

KAMS710033572022



**IN THE COURT OF THE ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE AND J.M.F.C.,  
T.NARASIPURA.**

**Present : Sri. Venkatesha.K.N.,** <sup>B.A. LL.B.</sup>  
Addl. Civil Judge & J.M.F.C.,  
T.Narasipura.

**Dated : This the 4<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2024.**

**O.S./172/2022**

Plaintiffs : 1. Sri.L.Devaraju,  
S/o Late Lingaiah,  
Aged about 65 years,  
  
2. Sri.L.Lakshmana,  
S/o Late Lingaiah,  
Aged about 63 years,  
  
3. Smt.Jayalakshamma,  
D/o Late Lingaiah,  
Aged about 61 Years,  
  
All are R/at Jai Bheem Nagara,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Stage, Ward No.22,  
Bannur Town, T.Narasipura Taluk.

(Represented by : Sri.S.C.S., Advocate.)

**-V/s-**

Defendants : 1. The Chief Officer,  
Municipality Office,  
Bannur, T. Narasipura Taluk.

2. The Assistant Executive Engineer,  
Karnataka Urban Water Supply  
and Drainage Board,  
No.927, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 6<sup>th</sup> Main,  
New Kantharaje Urs Road,  
Mysuru.

3. The Executive Engineer,  
Karnataka Slum Development  
Board, No.2, Sub-Division,  
Near High-way Circle,  
Java Factory Road,  
Mysuru.

(Represented by : Sri.N.J.G.K, Advocate for D-1,  
Sri.K.S.R, Advocate for D-2,  
Sri.H.V.S.M, Advocate for D-3).

\* \* \* \* \*

|                                                  |   |                        |
|--------------------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 1. Date of filing of suit                        | : | 18.06.2022.            |
| 2. Nature of Suit                                | : | Permanent Injunction.  |
| 3. Date of recording of<br>evidence commenced on | : | 24.07.2023.            |
| 4. Judgment pronounced on                        | : | 04.11.2024.            |
| 5. Total duration                                | : | Years    Month    Days |
|                                                  |   | 02        04        16 |

**(Venkatesha.K.N.)**  
**Addl. Civil Judge & J.M.F.C.,**  
**T.Narasipura.**

\* \* \* \* \*

## **J U D G M E N T**

This suit is filed by the plaintiffs against the defendants for the relief of Permanent Injunction in respect of the suit schedule property.

### **2. The case of the Plaintiffs in brief is that:-**

The mother of the plaintiffs by name Puttananjamma had purchased the suit schedule property from one Chikkamutthaiah under registered Sale Deed dated: 29.12.1970. Thereafter, she has got changed the Khatha into her name and she has been in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property by paying necessary revenue taxes to the concerned authority.

b). Further averred that, the plaintiffs are in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property and they have left 4 feet space towards Western side of their house to get access of air and light to their house. The defendants are trying to undertake under ground drainage work in the property of the plaintiffs with an intention to harass them on the instigation of political leaders. Even without having any manner of right, ownership and possession over the suit schedule property the defendants are trying to undertake under ground drainage work. In this regard on 31.05.2022

the son of plaintiff No.1 by name Manikanta has lodged a complaint before the concerned police station.

c). Further averred that, the plaintiffs are innocent and they could not able to resist the illegal acts of the defendants. The defendants are financially, politically sound and having people force as such the plaintiffs could not enjoy the peaceful possession of the suit schedule property due to continuous harassment of the defendants. Therefore, the cause of action arose to file this suit and praying to decree the suit with costs.

3. On service of summons, the defendant No.1 to 3 have appeared before the court through their respective counsels and filed their written statements.

a). The defendant No.1 in his written statement has denied the plaint averments and taken up a contention that, the Western side of the suit schedule property there exits a road to an extent of 6 feet width and towards the north side of the road there exits 17 feet road. The western side 6 feet space is not a galli, but it is used by the general public at large. Further contended that, this defendant has already taken up the work of under ground drainage in the 6 feet width road existing between the house of one Manikanta and the suit schedule property the said drainage runs from north to south and links the drainage the existing in the 17 feet public road. This work has been undertaken by this defendant

with main intention to provide civic facility to the general public. This under ground drainage would not affect the suit schedule property in any manner. The plaintiffs with malafide intention to prevent the civic facility work filed this false and frivolous suit against the defendants.

b). The defendant No.2 in his written statement has denied the plaint averments and taken up a contention that, the Government authorities have been undertaking the under ground drainage work underneath the Government road which has got no relation with plaint schedule property. Further the under ground drainage work done underneath the Government road is done for the benefits of the public. Further, in the said process no interference is caused to the property of the plaintiff. The plaintiffs in order to upsurp the government conservancy galli which is on the north side of the plaint schedule property has filed this false suit which deserves to be dismissed. Further contended that, he is no way concerned to the work carried out by defendant No.1 and 3. The plaintiffs without understanding this have made Karnataka Urban Water Supply Drainage Board as the party to this suit. Hence, the defendant No.2 prays to delete his name from the above suit.

c). The defendant No.3 in his written statement has denied the plaint averments and taken up a contention that,

the Karnataka Slum Development Board has constructed 30 houses on the North western side of the suit schedule property and allotted the said houses to 30 beneficiaries and they are living in their respective houses. The said beneficiaries do not have sewerage line facility. The Board has to provide the said basic sewerage line facility. A link Sewerage line will have to be drawn so as to connect it to the main Sewerage line which runs up-till southern side of the suit schedule property. There exists a gradient in the said line so as to facilitate free flow of Sewerage. This defendant is bound to provide drainage system to those 30 house which are constructed under P.M.A.Y-H.F.A Scheme by way of installing secondary line to interlink main line in the 6 feet width space belongs to the defendant No.1. The state of Karnataka has enacted a special Enactment called "The slum Area (Clearance and Development) Act of 1973 with Rule and the Karnataka Slum Development Board and its officials are all acting as per the provisions of he said enactment. Section 66 of the said Act clearly bars Civil courts from entertaining the suit for Injunction against the Board and its officials. Hence, prays to dismiss the suit with costs.

4. Upon considering the material proposition of law and facts averred by both the parties, this Court has framed the following:-

### **ISSUES**

1. Whether the plaintiffs prove that, they are in lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as on the date of filling of the suit ?
2. Whether the plaintiffs prove that, the alleged interference by the defendants over the suit schedule property ?
3. Whether the plaintiffs are entitled for the relief as sought for ?
4. What order or decree ?

5. In order to prove the above case, the plaintiff No.1 has appeared before the court and filed his affidavit in lieu of his examination-in-chief by reiterating the plaint averments and got marked 13 documents at Ex.P-1 to 13. On the other hand, defendant No.3 has examined himself as D.W-1 and defendant No.1 has examined himself as D.W-2 and got marked 02 documents as Ex.D-1 and 2.

6. Heard the arguments of both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. My answers to the above issues are as follows:-

Issue No.1 : In the **Affirmative**.

Issue No.2 : In the **Affirmative**.

Issue No.3 : In the **Affirmative**.

Issue No.4 : As per the final order  
for the following:

**R E A S O N S**

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

These issues are taken together for common discussion in order to avoid repetition of facts and evidence.

It is the specific case of the plaintiffs that, the plaintiffs are in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property and they have left 4 feet space towards Western side of their house to get access of air and light to their house. The defendants are trying to undertake under ground drainage work in the property of the plaintiffs with an intention to harass them on the instigation of political leaders. Even without having any manner of right, ownership and possession over the suit schedule property the defendants are trying to undertake under ground drainage work.

9. In order to prove their case the plaintiff No.1 examined as PW-1. In the oral evidence of P.W-1, he has reiterated the averments of the plaint and denied the case of the defendants. In addition to the oral evidence the plaintiff No.1 has got marked Ex.P-1 to 13. Ex.P-1 is the certified copy of Assessment Register. Ex.P-2 is the Acknowledgment dated: 31.05.2022 issued by the Police, Ex.P-3 to 8 are the Tax paid

receipts, Ex.P-9 to 12 are the photographs and Ex.P-13 is the CD.

10. On the other hand, the defendant No.3 has examined himself as D.W-1 and defendant No.1 has examined himself as D.W-2 and reiterated the written statement averments and denied the case of the plaintiff. Further contended that, the Western side of the suit schedule property there exists a road to an extent of 6 feet width and towards the north side of the road there exists 17 feet road. The western side 6 feet space is not a galli, but it is used by the general public at large. Further contended that, this defendant has already taken up the work of under ground drainage in the said 6 feet width road existing between the house of one Manikanta and the suit schedule property, the said drainage runs from north to south and links the drainage the existing in the 17 feet public road. This work has been undertaken by this defendant with main intention to provide civic facility to the general public. This under ground drainage would not affect the suit schedule property in any manner. The plaintiffs with malafide intention to prevent the civic facility work filed this false and frivolous suit against the defendants.

11. The defendants in order to disprove the case of the plaintiffs, the defendant No.3 has examined himself as D.W-1 and defendant No.1 has examined himself as D.W-2 and they

have reiterated the contents of the written statement and they have got marked 02 documents as Ex.D-1 & 2. Ex.D-1 & 2 are the Photographs.

12. On perusal of Ex.P-1 it reveals that, the suit schedule property has been standing in the name of Puttananjamma, who is the mother of the plaintiffs. Further reveals that, the property measuring 36 x 48 feet has been standing in the name of mother of plaintiffs and in which the plaintiffs have constructed the house measuring  $29\frac{1}{4}$  x  $22\frac{1}{4}$  feet and they have been residing in the said house. Further reveals that, the said Ex.P-1 was issued by the defendant No.1. Hence, the defendant No.1 has been fully knowledge about the suit schedule property. On perusal of Ex.P-2 it reveals that, son of plaintiff No.1 by name Manikanta has lodged a complaint against Aravinda and others in respect of interference of the suit schedule property. On perusal of Ex.P-3 to 8 which reveals that, the plaintiffs have paid the tax to the office of the defendant No.1 in respect of suit schedule property. On perusal of Ex.P-9 & 10 which reveals that, vacant space seen between two houses and the tree has been situated in the said vacant space. On perusal of Ex.P-11 & 12 which reveals that, road has been seen in the said photograph.

13. It is also necessary to examine the documents produced by the defendants. On perusal of Ex.D-1 it reveals

that, the road has been seen in the said photograph. On perusal of Ex.D-2 it reveals that, vacant space seen between two houses.

14. On perusal of the above pleadings and documents it is crystal clear that, the suit schedule house and vacant site property has been standing in the name of mother of the plaintiffs as per Ex.P-1. Further it is crystal clear that, the revenue records have been standing in the name of mother of the plaintiffs with respect to suit schedule property. Further it is crystal clear that, the plaintiffs have been paying the tax to the office of the defendant No.1 in respect of suit schedule property as per Ex.P-3 to 8. Further it is crystal clear that, on 31.05.2022 the son of plaintiff No.1 has lodged a complaint against Aravinda & others in respect of interference over the suit schedule property as per Ex.P-2. On the other hand it is the specific contention of the defendants that, the Western side of the suit schedule property there exists a road to an extent of 6 feet width. The western side 6 feet space is not a galli, but it is used by the general public at large. Further contended that, this defendant has already taken up the work of under ground drainage in the 6 feet width road existing between the house of one Manikanta and the suit schedule property. This work has been undertaken by the defendant No.1 with main intention to provide civic facility to the general public. In order to prove the said contention the defendants

have not produced any document. The defendants have admitted that, the plaintiffs have been residing in the suit schedule house property. But they have contented that, the Western side of the suit schedule property there exists a road to an extent of 6 feet width. The western side 6 feet space is not a galli, but it is used by the general public at large. In order to prove the said contention the defendants have not produced any oral and documentary evidence.

15. Further D.W-1 & 2 themselves admitted that, there is no documents available in respect of alleged 6 feet road existed between the suit schedule property and house of the Manikanta. Further, in order to prove the said contention the defendants have not produced any document except photographs.

16. For better appreciation of evidence, I have also gone through the cross-examination of D.W-1. The relevant portion of the cross-examination of D.W-1 is re-produced as under:-

“ ದಾವಾ ಅನುಸೂಚಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಪೂರ್ವ - ಪಶ್ಚಿಮ 36 ಅಡಿ ಉತ್ತರ - ದಕ್ಷಿಣ 48 ಅಡಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ದಾವಾ ಅನುಸೂಚಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಪಶ್ಚಿಮಕ್ಕೆ ವಾದಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಗೆ ಗಾಳಿ ಮತ್ತು ಬೆಳಕು ಬರುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ 4 ಅಡಿಗಳ ಜಾಗವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ.”

On perusal of the above portion of cross-examination of D.W-1 it is crystal clear that, D.W-1 admitted that, he does know the measurement of the suit schedule property. Further admitted that, he does not know about 4 feet vacant space left towards Western side of the suit schedule property in order to access air and light to the suit schedule house property.

17. The learned counsel for the plaintiff has cross-examined the D.W-2 and it is elicited from him as under:-

“ಯಾವುದೇ ಬಡಾವಣೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಚರಂಡಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಕಾಶೆ ತಯಾರಿಸಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ನಕಾಶೆಯನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರುಪಡಿಸಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವಾದಿಗೆ ದಾವಾ ಅನುಸೂಚಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಪೂರ್ವ ಪಶ್ಚಿಮ 36 ಅಡಿ ಉತ್ತರ ದಕ್ಷಿಣ 48 ಅಡಿಗಳುಳ್ಳ ಮನೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಿವೇಶನ ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ದಾವಾ ಅನುಸೂಚಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಾದಿಗಳು ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಉಳಿಕೆ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಾಂತಿಯುತ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನತೆ ಹೊಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ದಾವಾ ಅನುಸೂಚಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಪಶ್ಚಿಮಕ್ಕೆ 6 ಅಡಿಗಳ ರಸ್ತೆ ಇರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಕಾಶೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಜರುಪಡಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.”

On perusal of the above portion of cross-examination of D.W-2 it is crystal clear that, the D.W-2 himself admitted that, the suit schedule property house and vacant site measuring East to West 36 feet and North to South 48 feet is belongs to plaintiffs. Further admitted that, the plaintiffs have constructed the house in the suit schedule property and they have been in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule house and vacant property.

18. An injunction is an equitable relief by which a person is ordered to restrain from doing something or is ordered to do a particular act or thing. If a plaintiff prays in respect of a violation of right, he must establish his right at law and if he establishes his right, Court can grant an injunction. In this case, the right of the plaintiffs over the suit schedule property is established. On the other hand the defendants have also not denied the right of the plaintiffs over the suit schedule property. But, the defendants have contended that, the Western side of the suit schedule property there exists a road to an extent of 6 feet width. The western side 6 feet space is not a galli, but it is used by the general public at large. Further contended that, the defendants have already taken up the work of under ground drainage in the 6 feet width road existing between the house of one Manikanta and the suit schedule property. This work has been undertaken by the defendants with main intention to provide civic facility to the general public. But, to prove the said contention the defendants have not produced any cogent evidence. Further, the defendants have admitted that, the plaintiffs have constructed the house in the suit schedule property and residing therein. But they have contended that, the Western side of the suit schedule property there exists a road to an extent of 6 feet width. The western side 6 feet space is not a galli, but it is used by the general public at large. In order to

prove the said contention the defendants have not produced any piece of document. Further, the D.W-2 himself admitted that, the suit schedule property house and vacant site measuring East to West 36 feet and North to South 48 feet is belongs to plaintiffs. Further admitted that, the plaintiffs have constructed the house in the suit schedule property and they have been in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule house and vacant property. Moreover, the defendants have no right to taken up under ground drainage in the private property. Further, if the defendants have constructed under ground drainage between the two houses that too private property certainly the said under ground drainage causes hardship to the both houses. Further, the defendants have no right to under take under ground drainage in the private property. Therefore, the plaintiffs are certainly entitle to protect their right over the suit schedule property from any kind of interference.

19. In this regard, I have also gone through Section 38 of the Specific Relief Act which reads as under:-

**38. “Perpetual injunction when granted-**

**(1)** Subject to the other provisions contained in or referred to by this Chapter, a perpetual injunction may be granted to the plaintiff to prevent the breach of an obligation existing in his favour, whether expressly or by implication.

**(2)** When any such obligation arises from contract, the court shall be guided by the rules and provisions contained in Chapter II.

**(3)** When the defendant invades or threatens to invade the plaintiff's right to, or enjoyment of, property, the court may grant a perpetual injunction in the following cases, namely.-

(a) Where the defendant is trustee of the property for the plaintiff;

(b) Where there exists no standard for ascertaining the actual damage caused, or likely to be caused, by the invasion;

(c) Where the invasion is such that compensation in money would not afford adequate relief;

(d) Where the injunction is necessary to present a multiplicity of judicial proceedings.”

As per the above provision, the plaintiffs can approach the Court for perpetual injunction when the defendants invades or threatens to invade the plaintiff's right to or enjoyment of the property.

20. In order to throw more light on this aspect, I have also gone through Section 133 Karnataka Land Revenue Act, that reads as under:-

**"133. Presumption regarding entries in the records-** An entry in the Record of Rights and a certified entry in the Register of Mutations [or in the Patta book] shall be presumed to be true until the contrary is proved or a new entry is lawfully substituted therefor."

As per this Section, it is quite clear that an entry in the Records of Rights and a certified entry in the register of Mutation or Patta Book shall be presumed to be true until the contrary is proved or a new entry is lawfully substituted. Therefore, since it is a suit for Permanent Injunction, the burden is on the plaintiffs to prove that they are in lawful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as on the date of filing of the suit and alleged interference of defendants. As could be seen from the documentary evidence placed by the plaintiffs side, particularly Ex.P-1, it clearly goes to show that, the Khatha of the suit schedule property has been standing in the name of mother of the plaintiffs. Further, the said Ex.P-1 issued by the defendant No.1. Hence it is crystal clear that, the defendant No.1 has admitted the measurement, location and possession over the suit schedule property. Further, on perusal of Ex.P-3 to 8 which are clearly goes to show that, the plaintiffs have been paying the tax to the office of the defendant No.1 in respect of suit schedule property. Further, the D.W-2 himself admitted that, the suit schedule property house and vacant site measuring East to

West 36 feet and North to South 48 feet is belongs to plaintiffs. Further admitted that, the plaintiffs have constructed the house in the suit schedule property and they have been in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule house and vacant property. Further, which are clearly goes to show that, the plaintiffs are in lawful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as on the date of the suit. But the defendants have not proved contrary to documents produced by the plaintiffs. Hence it is quite clear that an entry in the Demand Register shall be presumed to be true.

21. Since the suit is for the relief of permanent injunction, the Court is required to lay its hands only on the aspect of possession and interference. The keen perusal of the documents of the plaintiff's side clearly goes to show that, the Khatha of the suit schedule property has been standing in the name of mother of the plaintiffs as per Ex.P-1. Accordingly, the plaintiffs have been in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule house and vacant property. On the other hand it is the specific contention of the defendants that, the Western side of the suit schedule property there exits a road to an extent of 6 feet width. The western side 6 feet space is not a galli, but it is used by the general public at large. In order to prove the said contention the defendants have not produced any piece of documents. Further, D.W-2 himself admitted that,

the plaintiffs are in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule house and vacant property. Therefore, the plaintiffs are certainly entitle to protect their right over the suit schedule property from any kind of interference. Further, the defendant No.1 himself issued Ex.P-1 in favour of plaintiffs. Hence it is crystal clear that, the defendant No.1 himself admitted the measurement of the suit schedule property and possession of the suit schedule property. Hence, the contention raised by the defendants in the cross-examination and arguments is not acceptable. Further, in order to prove the said contention the defendants have not placed any contra materials to rebut the presumption available under Section 133 of Karnataka Land Revenue Act. Hence, the case of the plaintiffs can be accepted.

22. The evidence of the plaintiffs side clearly supports their case and the contra materials of the defendants side do not come in the way to take away the case of the plaintiffs. The plaintiffs are claiming their right over the suit schedule property and the defendants are denied the possession of the plaintiffs over the suit schedule property. To prove the said aspect the defendants have not produced any oral and documentary evidence. Further the defendants have not disputed the nature of the property. Further they have not disputed the extent, boundaries, identity and location of the suit schedule property. Further, on perusal of Ex.P-1, it is

clearly disclosed that, the suit schedule property has been standing in the name of mother of the plaintiffs. At present the suit schedule property has been standing in the name of mother of the plaintiffs. Hence, the said documents have been clearly supported the case of the plaintiffs. Thus, when the suit schedule property is in the possession and enjoyment of plaintiffs, then the defendants have no right to interfere with peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. As mentioned above the materials on record disclosed that the plaintiffs are in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the plaintiffs have clearly established their case by placing relevant evidence in order to prove the Issue No.1 and thereby they have sufficiently proved that they are in lawful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as on the date of the suit.

23. The persons having right over the property they are entitled to get protection under law to the said property from any kind of interference from any person. The rightful owner of the property cannot be subjected to interference or threat by any person having no right over such property. Admittedly, the defendants do not have any right over the suit schedule property. The possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property with the plaintiffs are undisputed fact. Such being the case, it is very much necessary to protect the possession

and enjoyment of the plaintiffs over the suit schedule property from any kind of interference by the defendants. Otherwise, the plaintiff who is the rightful owner of the suit schedule property will be thrown away from the possession and enjoyment of the property and that is not permissible under law. Therefore, plaintiffs have been able to establish that, they are in lawful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property as on the date of filing of the suit and the interference caused by the defendants. Therefore, there is no reason to discard the same. Accordingly **Issue No.1 and 2** are answered in the **Affirmative**.

24. **Issue No.3:-**

In view of my findings on the Issue No.1 and 2 it is proved that, the plaintiffs are in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property as discussed above and the defendants without having any manner of right or interest are interfering with the possession of the plaintiffs. Hence, it is necessary to perpetually restrain the defendants from such interference with respect to suit schedule property. Hence, the plaintiffs are entitled for the relief of permanent injunction with respect to suit schedule property. Accordingly, **Issue No.3** is answered in the **Affirmative**.

**25. Issue No.4:-**

In view of the findings on Issue No.1 to 3 this Court proceeds to pass the following:-

**ORDER**

The suit of the plaintiffs is hereby **decreed.**

The defendants, their men, relatives, henchmen, agents, servants, representatives or any persons on their behalf are hereby restrained from interfering of the suit schedule property in any manner.

By considering the facts and circumstances of the case, No order as to costs.

Draw decree accordingly.

(Directly generated through the computer by the Stenographer to my dictation with my verification and then signed and pronounced by me in the Open Court dated: this the 4<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2024.)

**(Venkatesha.K.N.)**  
**Addl. Civil Judge & J.M.F.C.,**  
**T.Narasipura.**

**ANNEXURE****LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR PLAINTIFF:-**

P.W-1 : Sri.L.Devaraju.

**LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED FOR PLAINTIFF:-**

Ex.P-1 : Certified copy of Assessment Register.  
Ex.P-2 : Acknowledgment dated:31.05.2022,  
Ex.P-3 to 8 : Tax paid receipts,  
Ex.P-9 to 12 : Photographs,  
Ex.P-13 : C.D.

**LIST OF WITNESSES EXAMINED FOR DEFENDANT:-**

D.W-1 : Sri.G.S.Ramachandra,  
D.W-2 : Sri.R.Hemanth Raj.

**LIST OF EXHIBITS MARKED FOR DEFENDANT:-**

Ex.D-1 & 2 : Photographs.

**Addl. Civil Judge & J.M.F.C.,  
T.Narasipura. \*\***