



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V SRISHANANDA

REGULAR SECOND APPEAL NO. 1897 OF 2023 (PAR/POS)

BETWEEN:

SMT SOWMYA SHREE
D/O SRI SRINIVAS,
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.3396,
8TH MAIN, 8TH CROSS, 2ND PHASE,
NEAR NISARGA HOTEL,
KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT,
BENGALURU - 560 078

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. C. SHANKAR REDDY, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT KRISHNAMMA
D/O LATE M NARAYANAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS,
2. SMT GOWRAMMA
D/O LATE M NARAYANAPPA,
W/O KRISHANAPPA @ RAJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
3. SRI SRINIVAS
S/O LATE M NARAYANAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,

Digitally
signed by
MALATESH
K C

Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

CNR: KAHC010560862023

4. SMT YASHODAMMA
D/O LATE M NARAYANAPPA,
W/O SRI SRINIVAS
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
5. SRI DEVARAJU
S/O LATE M NARAYANAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
6. SMT ALUVELAMMA
D/O LATE M NARAYANAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/AT JEEGANAHALLI VILLAGE
MANDIKAL HOBLI
CHIKKABALLAPUR TALUK - 562 104
7. SRI NARAYANASWAMY
S/O LATE M NARAYANAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
8. SRI MAHESH
S/O SRI SRINIVAS
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,

RESPONDENTS NO.3 AND 8 ARE RESIDING AT DOOR
NO.567, 69TH CROSS, 1 STAGE
KUMARASWAMY LAYOUT
BENGALURU - 560 078

9. SMT SHASHIKALA
D/O SRI SRINIVAS
W/O ANAND,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
RESIDING KYATHASANDRA VILLAGE,
TUMAKURU TALUK AND DISTRICT,
KARNATAKA - 572 104



NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

CNR: KAHC010560862023

RESPONDENTS NO.1, 2, 4, 5 AND 7 ARE
RESIDING AT BAMBOO BAZAR,
KORAMARAPETE, K.G. ROAD,
CHIKKABALLAPUR TALUK
CHIKAKBALLAPUR DISTRICT - 562 101

10. SRI SRINIVAS GOTTIPATTI
S/O G RAMAKRISHNA RAO,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.105,
JYOTHI MEADOWS, NO.28/3,
SHIVALINGAIAH COLONY,
JEEVANA BHEEMA NAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 017
11. SRI. B.R. PRAKASH
S/O H R BASAVARAJU,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
RESIDING AT MARASANAHALLI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
CHIKKABALLAPURA - 562 101
12. SMT. SOWBAGYAMMA
D/O. M. KRISHNAPPA @ RAJAPPA
WIFE OF DEVARAJ
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
13. SMT. AMARAMMA
D/O. M. KRISHNAPPA @ RAJAPPA
AGED AOBUT 43 YEARS
14. SMT. SHYLAMMA
D/O. M. KRISHNAPPA @ RAJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

15. SMT. SANDHYA
D/O. M. KRISHNAPPA @ RAJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS

16. SMT. SUSHMA
D/O. M. KRISHNAPPA @ RAJAPPA
AGED AOBUT 37 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDENTS OF BAMBOO BAZAR
KORAMARAPETE, M.G. ROAD
CHIKKABALLAPURA
KARNATAKA - 562 101

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MANOJ M. NAIK, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. A. NAGARAJAPPA, ADVOCATE FOR R1
SRI. K.M. GOVINDA REDDY, ADVOCATE FOR C/R11)

THIS RSA IS FILED UNDER SEC.100 OF CPC., AGAINST
THE JUDGMENT AND DECREE DATED 03.08.2023 PASSED IN
R.A.NO.20/2023 ON THE FILE OF THE PRINCIPAL JUDGE,
FAMILY COURT, CHIKKABALLAPURA, DISMISSING THE APPEAL
AND CONFIRMING THE JUDGMENT AND DECREE DATED
02.12.2015 PASSED IN OS NO.76/2009 ON THE FILE OF THE
ADDITIONAL SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC,
CHIKKABALLAPUR.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY,
JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V SRISHANANDA



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

ORAL JUDGMENT

1. Heard Sri. C. Shankar Reddy, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri. Manoj M. Naik for Sri. A. Nagarajappa, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. Unsuccessful plaintiff is the appellant challenging the dismissal of the suit in OS No.76/2009 confirmed in RA No.20/2023.

3. Facts in the nutshell which are utmost necessary for disposal of the present appeal are as under:

3.1 A suit for partition and separate possession in respect of the following properties (hereinafter referred to as 'suit properties' for short) came to be filed in OS No.76/2009.

-:: SCHEDULE::-

1. House site situated in third division, Koramarpete, Chickballapur, bearing Municipal khata & assessment No.510/458, measuring 35X50 feet and 32 ¼ X 11 12 feet, consisting of two houses bounded as under :-

*East by: House Gadeppa
West by : Hanumanthappa's house
North by: House belongs to Rayappa
South by : Road*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

2. House site situated in third division, Koramarpete, Chickballapur, bearing Municipal khata & assessment No.526/492, measuring 30 X 50 feet, consisting of houses and shop premises bounded as under :-

*East by :Church premises
West by : Road
North by : Ashwathappa's property
South by: S. Narayanappa's property*

3. House site situated in third division, Koramarpete, Chickballapur, bearing Municipal khata & assessment No.481/452, measuring 11/2½ X 20 feet, consisting of house bounded as under :-

*East by :Joint family property
West by : Muthappa's property
North by : Kamalakshamma's property
South by : Gajalamma's property*

4. House site situated in third division, Koramarpete, Chickballapur, bearing Municipal khata & assessment No.482/453, measuring 25 X 24 feet, consisting of house bounded as under :-

*East by : Narayanaswamy property
West by: Joint family property
North by : Kamalakshamma's property
South by: Gajalamma's property*

5. Property bearing Sy.No.78 totally measuring 6-24 guntas and karab of 0-24 guntas, out of this 3-12 guntas only, situated at Marasanahalli village, Kasaba hobli, Chickballapur taluk, bounded by :-

*East by :N.H.7
West by :Poojappa's land
North by:Ashwathappa's land
South by:Harobande village limits.*

6. Property bearing Sy.No.45/4C, totally measuring 0-18 guntas, and karab of 0-15 guntas, out of which measuring East to West 15 feet and North to South 52 feet and East to West 15 feet and North to South 52 feet situated at



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

*Sidlaghatta Bagailu village, Kasaba hobli, Chickballapur
Taluk, bounded on :-*

*East by :Venkataswamy property
West by: Shop of Jayraju
North by: Play ground of St.Joseph Convent school
South by: Sidlaghatta Road.*

3.2. In the plaint, it is contented that the plaintiff, defendants No.9 and 10 are the children of defendant No.4. Defendant No.1 is the wife and defendants No.2 to 8 are the children of Sri. Narayanappa who was original prepositus of the family.

3.3. It is also contented that Narayanappa was in possession and enjoyment of the suit properties during his lifetime and after his death plaintiffs and defendants No.1 to 10 are in joint possession of the suit properties as coparceners.

3.4. Plaint averments further reveal that the sixth defendant was managing the joint family properties and alienated 1-00 acre in Item No.5 of the suit properties to



CNR: KAHC010560862023

defendant No.11 and 0-15 guntas of land in favour of defendant No.12.

3.5. Plaintiff averments also reveal that in respect of Item No.6 was alienated in favour of Defendant No.13 and therefore they are subsequently impleaded in the suit.

3.6. Plaintiff contended that since he is the coparcener of the suit joint family properties, suit is to be decreed.

3.7. Pursuant to the suit summons, defendants No.1, 2, 8, 9 and 13 though appeared did not choose to file any written statement. Defendants No.3, 6 and 10 remained absent. It is the defendant No.7 alone who filed the written statement admitting the claim of the plaintiff and sought for allotment of her share in the suit properties. Defendant No.11 filed separate written statement denying the plaint averments and contended that he purchased 1-00 acre in Item No.5 of the suit



CNR: KAHC010560862023

**NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023**

properties from defendant No.1 and remaining extent is still in possession of defendant No.1.

3.8. Defendant No.11 contended that he is a *bona fide* purchaser of the suit properties in Item No.1 and sought for dismissal of the suit.

3.9. Defendant No.12 also filed separate statement denying the plaint averments in *toto* and maintained that he is also a *bona fide* purchaser of value to the extent of 0-15 guntas in Item No.5 of the suit properties.

3.10. Based on the rival contentions, learned Trial Judge raised necessary issues and noting the fact that the plaintiff cannot maintain the suit during the lifetime of her father, dismissed the suit of the plaintiff.

3.11. Being aggrieved by the same, plaintiff filed an appeal before the First Appellate Court in R.A. No.20/2023.



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

3.12. Learned Judge in the First Appellate Court after securing the records, heard the arguments of the parties and on re-appreciation of the material on record, concurred with the findings recorded by the learned Trial Judge and dismissed the appeal.

4. Being further aggrieved by the same, plaintiff has filed the present appeal on following grounds and substantial questions of law:

GROUND

- *The impugned Judgments and Decrees of the courts below under challenge are contrary to law, facts and circumstances of the case and also evidence available on record.*
- *The first appellate failed to consider and dispose of the pending applications filed under Order VI Rule 17 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure and also the application filed under Order XLI Rule 27 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Keeping the applications pending though the pendency of the applications was brought to the knowledge of the first appellate court renders the impugned judgement bad in*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

law. All pending applications were required to be disposed of.

- *The courts below have failed to apply the law to the admitted facts and circumstances of the case and citations made available in this behalf were brushed aside without proper application of mind resulting in passing of erroneous judgments and decrees.*
- *The defendants though filed written statement failed to lead evidence and hence the contents of the written statement remained unproved on record. Hence, the courts below ought to have drawn adverse inference against the defendants for non tendering oral or documentary evidence which the courts failed to take note of.*
- *The lower appellate court being the last fact finding court ought to have examined the entire material oral and documentary evidence available on record instead of mechanically accepting the finding of the trial court and there is absence of independent and judicious findings.*
- *The Trial Court has framed the following issues: (1) Whether the plaintiff proves that the Plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 10 are the members of Hindu undivided Joint family?*

(i) Whether the plaintiffs proves that the Plaintiff schedule properties are the ancestral and joint



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

*family properties of the Plaintiffs and defendants
No.1 to 10?*

*(i) Whether the 12 defendant proves that he is the
bonafide purchaser to an extent of 15 guntas in
item No.5?*

*(iv) Whether the plaintiff is entitled for the relief as
claimed?*

(v) What Order and decree?

- *While the Trial Court answered the issue No.1, 2, 4 and 5 in the negative and with respect to issue No.4 observed that does not arise for consideration and holding that the appellant is not entitled for the relief sought, during the life time of father, even though the appellant has proved that the suit schedule items are ancestral and joint family properties. the specific observation made in the judgment that according to the reported Judgment of our Hon'ble High court in 2008(1) K.L.J 488 is squarely applicable to the facts of the case. hence during the life time of respondent No.4 in RA ie., father of the appellant, the plaintiff cannot said to have acquired any right, title or interest over the suit schedule properties, therefore the suit itself is to be held not maintainable, the apex as well as our own High court in various reported rulings and also amendment to section 6 of Hindu succession act, the female by birth got right in ancestral and joint family properties, admittedly the suit schedule Items are*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

ancestral and joint family properties, as such observation with respect to maintainability of the suit is not correct and proper.

- *The court below failed to appreciate that the parties to the suit are governed by Hindu Mitakshara Law, therefore the appellant as daughter of respondent No.4 (Coparcener), shall by birth become coparcener, in her own right in the same manner as that of the son and has same rights in the coparcenary property as if she was a son, including right to claim by survivorship, hence she is entitled equal right share allotable to son.*
- *The trial court failed to appreciate that under Mitakshara Law mother has no right to demand partition in the ancestral and joint family property, as such the appellant immediately after attainment of Majority as per Indian Majority act approached the respondent No.5 to demarcate the suit schedule property and allot a separate share, and further by virtue of amendment to section 6 of Hindu succession act, the daughter has taken the status of coparcener and acquired the rights available to son, therefore, the same analogy, in the interest of justice, has to be applied to the daughter.*
- *The trial court clearly observed in the impugned judgment that the suit schedule properties are originally belongs to one Narayanappa grandfather of the appellant, after the death of the Narayanappa, the suit schedule properties became the ancestral and joint family properties of*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

appellant and respondents, therefore the appellant by birth became coparcener, and it is further submit that the trial court failed to appreciate that after the death of Late Narayanappa his wife respondent No. 1 herein became name sake kartha of the joint family, accordingly the revenue entries pertaining to the suit schedule items mutated in the name of 1" respondent and further the property in the hands of 1" respondent is considered to be the coparcenary property, as she succeeded to the entire property along with respondent No.1 to 10, by virtue of amendment to Hindu succession act 1956, she became the coparcener having joint ownership over the suit property along with her father, therefore, the right to share and demand the separate share in the suit property.

- *The trial court failed to appreciate that, it is also settled principal of law that, one coparcener having actual physical possession over the joint family property, is treated that, his possession is on his behalf and on behalf of other coparceners though the other coparceners (joint family members) were residing elsewhere and that, such residence of other members cannot be treated that, they are separated and residing far away from the suit property having no possession and after lapse of alleged period they have lost their right over the joint family property etc, therefore the appellant considered to be residing separately and the possession of the suit property was with respondent No.1 and 5 it does not defeat the claim of the appellant has joint owner in*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

possession of the suit property, on the basis of the legal aspect the appellant has proved the joint status as coparcener and joint family member along with her father respondent No.4 and acquisition of joint ownership and possessory right over the suit properties, by virtue of the amendment to the Hindu Succession Act of 1956.

- *The trial court failed to appreciate the specific contention of the appellant before the court below that, in view of the drastic change in the law (Hindu Succession Act 1956-Amended Act) the appellant as daughter has secured the status as coparcener of the joint family property, who got vested the rights of a son in a ancestral and joint family property and she is entitled to her legitimate share in the suit property, thus the appellant and respondent No.1 to 10 are forming the joint Hindu family, therefore the appellant and respondent No.1 to 10 are considered to be the coparcener in respect of suit properties.*

- *The trial court grossly erred in non consideration of the facts and law that the suit schedule items are the ancestral and joint family properties of the appellant and respondent No.1 to 10 and it is held that Respondent No.1, 6 & 8 has sold 0-15 guntas in item No.5 in favour of 12th respondent under registered sale deed dated 30.07.2004 and further an extent of 1-00 acre out of the total extent in item No.5 of the suit schedule property the respondent No.1,6 & 9 has sold in favour of the respondent No.11 under a registered sale deed dated 06.05.2006, and which is followed by a consent deed*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

executed by the Respondent No.3, 5 and 7 confirming the registered sale deed executed in favour of the Respondent No.11, with respect to these alleged transactions the appellant vehemently canvassed her argument that in view of the Karnataka state government has amended Section 6 of Hindu Succession Act as Section 6-A, the said provision came into effect from 30.07.1994, as per the said provision of the Karnataka state government had amended Section 6 of the Hindu Succession Act by inserting Section 6-A to the Hindu Succession Act and which has been came into force with effect from 30.07.1994 and as per the amended provision if at all daughters married prior to 30.07.1994 or if at all partition has been effected before commencement of Hindu Succession Act, it will not apply to the daughters otherwise a female also became coparcener and she is also entitled to a share as a son. Thus, since from 30.07.1994 the female children/appellant became the coparcener in the joint family any alienation or transaction after they became coparceners in the joint family and any alienation or transaction after they became coparcener will not binds on her share, admittedly, the sale transactions are after the appellant became the coparcener, hence the said sale deeds not binds on the share of the appellant.

- *The trial court failed to notice that any of the respondents, including the 11th and 12th respondent in RA no.20/2023 have not entered into witness box to adduce their evidence, hence this benefit should go to the*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

appellant, and further the respondents intentionally avoided to adduce their evidence, since they are/were well aware that the truth will come out if entered into witness box and further it is their bounden duty to establish that alienation made by the kartha of the family has been challenged by the appellant on the ground that want of legal necessity and they have no independent right to alienate the portion of item No.5 and 6 of suit schedule, the alienee has to establish the legal necessity for the sale transaction. The recitals in the deeds are themselves do not prove all the legal necessities. of course, sale deeds which are marked Exhibit P-8 and 9 disclose that that the sale transaction made for family necessities of Respondent No. 1, 6 and 8 in RA no.20/2023, but it does not means to say that it is for the family and legal necessities of the respondents, the respondent No.11 and 12 in RA no.20/2023 have not made any efforts in proving the fact that the sale transaction is for the family and legal necessity of the aforesaid respondents, the court below instead of setting aside the said sales have observed that the suit is not maintainable.

- *The courts below ought to have followed the decision reported AIR 1983 SC 1601, AIR 1968 SC 1276 and AIR 1976 SC 1715 that under Hindu law, property inherited from parental ancestor is called ancestral property, under Hindu law, all property inherited by a Hindu from his father, father's father or father's father's father is ancestral property, the essential feature of ancestral*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

**NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023**

property according to Mithakshara law the person who inherits it acquire an interest in it by birth. The non consideration of this legal aspects has rendered the judgments of the courts below bad in law.

- *The trial court passed the impugned judgment and decree against the appellant, relied on a reported citation 2008 (1) KLJ 488. The appellant has made all sincere efforts to obtain the copy of judgment, which is not available and further the court below has not mentioned the parties name along with the reported ruling as such unable to get the copy of the same, and the appellant herein reserves her right to submit arguments on this aspect at appropriate stage.*
- *That the impugned Judgment clearly establishes that the courts below has not rendered the Judgment considering and appreciating the evidence and documents and further grossly erred in not applying his mind in a right perspective manner and the Judgments of the Courts below are based on only reasoning that the sentiments of the Respondents be hurt, though there is nothing on record to prove that the Respondents sentiments will be hurt in granting the relief.*
- *Under the above stated circumstances, the Appellant/ Plaintiff is entitled for a decree of Partition and separate possession against the Respondents and the judgments and decrees of the courts below are required to be reversed.*



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

- *Viewed from any angle, the impugned Judgments and Decrees of the courts below are not speaking ones, are bad under law, opposed to the facts and circumstances and it is perverse and hence the same are liable to be set aside.*
- *Viewed from any angle, the Judgments and Decrees of the courts below are contrary to the law and facts and circumstances of the case. The same are to be set-aside by this Hon'ble court by decreeing the above appeal.*
- *The appellant craves leave of this honourable court to canvas other grounds available to her in law at the time of hearing.*

SUBSTANTIAL QUESTIONS OF LAW :

[a] Whether the courts below were right in dismissing the suit though there was no contest from the defendants in the form or leading oral or documentary evidence ?

[b] Whether the first appellate court was right in disposing of the main appeal without disposing of the pending applications filed under Order VI Rule 17 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure and also the application filed under Order XLI Rule 27 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure ?

[c] Whether the courts below failed to appreciate that the appellant being the granddaughter of Smt. Lakshmamma



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

and Sri M. Narayanappa is entitled for a share in the suit properties and that the alienations are not binding on her especially when the same is not proved for joint family necessities ?

[d] Whether the courts below failed to appreciate that one of the sale deed is executed during the year 2006 ie., on 06.05.2006 and hence the amended Hindu Succession Act provides for a share to the plaintiff ?

[e] Whether the courts below failed to draw adverse inference against the defendants for not entering into the witness box and prove the allegations made in the written statement ?

[f] Any other substantial question of law that arises for consideration may be framed by this Hon'ble court ?

5. Sri. C. Shankar Reddy, learned counsel for the appellant reiterating the grounds urged in the appeal memorandum vehemently contained that the plaintiff is one of the coparceners of the joint family. Therefore, dismissal of the suit that during the lifetime of her father is not maintainable has resulted in miscarriage of justice and



CNR: KAHC010560862023

**NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023**

sought for admitting the appeal on the aforesaid substantial questions of law.

6. He also pointed out that two applications were filed before the First Appellate Court seeking amendment of the plaint and no order has been passed on the same by the First Appellate Court and as such, the matter needs to be remitted to the First Appellate Court for fresh consideration in accordance with law.

7. Per contra, Sri. Manoj Naik representing Sri. A. Nagarajappa supports the impugned judgment.

8. Having heard the arguments of both, this Court perused the material on record meticulously.

9. On such perusal of the material on record, it is pertinent to note that even though genealogical tree is placed on record, there is no mention as to the date of death and when father of the plaintiff got the suit



CNR: KAHC010560862023

**NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023**

property; whether at all the plaintiff was born when the succession opened is also not forthcoming on record.

10. The deficiency in the pleadings cannot be cured at the Appellate Court by mere filing an application for amendment, unless it is established that despite due diligence such additional plea could not be raised before Trial Court.

11. The material evidence placed on record is discussed by the Trial Court while arriving at a finding that the plaintiff cannot maintain the suit during the lifetime of her father especially when succession was open plaintiff was not even born.

12. Taking note of these aspects of the matter, dismissal of the suit by the Trial Court confirmed by the First Appellate Court is just and proper.

13. Insofar as the non consideration of the amendment is concerned, since there is a categorical



CNR: KAHC010560862023

NC: 2026:KHC:40774
RSA No. 1897 of 2023

finding recorded by the Trial Court that plaintiff had no right to seek the partition of the property as a coparcener is not established, any amount of amendment to the pleadings would not have improved the case of the plaintiff.

14. As such, this Court does not find any good grounds to admit the appeal and there is no substance in the substantial questions of law.

15. Hence, following order:

ORDER

- (i) Admission declined.
- (ii) Regular Second Appeal is ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(V SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE**

SNC
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 65