

BEFORE THE ADDITIONAL MASTER-III
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.
C.S.No.930 OF 2016

Date: 24.07.2026
Time: 10.45 A.M

Name : D.Venkatesh (DW1)

Continuation of Cross Examination by Mr.S.Mohanakrishnan, Learned counsel for the Plaintiffs.

Solemnly Affirmed:

Q28: Do you know why the plaintiffs have filed this suit?

A: Yes. Witness adds: They have sought for partition and details of bank account.

Q29: (Ex.P14 is shown to the witness) When did you file the suit in OS.No.5478/2016?

A: In the year 2016. I do not remember the date and month.

Q30: Do you know when the judgment was passed in OS.No.5478/2016?

A: On 02.12.2016.

Q31: How are the plaintiffs related to you?

A: They are my sisters.

Q32: I put it to you that you have filed OS.No.5478/2016 on the file of XVII Additional City Civil Court seeking partition.

A: Yes.

Q33: Why did you not include your sisters in OS.No.5478/2016?

A: They have already executed a release deed in favour of my parents. So, I did not include them.

Q34: What is the value of the property mentioned in OS.No.5478/2016?

A: My father had valued at Rs.25 Lakhs.

Q35: Is it correct that you filed the suit in OS.No.5478/2016?

A: Yes.

Q36: I put it to you that you have undervalued the property and filed the suit in XVII Additional City Civil Court and you have wantonly avoided to include your sisters in the suit.

A: I deny. Witness adds: My sisters have already given registered release deed in favour of my parents. So, there was no necessity to include my sisters in the suit.

Q37: (Ex.P6 is shown to the witness) Whether there is any mention that your sisters are executing the release deed in respect of the suit property in favour of your parents?

A: In page No.6 it is stated as follows “மேலும் எங்களது பெற்றோர் பெயரில் உள்ள மிகுதி சொத்துக்களில் நாங்களோ எங்களது வாரிசுதாரர்களோ பிற்காலத்தில் எவ்வித சொத்து உரிமையும் கோரமாட்டோம் என இதன்மூலம் உறுதி அளிக்கிறோம்” This Ex.P6 release deed was executed on consideration.

Q38: (Ex.P6 is shown to the witness) In Page No.4 of Ex.P6 release deed only the Shastri Nagar property is mentioned and in the description of property in Ex.P6 also only Shastri Nagar property is mentioned. So, I put it to you that Ex.P6 release deed is not in relation to the property as mentioned in this suit?

A: I deny. Witness adds: That the suit property also is included in Ex.P6 release deed.

Q39: I put it to you that in a release deed the description of the property and the consideration will be clearly stated.

A: In Ex.P6 it is stated “மிகுதி சொத்துக்களில்” which includes the suit property also.

Q40: I put it to you that a single release deed cannot be executed with regard to all properties.

A: I deny.

Q41: Whether it is correct that the plaintiffs have filed the suit on November 2016 from this Court?

A: On seeing the original plaint the witness says that the suit was filed on 28.11.2016.

Q42: I put it to you that the plaintiffs herein were not aware of the suit filed by you before the XVII Additional City Civil Court in OS.No.5478/2016 and the plaintiffs herein have filed this suit even prior to your filing OS.No.5478/2016?

A: I am not aware of it.

Q43: Whether you and your sisters are residing together in the suit schedule property?

A: No, one of my elder sister alone is residing in the suit property.

Q44: (Ex.P4-Ex.P6 are shown to the witness) Is it correct that Ex.P4-Ex.P6 were registered on one and the same day?

A: Yes.

Q45: I put it to you that the value of the suit property in OS.No.5478/2016 is Rs.3 Crores that you have wantonly undervalued the suit property and malafidely obtained an order from the Court.

A: I deny.

Q46: The guideline value of the suit property in the year 2016 was Rs.8,500/- per Sq.ft. Is it right?

A: I have not seen the guide line value.

Q47: When was the first hearing date in the suit in OS.No.5478/2016?

A: I do not remember.

Q48: Whether you took care of your parents when they were alive?

A: No, we were residing separately.

Q49: I put it to you that on your instruction your father had entered into a compromise in the suit in OS.No.5478/2016 even on the first date of hearing on 02.12.2016.

A: I deny. Witness adds: The elders in the family convinced my father to enter into a compromise.

Q50: Is it right that the plaintiffs herein have claimed share in A and B Schedule properties?

A: Yes.

Q51: I put it to you that your sisters Alamelu and Jayanthi were not aware of the details of the jewels possessed by your parents.

A: I deny.

Q52: In your written statement you have stated that your sisters had applied to bank under RTI seeking the details of the jewels in the locker. I put it to you that as your sisters were not aware of the details of your parents jewels, they had sought for information under RTI.

A: No, it is not correct.

Q53: I put it to you that you had forced your father to give letter to the bank and that your father had not voluntarily given any letter to the bank.

A: I deny. Witness adds: All of us have given the letter to the bank willingly.

Q54: I put it to you that either the release deed or any other document cannot deny the claim made by the plaintiffs in this suit.

A: I deny.

Q55: I put it to you that your father being the first defendant has filed the written statement on your instruction and instigation stating that the plaintiffs herein have no right in the suit property

A: I deny.

Q56: I put it to you that you have not filed any written statement separately and you have just adopted the written statement filed by your father.

A: Yes, but I have also filed an additional written statement.

Q57: I put it to you that only with an intention to grab the entire property you have filed OS.No.5478/2016 without including your sisters.

A: I deny. Witness adds: My sisters have no right in the properties.

Q58: I put it to you that you cannot say that the daughters have no right in the property of their parents and I state that the plaintiffs have right over the suit property.

A: I deny. Witness adds: Once my sisters have executed the release deed, they cannot claim any share in the property.

Q59: I put it to you that as the suit in OS.No.5478/2016 was malafidely filed by undervaluing the suit property the preliminary decree passed in that suit will not bind the plaintiffs herein.

A: I deny.

Time : 11.30 A.M.

Taken down in open Court, read over and explained to the witness and the same is admitted by the witness to be correct and signed before me.

ADDITIONAL MASTER-III