

BEFORE THE ADDITIONAL MASTER IV,
HIGH COURT, MADRAS
T.O.S.No.68 OF 2024

Date: 23.01.2026
Time : 11.01 A.M.

Name : Mrs. R. Sujatha Ramesh Pawar (DW1)

Continuation of cross examination by Mr. Mahesh, Counsel for the plaintiff.

Solemnly affirmed:

Q18: I put it to you that since the suit property was given to Soorya Prakash in accordance with the family arrangement, the deceased Kuppu Rao has provided partial financial help to purchase two house properties at Bangalore in the name of your husband and your name in the year 2006.

A: I deny. Both the apartments at Bangalore were purchased jointly with my husband when we both were working in Bangalore through home loan. Normally, home loan is given only for 85% of the property value but in our case, we provided additional mortgaged documents, like NSC certificates and insurance certificates and got 100% home loan from IDBI bank, we only paid processing expenses for the loan and all these are mentioned in the home loan issued documents. I am still repaying the home loan. I am currently living with my brother in my mother's home in Chennai. No financial assistance was provided by anyone to buy this.

Q19: Can you name the bank and the amount of loan availed by you from the said bank?

A: Home loan was taken from IDBI bank and the total loan amount received was Rs.34 lakhs together for both the flats.

Q20: I put it to you that the extent of the properties in Survey No.30/8 purchased at Belandur, Bangalore would approximately be 2500 sq.ft and its market value would be Rs.50 lakhs.

A: Both the properties' square feet measurement would be around 2300 but I am not sure about the current market value.

Q21: Where was your husband employed and what was his monthly income?

A: My husband was into sales roles in different IT companies in both Chennai and Bangalore and his pay scale was roughly around Rs.50,000/- per month. Also due to his health condition, he was unemployed for several months.

Q22: Where were you employed and what was your monthly income?

A: I was working with a private firm in Chennai lastly in 2016 and I was earning around Rs.30,000/- per month.

Q23: What was the EMI amount and to which bank was it paid?

A: Loan was taken from IDBI bank and the EMI amount was roughly about Rs.37,000/-.

Q24: I put it to you that you and your husband made a monthly income of Rs.87,000/- and did not have the financial capacity to pay the EMI.

A: When the loan was taken from IDBI bank, they normally check the financial capacity of the persons and only then issue the loan. So, I think, we were comfortable paying the loan though it was difficult during the bad health situation.

Q25: I put it to you that you would have shown your financial capacity to the bank but you could not afford to pay the EMI to the bank.

A: Yes, it was really difficult sometimes paying the home loan EMI. So, I had to pledge my jewels to pay it in bad times.

Q26: I put it to you that your husband was not well and therefore, you did not have the sufficient means to pay the EMI.

A: Yes, it was really difficult and I had to pledge my jewels to repay the loan in bad times.

Q27: I put it to you that since you did not have enough money to buy the Bangalore property, Kuppu Rao lent you a sum of Rs.20,00,000/-.

A: I totally deny.

Q28: I put it to you that since Kuppu Rao had lent you Rs.20,00,000/- part financial help, your husband, Ramesh Kuppu Rao did not claim any share in the suit property.

A: I deny.

Q29: I put it to you that out of greed you are claiming share in the suit property beyond the family arrangement.

A: I deny.

Q30: In CS.No.240/2024, Kuppu Rao has filed his written statement in which he has stated that Ramesh Kuppu Rao has no right to claim any share in the suit property as it is a self acquired property. What do you say?

A: As legal heir of Ramesh Kuppu Rao, I have full legal rights to claim my share in the property.

Q31: Is it correct to state that CS.No.240/2024 was referred to Mediation by the XVIII Assistant Judge, City Civil Court while it was pending there and was send back to the said court when the mediation failed?

A: Yes.

Q32: Is it correct to state that since the deceased Kuppu Rao refused to give any share to you in the suit property in the Mediation proceedings, it was send back to court?

A: In the Mediation court, it was asked by the Mediator to provide the legal documents of the property, that is when they moved back to the court since they could not provide documents as the sale deed was still pending / not issued.

Q33: I put it to you that since Kuppu Rao had already decided to give the suit property to Soorya Prakash, he refused to give you any share in the Mediation proceedings.

A: Kuppur Rao has not mentioned about the Will in any of the written statements or in the case hearings / mediation proceedings.

Q34: You have stated that the Will has been fabricated. Have you stated on what basis and under what circumstances you claim that the Will has been fabricated in your written statement?

A: Detailed documents have been filed already that the Will is a fake and forged document created after the death of Mr. Kuppu Rao.

Q35: You have mentioned that the Will is a fake and forged document. Have you made out any specific allegation with regard to the signature in the Will in the written statement?

A: Yes. It is already mentioned.

Q36: I put it to you that since Kuppu Rao's signatures found in the written statement filed by him in CS No.240/2024 and the signature found in the Will are the same, you had not made any allegation with respect to his signature in your written statement.

A: I deny.

Q37: I put it to you that since you knew that the signatures were the same, you did not read through the Will and out of greed have filed your written statement in CS 240/2024.

A: I deny. Witness adds: When I filed the partition suit Mr. Kuppu Rao was alive and he had personally come for the case hearings. So, here his signature is not a prime evidence.

Q38: I put it to you that the Will has all the necessary features of an original Will, you have not been able to dispute the same.

A: I deny.

Q39: I put it to you that Soorya Prakash had spent Rs.9,72,157/- in constructing and renovating the suit property.

A: I deny.

Q40: I put it to you that Soorya Prakash has filed all the necessary documents to prove that he has spent the sum of Rs.9,72,157/- and you have not disputed the genuineness of the documents.

A: I deny. Witness adds: Those bills are not genuine.

Q41: Have you stated in your written statement that the bills are not genuine?

A: Yes, it is mentioned, though these bills are not genuine to the fact.

Q42: Did you go to your in-laws house at the time of the demise of your father-in-law and mother-in-law?

A: I was not informed about their death and only later, came to know about it.

Q43: When you came to know about their demise, did you visit their house and offer your condolences?

A: I was chased out of the house after my husband's death. So, I had to file a partition suit for the property. So, visiting them, at that time, would not be appropriate.

Q44: I put it to you that you were not in cordial terms with them and have filed this suit out of greed.

A: I deny.

Q45: I put it to you that the Will is genuine and that you have filed your written statement falsely stating that it is a false, fake and forged document.

A: I deny.

Q46: I put it to you that the Letters of Administration have to be granted to Soorya Prakash as a legatee of Kuppu Rao as prayed for.

A: I deny.

Re-Examination : Nil.

Time: 11.47 A.M.

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

ADDITIONAL MASTER-IV