

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON :07.02.2018

PRONOUNCED ON: 02.03.2018

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE T.RAVINDRAN

S.A.Nos.178,384 & 387 of 2003

S.A.No.178 of 2003

Jeyalakshmi Appellant/Plaintiff
Vs.
Selvaraju Respondent/2nd Defendant

S.A.No.384 of 2003

Savithiri Appellant/Plaintiff
Vs.
Selvaraju Respondent/2nd Defendant

S.A.No.387 of 2003

Mallika Appellant/Plaintiff
Vs.
Selvaraju Respondent/2nd Defendant

Prayer in S.A.No.178 of 2003:

Second Appeal filed under Section 100 of C.P.C., against the judgment and Decree dated 26.06.2002 passed in A.S.No.45 of 2002 before the Additional District Judge, (Fast Track Court No.2) Cuddalore reversing the judgment and the decree dated 10.04.2001 passed in O.S.No.287 of 1997 on the file of the Additional District Munsif Court Cuddalore.

Prayer in S.A.No.384 of 2003:

Second Appeal filed under Section 100 of C.P.C., against the judgment and Decree dated 26.06.2002 passed in A.S.47 of 2002 on the file of the Additional District Judge (Fast Track Court No.II) Cuddalore, reversing the judgment and the decree dated 10.04.2001 passed in O.S.No.286 of 1997 on the file of Additional District Munsif Court, Cuddalore.

Prayer in S.A.No.387 of 2003:

Second Appeal filed under Section 100 of C.P.C., against the judgment and Decree dated 26.06.2002 passed in A.S.No.46 of 2002 on the file of Additional District Court, (Fast Track Court No.2) Cuddalore, reversing the Judgment and the decree dated 10.04.2001 passed in O.S.No.284 of 1997 before Additional District Munsif's, Court Cuddalore.

For Appellant : Mrs.Hema Sampath, SC
for M/s.R.Subramanian

For Respondent : Mr.R.Gururaj

C O M M O N J U D G M E N T

1.(i)S.A.No.178 of 2003 is directed against the judgment and decree dated 26.06.2002 passed in A.S.No.45 of 2002 on the file of the Additional District Judge, (Fast Track Court No.2) Cuddalore reversing the judgment and the decree dated 10.04.2001 passed in O.S.No.287 of 1997 on the file of the Additional District Munsif Court Cuddalore.

(ii)S.A.No.384 of 2003 is directed against the judgment and Decree dated 26.06.2002 passed in A.S.47 of 2002 on the file of the Additional District Judge (Fast Track Court No.II) Cuddalore, reversing the judgment and the decree dated 10.04.2001 passed in O.S.No.286 of 1997 on the file of Additional District Munsif Court, Cuddalore.

(iii)S.A.No.387of 2003 is directed against the judgment and Decree dated 26.06.2002 passed in A.S.No.46 of 2002 on the file of the Additional District Judge, (Fast Track Court No.2) Cuddalore, reversing the Judgment and the decree dated 10.04.2001 passed in O.S.No.284 of 1997 on the file of the Additional District Munsif Court, Cuddalore.

2.At the time of admission of the above second appeals, the following substantial questions of law were formulated for consideration.
S.A.178 of 2003

"(a)Whether in law the lower appellate court was right in finding that Ex.A1 settlement deed was not given effect to ignoring that Ex.A1 satisfied requirements under Sec.123 of the Transfer of Property Act?

(b)Whether in law the lower appellate court was

not wrong in finding that as possession was not handed over the settlement was invalid when it is settled law that actual disposition could be postponed provided that there was vesting of rights in presenti and as held in AIR 1996 SC 2220?

(c) Whether in law lower appellate court was right in failing to see that the donor himself admitted to the coming into force of Ex.A1 by executing the cancellation deed?

(d) Whether in law the lower appellate court did not err grievously by protecting the possession of the trespasser as against the right of the true owner?"

S.A.384 of 2003

(A) Whether in law, the lower appellate court was right in finding that Ex.A1 settlement deed was not given effect to ignoring that Ex.A1 satisfied the requirements under Section 123 of the Transfer of Property Act?

(B) Whether in law the lower appellate court was right in failing to see that as the first defendant's title was declared in the prior proceedings the respondent was bound by the decree and that he could not claim any right based on his illegal possession?

S.A.387 of 2003

(A) Whether in law the Lower Appellate Court has right in finding that Ex.A1 settlement deed was not given effect to ignoring that Ex.A1 satisfied the requirements under section 123 of the Transfer of Property Act?

(B) Whether in law the Lower Appellate Court was not wrong in finding that as possession was not handed over the settlement was invalid when it is settled law that actual disposition could be postponed provided that there is vesting of rights in presenti and as held in AIR 1996 SC 2220?

3.Considering the issues involved in all the second appeals

being one and the same and also involved between the same parties and also laying in a narrow compass, it is unnecessary to discuss the facts of the case as put forth by the respective parties in their pleadings in detail and therefore the second appeals are disposed of taking into consideration, the main issues involved in the same as urged by the respective counsel during the course of the arguments.

4.It is found that the appellants in all the second appeals are the daughters of Sahadeva Gounder. The respondent in all the second appeals is the son of Sahadeva Gounder. The relationship between the parties as above referred is not in dispute. On the materials placed, it is found that following the dispute between Sahadeva Gounder and his son namely the respondent herein, in respect of the suit properties involved in all the second appeals, it is found that a suit in O.S.No.896 of 1994 had been laid by Sahadeva Gounder on the file of the Principal District Munsif Court, Cuddalore against the first respondent herein for declaration of his title to the same and also for recovery of possession. Alleging that, the first respondent had obtained a fraudulent document from him thereby taking a major portion of the suit properties and also throwing him out of the house and that he was made to believe that only a Will is being executed. The first respondent had taken a plea that the document impugned had been executed by his father Sahadeva Gounder on his own volition and with full knowledge about the nature of the document and the same is binding upon him and therefore sought for the dismissal of the suit laid by Sahadeva Gounder in O.S.No.896 of 1994. The said suit, after contest, came to be dismissed.

5.Sahadeva Gounder preferred A.S.No.171 of 1995 impugning the dismissal of the suit by the trial court and it is found that the first appellate court, on a consideration of the materials placed on record and the submissions made, allowed the appeal preferred by Sahadeva Gounder and resultantly decreed the suit as prayed for by him in O.S.No.896 of 1994. As against the same, it is found that the second appeal preferred by the respondent herein in S.A.No.1433 of 1996 has been dismissed and thereby, it is seen that the judgment and decree of the first appellate court in A.S.No.171 of 1995 upholding the title of Sahadeva Gounder in respect of the suit properties had been uphold and also his entitlement to recover the possession and enjoyment of the suit properties has also been upheld. Further, it is also seen that the Special Leave Petition [Civil] No.8812 of 1997 preferred by the respondent against the same has come to be dismissed by the Apex Court. It is thus found that the title of Sahadeva Gounder, in respect of the suit properties had been confirmed and thus, it is evident that the suit properties belonged to Sahadeva Gounder as such.

6. After the first appellate court had upheld the title of Sahadeva Gounder in respect of the suit properties and also his entitlement to recover the possession of the same from the respondent, it is found that Sahadeva Gounder had executed three settlement deeds in favour of the appellants i.e., his daughters in respect of the suit properties as described in the settlement deeds on 01.10.1996, and based on the above said settlement deeds, it is found that the appellants claim title to the suit properties involved in the matter. Now, according to the appellants, the above said settlement deeds executed by their father i.e., Sahadeva Gounder had been accepted by them and acted upon and hence, by way of the same, it is only the appellants, who have title to the suit properties involved in the subject matter. On that footing, it is found that the appellants have preferred the civil action against their father Sahadeva Gounder as well as the respondent, for declaration and also for recovery of possession and damages as above stated.

7. The father Sahadeva Gounder had died during the pendency of the suit. It is found that the respondent had contested the claim of title to the suit properties by the appellants by projecting a case that the settlement deeds executed by Sahadeva Gounder in favour of the appellants dated 01.10.1996 had been canceled by Sahadeva Gounder on 12.11.1997 and therefore, according to the respondent, the appellants cannot lay a claim of title to the suit properties as put forth by them and the further case of the respondent is that Sahadeva Gounder had executed a Will in respect of the suit properties, in favour of his son on 30.06.1998 and by way of the above defence, the respondent sought for the dismissal of the civil actions laid by the appellants.

8. After contest, it is found that the civil suits laid by the appellants as above stated ended in their favour. Impugning the same, the respondent preferred the first appeals above stated and the first appellate court on a consideration of the materials placed was pleased to set aside the judgment and decrees of the trial court and by way of allowing the appeals preferred by the respondent, dismissed the civil suits laid by the appellants. Impugning the same, the present second appeals have been preferred.

9. Thus, it is found that the main points for consideration involved in all the second appeals is whether the appellants had derived title to the suit properties by way of the settlement deeds executed in their favour by their father dated 01.10.1996 and whether the above said settlement deeds had been accepted by the appellants and acted upon and whether the deceased Sahadeva Gounder is entitled to revoke the above said settlement deeds by

way of the execution of revocation deeds unilaterally and convey the suit properties to the respondent's sons by way of a Will.

10. Materials placed disclose that an attempt had been made by the respondent before the trial court to record the compromise alleged to have been entered into between him and the deceased Sahadeva Gounder, however the said attempts ended in vein and the applications preferred by the respondent with reference to the same had come to be dismissed by the trial court. The said facts need not to be adverted to in detail as the same may not have a direct bearing on the points to be answered involved in these second appeals.

11. The first appellate court on the footing that inasmuch as the Sahadeva Gounder himself had laid the suit against the respondent in O.S.No.896 of 1994 seeking for recovery of possession of suit properties, on that premise, as such would not have been in a position or competent to deliver the possession of the suit properties to the appellants at the time of execution of the settlement deeds in their favour on 01.10.1996 and therefore, inasmuch as the delivery of the suit properties had not been entrusted to the appellants by the deceased Sahadeva Gounder, accompanying the execution of the settlement deeds in their favour, determined that the settlement deeds dated 01.10.1996 had not been accepted and acted upon and therefore, by way of the same, the appellants would not be entitled to claim title to the suit properties. Accordingly, the first appellate court also proceeded that Sahadeva Gounder had revoked the settlement deeds unilaterally on 12.11.1997 and in such view of the matter, disposed of the first appeals in favour of the respondent. In this connection, the first appellate court placed reliance upon the decisions of the Apex Court as referred to in its judgments.

12. Reiterating the determination of the issues involved in the second appeal in favour of the respondent, the counsel for the respondent contended that inasmuch as the deceased Sahadeva Gounder would not have been in a position to entrust the possession of the suit properties to the appellants at the time of the execution of the settlement deeds in their favour as at that point of time, he had not obtained the physical possession of the suit properties from the respondent, according to him, the settlement deeds projected by the appellants cannot be treated as validly executed settlement deeds, as the physical possession had not been entrusted to the appellants thereby and accordingly, contended that the deceased Sahadeva Gounder had also accordingly revoked the said settlement deeds subsequently and reiterating the above said contentions, he relied upon the decisions reported in 1997 (2) SCC 255 [Naramadaben Maganlal Thakker Vs Pranjivandas Maganlal Thakkaer], 1996 (11) SCC 681

[Gomtibai (smt) (Dead) Through LRs and others Vs Mattulal (Dead) Through LRs], 1997 (2) SCC 636 [Baby Ammal Vs Rajan Asari] and 1997 (3) Law weekly 761[Devasironmani and another Vs. Rajathangam.T and another]

13. On a perusal of the above said decisions referred to by the counsel for the respondent as well as the decisions relied upon by the first appellate court, in the light of the settlement deeds covered in those cases, considering the recitals contained therein and finding that the settlor himself had reserved the possession and enjoyment of the properties comprised under the respective settlement deeds with himself, on that footing, the Courts while deciding the matter in the above said cases, found that the possession of the properties settled had not been handed over accompanying the execution of the settlement deeds concerned and therefore the settlement deeds could not be determined to have been accepted and acted upon by the settlees and accordingly held that the settlement deeds involved in the above said cases had been acted upon and thereby the settlees would not be entitled to derive title to the properties comprised in the settlement deeds.

14. In so far as the present cases are concerned, it is found that on a perusal of the terms contained in the settlement deeds executed by Sahadeva Gounder in favour of the appellants, there are clear recitals that by way of the same, Sahadeva Gounder had entrusted the possession of the suit properties to the appellants and accordingly, there are recitals that the appellants would be entitled to acquire the suit properties by way of the same and enjoy the same by paying necessary charges to the Government and also by mutating their names in the Revenue records with reference to the suit properties and it is also found that Sahadeva Gounder had not reserved any right of revocation of the settlement deeds and also averred that even if, any such revocation deed is executed by him, the same would not be valid. It is found that by way of the above said settlement deeds, Sahadeva Gounder had entrusted the constructive possession of the suit properties to the appellants conferring on them the absolute title to the same which he had in the suit properties at the time of the execution of the settlement deeds.

15. In the light of the above said position, it has to be seen whether physical possession of the suit properties is necessary for completing the validity of the above said settlement transactions. No doubt, at the time of the execution of the settlement deeds, in favour of the appellants, Sahadeva Gounder had not been in possession of the suit properties and on the other hand, as above seen, he has himself laid the suit only for recovery of possession of the suit properties from the respondent as above discussed.

16. In this connection, the counsel for the appellants, vehemently contended that the transfer of the physical

possession of the properties settled is not the sine quanon for the completion of the settlement deed and the factum of the acceptance of the settlement deed could be inferred by the Courts based on the recitals contained therein and therefore, according to her, the mere failure on the part of the appellants to establish the transfer of the physical possession of the suit properties in their favour by Sahadeva Gounder at the time of the execution of the settlement deeds would not be, in any manner, fatal to their case and in this connection, placed reliance upon the decisions reported in AIR 1922 Calcutta 422 [Tara Prosanna Sen Vs Shandi Bibi and others], 2007 (13) SCC 210 [Asokan Vs Lakshmikutty and others], 2012 (5) MLJ 169[D.Mohan Vs The Sub Registrar], 2008 (1) MLJ 227 [N.Subramanian Vs Thanjiammal and others] and 1997 (2) Law Weekly 197 [Selvaraju Kounder Vs Sahadeva Kounder]. On a perusal of the above said decisions, it is found that, on the basis of the terms and the nature of the settlement deed, the Court would be entitled to determine the acceptance of the settlement deed and it is further seen that by way of the same, the Court can raise a presumption that the possession had been given to the settle and thereby the settle had accepted the same. It is thus seen that the physical delivery of the possession of the properties settled is not necessary for completing the settlement transaction.

17. Admittedly, the settles are the daughters of the deceased Sahadeva Gounder. It is found that the settles are aware of the litigation pending between the deceased Sahadeva Gounder and the respondent at the time of the execution of the settlement deeds. It is therefore seen that Sahadeva Gounder would not have been in a position to entrust the physical possession of the suit properties to the settles at the time of the execution of the settlement deeds. Considering the relationship between the parties, when there are clear recitals in the settlement deeds about the handing over of the possession of the properties settled in favour of the settles and also empowering the settles to effect the mutation of their names in respect of the properties settled in the Government records and further the settlor had not also reserved any right of revocation of the settlement deeds and declared that even if any such revocation deed is effected by him, the same would be invalid and further, when on the date of the execution of the settlement deeds, the settlor had already laid a claim against the respondent for recovery of possession of the suit properties from the respondent and at the time of the execution of settlement deeds involved in these matters, the title of the suit properties in favour of the settlor had been declared by the first appellate court and the first appellate court had also declared that the settlor is entitled to recover the possession of the suit properties from the respondent and the said determination of the first appellate court both as regards the

title as well as the recovery of possession had been confirmed by the High Court as well as the Apex Court as above discussed, by way of the execution of the settlement deeds in favour of the appellants, the settlor namely, Sahadeva Gounder had also conferred on them the right to obtain the possession of the suit properties settled on them by way of the settlement deeds and it is thus found that the settlers namely the appellants by accepting the recitals contained in the settlement deeds in toto became entitled to recover the possession of the suit properties from the respondent by way of the above said settlement deeds as the full owners of the properties settled in their favour by stepping into the shoes of the settlor and in the light of the above position, it is seen that on the facts and circumstances of the case at hand, the transfer of physical possession of the suit properties is not necessary as such, for the acceptance of the settlement deeds and on the other hand, it is found that considering the above said facts, particularly, the relationship between the parties and the lis pending between the settlor and the respondent at the relevant point of time would go to show that settlers namely the appellants had accepted the settlement deeds executed in their favour and in such view of the matter, the mere factum of the non delivery of the settled properties by itself would not render the settlement deeds as invalid documents.

18.The above said position of law could also be gathered from the decision of the Apex Court reported in 2008 (1) MLJ 193 SC [Asokan Vs. Lakshmikutty] which has been elucidated as follows:

"16.While determining the question as to whether delivery of possession would constitute acceptance of a gift or not, the relationship between the parties plays an important role. It is not a case that the appellant was not aware of the recitals contained in deeds of gift. The very fact that the defendants contend that the donee was to perform certain obligations, is itself indicative of the fact that the parties were aware thereof. Even a silence may sometime indicate acceptance. It is not necessary to prove any overt act in respect thereof as an express acceptance is not necessary for completing the transaction of gift.

...

18.Mr.Iyer, however, submitted that it would be open to the donors to prove that in fact no possession had been handed over. Strong reliance in this behalf has been placed on S.V.S.Muhammad Yusuf Rowther and another

V.Muhammad Yusuf Rowther and other [AIR 1958 Madras 527] and Alavi v. V.Aminakutty & Others [1984 KLT 61 (NOC)].

....20. When a registered document is executed and the executors are aware of the terms and nature of the document, a presumption arises in regard to the correctness thereof. [See Prem Sing and Ors. v. Birbal and Ors (2006 5 SCC 353)]. When such a presumption is raised coupled with the recitals in regard to putting the donee in possession of the property, the onus should be on the donor and not on the donee".

19. The above position of law has also been reiterated by this Court in the decision relied upon by the appellants' counsel reported in 2008(1)MLJ 227 [N.Subramanian Vs. Thanjiammal and another] as follows:

"16. Under Section 123 of the Transfer of Property Act, a gift of immovable property should be made by a registered instrument signed by or on behalf of the donor and attested at least by a two witnesses and the second requirement is there must be acceptance of the gift by the donee. The delivery of possession is not necessary and Section 123 does away with the necessity of delivery of possession even it was required by the strict Hindu Law, in the case of a registered instrument of gift properly executed and attested. The above said legal principle has been laid down in 1997 (I) CTC 256 (referred to supra). Therefore the finding of the trial court that the settlement deed executed by Thanjiammal in favour of Pachiammal is sham and nominal and it has not been acted upon since possession has not been handed over to Pachiammal is erroneous.

20. Similarly, the above principles of law had been followed by this Court by following the decision of the Apex Court reported in 2004(1)CTC 146 [SC] [K.K.Balakrishnan Vs. K.Kamalam and others] in the decision reported in 2009(5) CTC Page No.558 [S.Ganesan Vs. Bharathi Rajan]. It is thus found that the settlement deeds could not be invalidated on the ground that the possession was not handed over to the settlers or on the footing that the settlers had failed to make mutation in respect of the properties settled in their favour.

21. Following the above said principles in the decision reported in 2011(5)Law Weekly 553 [1. K.A.Shanmugam, 2.K.Sengodan Vs. Tamilarasi and two others], this Court had held

that

the mentioning of the handing over of the possession of the settlement deed itself is sufficient to come to the conclusion that the settlement deed has been acted upon and the non transfer of the name of the donee in the revenue records immediately after the settlement deed has not significance because after the execution of the settlement deed by the mother in favour of her daughters both of them were residing in the same property.

22. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that I had an occasion to consider the similar issues of the acceptance of the settlement deed etc., in the decision rendered by me dated 19.01.2018 in S.A.No.1804 of 2001 [Minor Shankar Represented by his mother Nallammal Vs. Muruganandam and Manicka Servai]

23. Considering the principles of law enunciated as regards the subject matter/controversy as above detailed, when it is found that there are clear recitals in the settlement deeds involved in the present case about the entrustment of the possession of the suit properties empowering the settlers to take further steps as regards the same, by mutating their names in the revenue records, with reference to the properties settled and considering the relationship between the parties, it is found that the settlers namely the appellants had, by stepping into the shoes of settlor, acquired the right which the settlor had in respect of the suit properties i.e., the right to obtain the physical possession of the suit properties from the respondent. Accordingly, it is seen that the appellants laying claim of absolute title to the properties settled on them, had preferred the civil action against the respondent as above pointed out. In such view of the matter, it is found that, the contention put forth by the respondent's counsel that on the failure of the appellants establishing the factum of the transfer or the handing over the physical possession of the suit properties to them at the time of the execution of the settlement deeds as such by itself would lead to the conclusion that the settlement deeds had not been accepted and acted upon by the appellants, as such, cannot be countenanced. When it is found that the physical entrustment of the possession of the properties settled is not necessary as such for completing the transaction and on the other hand, the acceptance of the settlement deeds could be gathered from the recitals, surroundings and circumstances appurtenant thereto as above discussed and as per the decisions relied upon by the appellants' counsel, when it is found that the silence may sometimes also indicate the acceptance of the settlement deeds, it is seen that there is no need to prove any overt act, in

respect of the acceptance of the settlement deeds by physically obtaining the possession of the properties concerned and when considering the facts and circumstances of the case, when it is found the appellants had by way of the settlement deeds asserted their right in the properties settled by seeking necessary reliefs with reference to the same against the respondent by laying civil actions above referred to, it is found that the appellants had established the acceptance of the settlement deeds in the manner known to law. In such view of the matter, it is found that the first appellate court had erred in not suiting the appellants on the erroneous premise that the appellants had failed to establish the transfer of the physical possession of the properties settled in their favour by Sahadeva Gounder, at the time of the execution of the settlement deeds.

24. In the light of the above position, when it is found that the settlement deeds had been validly accepted by the appellants and acted upon following the principles of law outlined in the above said decisions, the settlor namely Sahadeva Gounder would not be competent to unilaterally cancel the settlement deeds and accordingly, it is found that the revocation deeds said to have been executed by Sahadeva Gounder would not be valid and binding upon the appellants and thus it is further seen that any further transactions or conveyance effected by Sahadeva Gounder in respect of the suit properties also could not be validly accepted as divesting of the title of the appellants in respect of the suit properties.

25. The counsel for the respondent in support of his contentions relied upon the decisions reported in AIR 1975 Supreme Court 1409 [A.N.Ray, C.J. and K.K.Mathew, J. and V.R.Krishna Iyer, J.] and 2000(3) SCC 350 [Sajjadanashin Sayed Md.B.E.EDR.(D) By LRs Vs. Musa Dadabhai Ummer and others]. The principles of law outlined in the above said decisions are taken into consideration and followed as applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case at hand.

26. In the light of the above discussions, the first appellate court had erred in holding that the settlement deeds in favour of the appellants had not been given effect to ignoring the principles of law concerning the settlement deed as above discussed and pointed out and particularly, when the settlement deeds had been established to be in consonance with the requirements of law in all aspects, it is thus seen that the first appellate court had erred in holding that actual, physical transfer of the properties settled is the sinequanon for constituting the valid settlement transaction and on the other hand, considering the relationship between the parties and the terms of the settlement deeds involved in the matter as they had transferred all the rights of the settlor in respect of the properties settled in praesenti in favour of the appellants and when the settlement deeds had not shown to be brought about by

the exercise of any fraud, mis-representation, undue influence etc., on the part of the appellants, on the other hand, the mere factum of the settlor admitting the execution of the settlement deeds could be gathered by the execution of the alleged revocation deeds as above discussed, it is found that the first appellate court has miserably erred in non suiting the appellants particularly, failing to hold that the respondent is in the illegal possession of the suit properties without any legal right over the same. The substantial questions of law formulated in all the three appeals are accordingly answered in favour of the appellants and against the respondent.

27.At the end, the judgment and decrees 26.06.2002 passed in A.S.No.45, 47 and 46 of 2002 on the file of Additional District Judge, (Fast Track Court No.2) Cuddalore are set aside and the judgment and decrees dated 10.04.2001 passed in O.S.Nos.287, 286, 284 of 1997 on the file of the Additional District Munsif Court, Cuddalore are confirmed. Accordingly the second appeals are allowed with costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition, if any, is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS IV)

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mfa

To

1.The Additional District Judge,
(Fast Track Court No. II),
Cuddalore.

2.The Additional District Munsif, Cuddalore.

+3cc to Mr.R.Subramanian, Advocate SR.No.16497 to 16493

+9cc to Mr.R.Gururaj, Advocate SR.No.16407 to 16409

S.A.Nos.178, 384 and 387 of 2003

VD(CO)

GN(18/04/2018)