout. Whiles, his father died inestate on 29.11.1971 and they inherited the property as his legal heirs. Subsequently, his legal heirs have executed Ex.B4 General power of attorney in favour the 1st Defendant.

16. It is pertinent to note that from Ex.B5 encumbrance certificate, it is clear that the Plaintiff have sole Plot No.7 and 8 part in Om Sakthi Nagar to one Mrs.Jayalakshmi and Mrs.Sivagami. The sale deeds are not filed and hence the details regarding the conveyance cannot be determined in detail. Out of the layout formed, they sold Plot No.8 to Mrs.Jayalakshmi. She had filed O.S. No.111/2008 and it was decreed exparte in Ex.B7. The vendor of the 1st defendant's father had again executed a false sale deed Ex.A8/B8 based on which the Plaintiff and other purchasers are claiming title through Ex.B10 to Ex.B12. The Plaintiff have no right or title in the suit property. Hence the suit has to be dismissed.

17. In light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Anathula**

Sudhakar Vs. P.Buchi Reddy (Dead) by Lrs. & Ors, 2009 2 LW 546, had clearly differentiated the circumstances in which a suit for bare injunction would lie and where there is a cloud over title, declaratory relief has to be sought for. This Court takes judicial note of the the judgments in ***Somasundaram Vs. Parameswariammal (Deceased), Represented by her Legal Representatives & Others, 2021 (4) CTC 44***, ***K. Shanmugam (Died) & Others Versus Yasodha & Others, 2022 (1) LW 792***, the Hon'ble High Court had clearly observed that the question of declaration of title would become necessary only if the defendant established a cloud over the Plaintiff's title otherwise a bare injunction suit would be maintainable.

18. This court takes note of the judgment in ***Ananthammal (died) and others Vs. M.Ramakrishnan and others, 2018 (1) CTC 24*** and finds that the Plaintiff has to stand on his own legs to discharge in burden of proof and not on the weakness of the Plaintiff case. Now the question is whether there is any cloud over title established by the defendant.

19. With regard to the title of the Plaintiff, this court finds that the PW1 had deposed clearly about the devolvment of title upon his predecessors and conveyance to the Plaintiff. This court finds that one Mr.Muthu and his children have executed a Ex.A8/B8 Sale Deed dated 04.04.1984 in favour of Mr.Munusamy Achari. As per the recitals, it is claimed that the property in S.No.90/2 9 cents and S.No.90/3 37 cents have devolved upon them as the legal heirs of Mr.Ramalingam. At this juncture, this court considers the contention of the learned counsel for the Plaintiffs, that the sale is duplicate sale, as the said Mr.Ramalingam already sold 12 cents in S.No.90/2 to

Mr.K.B.Padmanabhan.

20. This court hence perused Ex.A7/B2/B15 and Ex.A6/B14 and finds that as per the document S.No.90/2 only 12 cents has been sold to Mr.K.B.Padmanabhan. The boundaries in Ex.A6/B14, Ex.A7/B2/B15 clearly indicate that the said Mr.Ramalingam had more extent adjacent to the property sold. Apart from that this court perused Ex.A17 Sale Deed executed by the 1st Defendant in respect of Plot No.5A, 5B part in Banu Nagar. A clear perusal of the boundaries in Ex.A8/B8 in favour of Mr.Munsamy Achari, it is evidenced that the said Banu Nagar is reflected as located in the east of the property sold.

21. This court finds that as per DW1 evidence one Mr.K.B.Padmanabhan has purchased 25 cents and 12 cents in S.No.90/2 through the Ex.A6/B14 Sale Deed dated 04.02.1966 and Ex.A7/B2/B15 dated 16.02.1966. Upon perusal of the recitals in the Deed it is noted that how the said vendors have been conveyed the title is mentioned as ancestral. The further details of ancestral conveyance and relevant material facts are not mentioned to show the legal right of conveyance of the predecessors. The 1st Defendant have claimed title in S.No.90/3 and produced Ex.B1 Sale Deed.

22. The said Mr.K.B.Padmanabhan died on 29.11.1971 leaving behind the 1st Defendant and others as his legal heirs. It is necessary to note that there are no documents filed to show the death and legal heirship of the 1st Defendant with Mr.K.B.Padmanabhan. The nature of relationship between the 1st Defendant and the deceased is not duly pleaded to show the manner of succession and inheritance of

share. In fact the number of children of the deceased is not pleaded. The nature of relationship and right of the other legal heirs with the 1st defendant is not specifically pleaded, though it a material fact to identify the devolvment of title to the 1st Defendant and the right of each of the legal heirs in the suit property. Thus the material facts regarding the share and right of the 1st Defendant in respect of the suit properties have not been pleaded to identify their rights as mandated under Order VI Rule 2 CPC.

23. Whiles, the legal heirs of the deceased Mr.K.B.Padmanaban have executed a General Power of Attorney in favour of the 1st defendant for formation of layout and Sale as per Ex.B4 General Power of Attorney dated 27.10.1997. A thorough reading of the deed would indicate that the power was handed for Survey No.90/2 admeasuring 25 cents only apart from other properties. It is pertinent to note that as per the 1st defendant, they are claiming ownership in 37 cents of land in S.No.90/2. As seen from Ex.B3 A register extract.

24. The Ex.B7 the decree and judgment obtained by Mrs.Jayalakshmi in respect of her property in Plot No.7 against one Mrs.Lakshmi. Whiles, pending the suit the 1st Defendant have sold Plot No.5A, 5B part in Banu Nagar to one Mrs.Chandra, as seen from Ex.A17. This court notes that the name of the layout or nagar is not mentioned in the schedule of either Ex.B7 decree and judgment or Ex.A17 Sale Deed schedule executed by the 1st defendant.

25. However, the reference of Banu Nagar is evidenced in the Ex.A17 Sale Deed page 18. Further from the same it is noted that the extent is 17011.2 sq.ft. However,

as per Ex.B4 Power deed the portion given to 1st defendant for layout is 90/2 25 cents only. As such the extent in Banu Nagar appears to be more than that was given to him. Though the PW1 mentions it includes S.No.90/3, even the Ex.A17 mentions only S.No.90/2 in the layout. It is pertinent note that the details regarding the layout, the extent of layout in S.No.90/2 in the said layout is not clearly explained or pleaded. Even as per the 1st defendant, his father had formed a layout but the details of the same are not pleaded in this suit, though a material fact under Order VI Rule 2 CPC. There is no clear pleadings about whether the layout is approved or not.

26. From Ex.A17 Sale Deed, this court finds that the defendant's promoted Banu Nagar though not specifically pleaded whether it was promoted by the Mr.K.B.Padmanabhan and the Plaintiffs. The 1st Defendant have failed to prove after sale of plots what is the portion of property still owned by them and in which of the alleged portion, the suit property is situated and admitted about it in his cross examination. This court finds that the 1st Defendant have not clearly pleaded how the suit properties is located in their alleged layout and identified in which plot of the layout the same is situated.

27. It is noted that neither party have clearly indicated the complete extent in S.No.90/2 before sub division. However, the Ex.B3 A register would indicate that the S.No.90/2 is 0.37 cents. But the same is in the name of Mari and DW1 claims he is his father's vendor. However a thorough reading of the Ex.A7/B2/B15 and Ex.A6/B14 Sale Deeds, the same is not duly found. Therefore, the Ex.B3 is not assisting the 1st defendant's case.

28. On perusal of the FMB sketch in Ex.A13 would also clearly indicate about the further sub divisions in S.No.90/2. There is a clear sub division as 90/2A and 90/2B. The 1st Defendant have not clearly mentioned in which sub division their property is situated. They have not pleaded if the entire S.No.90/2A and 2B are part of the Ex.A6/B14, Ex.A7/B2/B15 Sale Deeds in favour of their father. If so, the purpose of sub division seems far fetched. Hence, the contention that the property sold in Ex.A8/B8 does not convey any title as the property was already sold does not seem probable.

29. From a conjoint reading of the above Ex.A6/B14, Ex.A7/B2/B15, Ex.A8/B8, Ex.A13, Ex.A17 and in absence of any material facts or evidence to show the original extent of 90/2 owned by Mr.Ramalingam, this court considers that the entire property in S.No.90/2 owned by Mr.Ramalingam was not sold to Mr.K.B.Padmanabhan. There was excessive land that was sold through Ex.A8/B8. Thus, there was valid conveyance to Mr.Munusamy Achari and there is no duplicate sale as claimed by the 1st defendant.

30. Based on the Ex.A8/B8 Sale, the said Mr.Munusamy Achari had executed a general power of Attorney dated 17.08.1998 in favour of Mr.Abdul Salam in Ex.A9 deed. From the same, it is evidenced that Mr.Munusamy Achari had formed a layout and executed power for Sale of Plot No.1, 2, 2A in S.No.90/2, 90/3 admeasuring 46 cents to the said power agent. The said power agent executed Ex.B10, Ex.A3/B12, Ex.B9 in favour of the Plaintiff and his neighbours for Plot No.2A, 2, 1 respectively. The said Mr.Mohammed Sultan had executed the Ex.B11 Sale deed in favour of the

3rd defendant for Plot No.1, it is clear that the layout promoted by the defendants' vendor is Indra Nagar. The entries in Ex.A5 and A12, Ex.A11 encumbrances certificates would clearly indicate the entries of the deeds in Ex.A8/B8, Ex.B9 and Ex.B11 respectively. There is no adverse entry noted. In Ex.B11, the details regarding Indra Nagar is clearly evidenced. Also the Ex.B12 would show Indra Gandhi 1st street in respect of the properties conveyed to Mr.Munusamy Achari.

31. It is not in dispute that the suit property is a part of S.No.90/2. As already indicated about, there is a sub division in S.No.90/2 as evidenced from Ex.A13 FMB sketch, Patta in Ex.A4, Chitta Ex.A14, Chitta and Adangal Ex.A15. It is true that there is an enquiry regarding the issuance of Patta, as seen from Ex.B13 Writ Petition. However, the pendency of the Patta proceedings does not hinder the conveyance of title and cannot be document to establish title. Hence, this court considers that the enquiry has not affected the case of the Plaintiff.

32. From a thorough reading of the Plaint schedule and the discussions hereinabove, it is clear that the property conveyed to the Plaintiff is in Indra Nagar and not in Banu Nagar promoted by the 1st defendant. It is for the 1st Defendant to duly identify their property as claimed and clearly describe the same for identification to show that the suit property is the same.

33. Apart from that as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the 1st defendant, the revenue records do not establish title. From the discussions in paragraph No.15 to 33 hereinabove, the Plaintiff have not been able to clearly

establish the title in respect this property resulting in a cloud over the title of the Plaintiff. The DW1 has clearly admitted that the suit property is a vacant land and seen from Ex.B6. As per the well established principle of law, possession follows title in respect of vacant lands. However, in this case to show their possession, the 1st Defendant have filed the tax receipts in their name in Ex.A1, A2 and A16. Further, the Patta in Ex.A4 as the proceedings is pending as seen from Ex.B13 is not assisting the Plaintiff. The Chitta in Ex.A14, Chitta and Adangal in Ex.A15 are in the name of the Plaintiff. The DW1 admits that he had not filed any revenue documents in his name or that of his father, though he claims possession. Thus, the Plaintiff is able to show possession in the suit property as their title is already clearly shown.

34. Apart from the dispute between the parties is clearly evidenced from the pleadings regarding pendency of OS No.184 of 2010 filed by the 1st defendant for permanent injunction. Thus it is clear that there is a clear dispute between the parties in respect of the properties of the 1st Defendant and the Plaintiff. From the discussions, above it is evidenced that the Plaintiff property is different from the 1st defendant.

35. This court considers that the 1st Defendant has been unable to clearly identify their property and that of the Plaintiff being the same and the alleged duplicate sale by their vendor. On the contrary, the Plaintiff have been able to clearly prima facie establish the flow of valid title from their predecessors. Hence, the defendant is unable to clearly establish a cloud over title in respect of the suit property. In the absence of clear pleadings regarding material facts regarding flow of title upon the 1st

Defendant, the description and identification of their property; this court concludes that there is no issue regarding the title of the suit property and a bare injunction suit would suffice to settle the issue at hand. This court concludes that there is no clear cloud over the valid conveyance of title upon the Plaintiff irrespective of the pleadings regarding ownership. As the cloud has not been established, the Plaintiff's suit for permanent injunction is maintainable. Apart from that the title of the true owner cannot be disturbed. As possession flows title, the Plaintiff is in possession of the suit property and hence the 1st defendant is not entitled to disturb the Plaintiff in any manner.

36. This Court is of the considered view that the plaintiff has already initially discharged her onus of proof regarding the conveyance of the title in her favour and hence, no person has any right to interfere with the possession of the suit property. Further, it is a well laid down law of the land, that there cannot be any perpetual injunction under Section 38 of the Specific Relief Act, until the Plaintiff has to duly explain and substantiate the alleged threat of dispossession and the loss caused to him or the manner in which it is not compensatable in terms of money or how it avoid multicaplity of judicial proceedings.

37. On careful analysis of the oral and documentary evidence available record, this court decides that the plaintiff having established her case and the lack of authority on the part of the defendants to interfere with the possession and enjoyment of the suit property, the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of permanent injunction. From the above discussion, this court concludes that the 1st defendant has failed to discharge his

burden of proof regarding the entitlement to permanent injunction in the counter claim as per Section 101 and 102 of the Indian Evidence Act. Hence, the issue No.1 is answered in favour of the Plaintiff in the suit.

ISSUE NO.2: Other Relief

38. As the Issue No.1 has been answered in favour of the Plaintiff and this Court considers that both parties are not entitled to any other relief.

39. Considering the nature of the relief sought for, the dispute between the parties, this court considers that both the parties shall bear their own costs. Thus, Issue No.2 is answered accordingly.

RESULT

In the result, the suit is partly decreed without costs

I) granting a permanent injunction restraining the 1st defendant, their men, agents or any one acting on their behalf from in any way interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property by the plaintiff.

II) The suit is already dismissed as not pressed against 2nd defendant on 19.07.2010.

III) The parties shall bear their own costs.

Dictated to the steno-typist, transcribed by her in the desktop, corrected and pronounced by me in the open Court on this 28th day of October 2024.

Sd/-FANNY RAJAN
DISTRICT MUNSIF,
AMBATTUR.

PLAINTIFFS SIDE WITNESSES:

PW1 A.Katheeja Bivi

PLAINTIFF SIDE EXHIBITS:

Exhibit A1	01.04.2010	Tax Receipt - Original
Exhibit A2	17.03.2000	Tax Receipt - Original
Exhibit A3	31.05.1999	Sale Deed – Certified Copy
Exhibit A4	26.05.2006	Patta - Original
Exhibit A5	01.10.1979 to 31.12.1986	Encumbrance Certificate - Original
Exhibit A6	04.02.1966	Sale Deed – Certified Copy
Exhibit A7	16.02.1966	Sale Deed – Certified Copy
Exhibit A8	04.04.1984	Sale Deed – Certified Copy
Exhibit A9	17.08.1998	General Power of Attorney – Certified Copy
Exhibit A10	31.05.1999	Sale Deed – Certified Copy
Exhibit A11	12.07.2017	Encumbrance Certificate – Original
Exhibit A12	13.11.2017	Encumbrance Certificate – Certified Copy
Exhibit A13	17.01.2018	FMB Sketch – True Copy
Exhibit A14	17.01.2018	Chitta – True Copy
Exhibit A15	01.04.2010	Chitta and Adangal – True Copy
Exhibit A16	01.02.2013	Tax Receipt - Original
Exhibit A17	25.01.2011	Sale Deed – Certified Copy

DEFENDANTS SIDE WITNESSES :

DW1 Mukundan

DEFENDANTS SIDE EXHIBITS:

Exhibit B1	01.09.1965	Sale Deed – Certified Copy
Exhibit B2	16.02.1966	Sale Deed – Certified Copy
Exhibit B3	--	A Register Extract – True Copy
Exhibit B4	27.10.1997	Power of Attorney – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B5	19.04.2010	Encumbrance Certificate – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B6	--	Photo – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B7	--	O.S. No.111/2008 Decree and Judgment – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B8	04.04.1984	Sale Deed – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B9	31.05.1999	Sale Deed – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B10	27.09.2002	Sale Deed – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B11	31.05.1999	Sale Deed – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B12	31.05.1999	Sale Deed – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B13	--	Writ Petition W.P No.28225/2017 – True Copy
Exhibit B14	04.02.1966	Sale Deed – Certified Xerox Copy
Exhibit B15	16.02.1966	Sale Deed – Certified Xerox Copy

Sd/-FANNY RAJAN
DISTRICT MUNSIF,
AMBATTUR.