

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on: 11.10.2018	Delivered on: 13.03.2019
-------------------------	--------------------------

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE P.RAJAMANICKAM

S.A.Nos.1863 and 1864 of 2001

S.A.No.1863 of 2001 in

1.Muniammal
2.Pachaiappan

.. Appellants in S.A.No.1863/2001

Vs.

Chandra Ammal .. Respondent in S.A.No.1863/2001

S.A.No.1864 of 2001 in

Pachaiappan

.. Appellant in S.A.No.1864/2001

Vs.

1.Chandra Ammal
2.Muniammal

.. Respondents in S.A.No.1864/2001

PRAYER in S.A.No.1863 of 2001: Second Appeal filed under Section 100 of C.P.C., against the judgment and decree dated 30.08.2001 and made in A.S.No.18 of 2001 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai, reversing the judgment an decree dated 13.12.2000 and made in O.S.No.912 of 1992 on the file of the II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai.

PRAYER in S.A.No.1864 of 2001: Second Appeal filed under Section 100 of C.P.C., against the judgment and decree dated 30.08.2001 and made in A.S.No.59 of 2001 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai, confirming the judgment an decree dated 13.12.2000 and made in O.S.No.165 of 1993 on the file of the II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai.

For Appellants in

both SAs. : Mr.R.Siddharth for
: Mr.T.R.Rajaraman

For Respondents : Mr.P.Jagadeesan for R1 in
both S.As.
: R2 givenup in S.A.No.1864/2001

COMMON JUDGMENT

1.(a) S.A.No.1863 of 2001 has been filed by the defendants in O.S.No.912 of 1992 on the file of the II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai, against the judgment and decree passed by the Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai in A.S.No.18 of 2001 dated 30.08.2001 reversing the judgment and decree passed by the II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai in O.S.No.912 of 1992 dated 13.12.2000.

(b) S.A.No.1864 of 2001 has been filed by the plaintiff in O.S.No.165 of 1993 on the file of the II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai, against the judgment and decree passed by the Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai, in A.S.No.59 of 2001 dated 30.08.2001 confirming the judgment and decree passed by the II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai, in O.S.No.165 of 1993 dated 13.12.2000.

2. The respondent in S.A.No.1863 of 2001 had filed a suit in O.S.No.912 of 1992 on the file of the II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai, to declare that she is the absolute owner of the suit property and to restrain the appellants in S.A.No.1863 of 2001 by means of permanent injunction from interfering with her peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The appellant in S.A.No.1864 of 2001 had filed a suit in O.S.No.165 of 1993 on the file of the II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai, against the respondents in S.A.No.1864 of 2001 for the relief of specific performance and delivery of possession in respect of western ½ of the suit property.

3. The learned II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai by the common judgment dated 13.12.2000 had dismissed both the suits without costs. Aggrieved by the dismissal of her suit in O.S.No.912 of 1992, Chandra Ammal had filed an appeal in A.S.No.18 of 2001 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai. Likewise, Pachiappan also filed an appeal in A.S.No.59 of 2001 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai, as against dismissal of his suit in O.S.No.165 of 1993.

4. The learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai, by the common judgment dated 30.08.2001 had allowed the appeal

filed by the Chandra Ammal in A.S.No.18 of 2001 and set aside the judgment and decree passed by the trial Court in O.S.No.912 of 1992 and decreed the suit as prayed for, however, he dismissed the appeal filed by the Pachaiappan in A.S.No.59 of 2001 and confirmed the judgment and decree passed by the trial Court in O.S.No.165 of 1993. Feeling aggrieved, the said Muniammal and Pachaiappan, who are the defendants in O.S.No.912 of 1992 have filed the Second Appeal in S.A.No.1863 of 2001. The said Pachaiappan has also filed the Second Appeal in S.A.No.1864 of 2001, who is the plaintiff in O.S.No.165 of 1993 against the dismissal of his appeal in A.S.No.59 of 2001. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as described before the trial Court.

5. The averments made in the plaint in O.S.No.912 of 1992 are in brief as follows:-

This suit property was originally Government Poramboke land, the Government gave a patta in favour of the plaintiff namely, Chandra Ammal on 20.08.1990 by assigning the said land. The plaintiff had taken possession of the said land and put up a small shed therein and she is in possession and enjoyment of the same. The first defendant had no right over the suit property but she claimed the right over the same. Further, the first defendant proclaimed that she already sold the suit property in favour of the second defendant. On 04.09.1992 the defendants attempted to trespass into the suit property. Hence, the plaintiff (Chandra Ammal) was constrained to file the suit in O.S.No.912 of 1992 to declare i.e., she is the absolute owner of the suit property and to restrain the defendants therein from interfering with her peaceful possession and enjoyment by means of permanent injunction.

6. The averments made in the written statement filed by the first defendant (Muniammal) in O.S.No.912 of 1992 are in brief as follows:-

(a) It is true that the suit site was originally a poramboke land, but it is false to state that the Government granted patta in favour of the plaintiff on 20.08.1990 and the plaintiff constructed a small thatched house therein and that she has been residing therein. On the contrary, one Gopala Moppan, the father of the plaintiff and the first defendant and others had encroached upon the suit survey number about 40 years back. Since then, they were in possession and enjoyment thereof. Considering the long possession and also the fact that they were houseless poor, the Government was pleased to assign the site. Gopala Moopan, was granted patta by the Government in October, 1969, for the suit site. During the same time, the adjacent occupants were also granted patta. The said Gopala Moppan put up a small house that includes a kitchen, garden and he was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property till his death.

After his death, his wife Lakshmi Ammal was in possession and the assessment for the house was transferred in her name. She was paying the house tax also. The plaintiff and the first defendant are sisters. On the death of Gopala Moopan, the sisters succeeded to the property along with their mother Lakshmi Ammal. On the death of Lakshmi Ammal, the plaintiff and the first defendant succeeded to the property.

(b) In or about December, 1989, Lakshmi Ammal died intestate. Immediately, after her death, there were an oral partition in the presence of the Panchayat in the Village. In the said partition, the property was divided into two equal share; the western half was allotted to the first defendant and the eastern half was allotted to the plaintiff. Since then, the first defendant has been the owner of the western half. While so, in and under an agreement dated 26.06.1992, the plaintiff and the first defendant agreed to sell the suit property in favour of the second defendant for Rs.8,100/-. The said agreement was reduced in to writing and as per the said agreement, the second defendant demanded execution of the sale deed, but the plaintiff refuses to execute the sale deed. Hence, the first defendant had executed a registered sale deed dated 04.09.1992 in favour of the second defendant in respect of the western half of the suit property handed over possession to the second defendant. The plaintiff has conveniently suppressed all the aforesaid facts and filed the above suit with false averments.

(c). It is false to allege that the Government granted patta in favour of the plaintiff. The original patta granted in favour of Gopala Moopan was kept in the family house. After the death of Lakshmi Ammal, the plaintiff has taken the said patta and the present patta dated 29.08.1980 is not true and in any event, it does not relate to the suit property. The plaintiff has got another house in the neighbour hood. The kist and tax receipt filed by the plaintiff do not relate to the suit property. The suit is misconceived and there is no merit and therefore, she prayed to dismiss the suit.

7. The averments made in the written statement filed by the second defendant (Pachaiappan) in O.S.No.912 of 1992 are in brief as follows:

(a) The allegations made in the plaint are denied as false. There is no cause of action for the suit. The house bearing D.No.39 in ward No.2 of Arasanpatti Village, Tiruvannamalai, is the absolute property of Gopala Moopan, the father of the plaintiff and the first defendant. The said Gopala Moopan occupied the suit site 40 years ago and considering his long possession, the Government of Tamil Nadu granted patta in favour of the said Gopala Moopan in respect of the suit site. Likewise, pattas were granted in respect of the persons, who

were in possession of the adjoining lands. Gopala Moopan was in absolute possession and enjoyment of the suit property, after his death, his wife and his daughters namely, the plaintiff and the first defendant as legal heirs succeeded to the suit property, after the death of Lakshmi Ammal, in an oral partition, the suit property was divided into two shares and the western portion was allotted to the first defendant and eastern portion was allotted to the plaintiff.

(b) The plaintiff and the first defendant had agreed to sell the whole house property to one Durai, son of Perumal for a sum of Rs.8,050/- and the plaintiff had received a sum of Rs.1,100/- as advance. When the said Durai was not able to pay the balance sale consideration, the second defendant agreed to purchase the house and the plaintiff insisted to enhance the sale consideration of Rs.8,100/- and received the advance amount and the said amount was utilized for returning the advance amount to Durai and an agreement of sale dated 26.08.1992 was entered into between the plaintiff and the first defendant on the one hand and the second defendant on the other. As per the agreement of sale, the second defendant demanded execution of sale deed. The first defendant alone executed the sale deed dated 04.09.1992, in respect of the western half alone, whereas the plaintiff refused to execute the sale deed. Suppressing the aforesaid facts, the plaintiff had filed the above suit. Hence, the second defendant had filed a suit for specific performance in O.S.No.165 of 1993 directing the plaintiff herein to execute the sale deed in respect of her share in the suit property and the same is also still pending. Therefore, he prayed to dismiss the above suit.

8. The said Pachaiappan had filed a suit in O.S.No.165 of 1993 for the relief of specific performance and delivery of possession of the eastern half of the suit property reiterating the same contents raised in the written statement filed by him in O.S.No.912 of 1992. In that suit the plaintiff in O.S.No.912 of 1992 has been arrayed as defendant No.1 and the first defendant in O.S.No.912 of 1992 namely, Muniammal has been arrayed as the second defendant. The first defendant namely, Chandra Ammal had filed in O.S.No.165 of 1993 had filed a written statement reiterating the allegations made in the plaint in O.S.No.912 of 1992. She denied the allegation that her father Gopala Moopan had occupied the suit site 40 years ago and considering his long possession, the Government had granted patta in his favour. She also denied the allegation that till his death, he was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property and after his death, his wife Lakshmi Ammal and the plaintiff and the second defendant succeeded to the suit property and after the death of the said Lakshmi Ammal an oral partition took place and that in the said oral partition the western half of the suit property was allotted to the second

defendant and the eastern half was allotted to her. She also denied the allegation that she along with the second defendant entered into a sale agreement with one Durai for selling the entire suit property and since the said Durai was unable to mobilize the funds, the defendants entered into a sale agreement with the plaintiff and agreed to sell the suit property for Rs.8,100/- and she received a sum of Rs.1,100/- as advance and subsequently, she executed the sale deed. She further stated that the second defendant namely, Muniammal had no right to execute the sale deed in favour of the plaintiffs in respect of western half of the suit property. She further alleged that the Government had granted patta in her favour on 20.08.1990 and from that date onwards, she is in possession and enjoyment of the suit property in which, the second defendant is not having any right and therefore, she prayed to dismiss the aforesaid suit.

9. It appears that the second defendant namely, Muniammal did not file any written statement in O.S.No.165 of 1993 and remained exparte.

10. Based on the aforesaid pleadings, the learned II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai, had framed necessary issues and tried both the suits jointly. The evidence was recorded in O.S.No.912 of 1992 and the same was treated as evidence in O.S.No.165 of 1993. The plaintiff namely, Chandra Ammal in O.S.No.912 of 1992 examined as PW1 and one Kumarasamy Udaiyar was examined as PW2. Exs.A1 to Ex.A3 were marked on the side of the plaintiffs. On the side of the defendants, the second defendant namely, Pachaiappan in O.S.No.912 of 1992 was examined as DW1 and the first defendant (Muniammal) in O.S.No.912 of 1992 was examined as DW2 and three more witnesses were examined as DWs3 to 5 and Exs.B1 to Ex.B11 were marked on the side of the defendants.

11. The II Additional District Munsif, Tiruvannamalai, after considering the materials placed before him found that the father of Chandra Ammal and Muniammal namely, Gopala Moopan had occupied the suit site 40 years ago and considering his long possession, the Government had granted patta in his favour in the year 1969. He further found that after the death of said Gopala Moopan and his wife Lakshmi Ammal their daughters Chandra Ammal and Muniammal had succeeded to the suit property and in an oral partition, the western half share was allotted to Muniammal and eastern half share was allotted to Chandrammal. He also found that the said Muniammal had executed a sale deed in favour of the said Pachaiappan in respect of the western half share of the suit property and also delivery of possession to him. However, he found that the alleged sale agreement dated 26.08.1992 is not a true agreement. Accordingly, he dismissed both the suits.

12. Chandra Ammal had filed an appeal in A.S.No.18 of 2001 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai, against the dismissal of her suit in O.S.No.912 of 1992. Pachaiappan had filed an appeal in A.S.No.59 of 2001 on the file of the Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai, as against the dismissal of his suit in O.S.No.165 of 1993. The learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvannamalai by the common judgment dated 30.08.2001 had allowed the appeal in A.S.No.18 of 2001 and set aside the judgment and decree passed by the trial Court in O.S.No.912 of 1992 and decreed the said suit as prayed for. However, he dismissed the appeal in A.S.No.59 of 2001 confirming the judgment and decree passed by the trial Court in O.S.No.165 of 1993. Feeling aggrieved, the defendants in O.S.No.912 of 1992 namely, Muniammal and Pachaiappan have filed the second appeal in S.A.No.1863 of 2001 against the allowing of the appeal in A.S.No.18 of 2001. The plaintiff in O.S.No.165 of 1993 namely, Pachaiappan has filed the second appeal in S.A.No.1864 of 2001 against the dismissal of his appeal in A.S.No.59 of 2001.

13. This Court, at the time of admitting the second appeals formulated the following the substantial questions of law in S.A.No.1863 of 2001:-

"1. Is the learned Principal District Judge right in dismissing the suit for specific performance without giving a finding as to whether the signature in agreement Ex.B2 is that of the first defendant or not?

2. When the evidence of the plaintiff clearly established execution of agreement by the first defendant is the Principal District Judge right in refusing the decree?"

14. This Court, at the time of admitting the second appeals formulated the following the substantial questions of law in S.A.No.1864 of 2001:-

"1. When the plaintiff as PW1 has admitted possession of the suit property by her mother Lakshmi Ammal and also the fact the assessment was standing in her name coupled with the fact that Ex.B1 patta stood in the name of the father of the plaintiff and the first defendant is the learned Principal District Judge right in holding that the plaintiff is entitled to the suit property?

2. When the plaintiff failed to prove her possession of the entirety of the suit property by producing any evidence is the learned Principal District Judge right in granting a decree for injunction?"

15. Heard Mr.R.Siddharth, for Mr.T.R.Rajaraman, the learned counsel for the appellants in both the Second Appeals and Mr.P.Jagadeesan, the learned counsel for the first respondent in both the Second Appeals.

16. Substantial questions of law 1 and 2 in S.A.No.1863 of 2001 and substantial questions of law 1 and 2 in S.A.No.1864 of 2001:

The learned counsel for the appellants has submitted that the first appellate Court erred in holding that as per Ex.A1 patta the plaintiff namely, Chandra Ammal is the absolute owner of the suit property. He further submitted that the first Appellate Court erred in rejecting Ex.B11 patta dated 12.10.1969 which was issued in favour of Gopala Moopan, on the ground that it is only a true copy. He further submitted that the first Appellate Court failed to consider the oral evidence of DW2 that the original patta which was issued in favour of Gopala Moopan has been taken away by Chandra Ammal. He further submitted that the first Appellate Court failed to consider the admission made by PW1 in chief examination that till his life time Gopala Moopan was in possession of the suit property and after his death, her mother was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property. He further submitted that the first Appellate Court failed to consider that PW1 has admitted in her cross examination that her mother Lakshmi Ammal had constructed a house in the suit property and house tax assessment was transferred in her name.

17. The learned counsel for the appellants has further submitted that the Courts below failed to consider that Ex.B2 sale agreement was proved through the oral evidence of DW1 to DW5 and therefore, he prayed to allow both the Second Appeals and to set aside the judgment and decree passed by the first Appellate Court in A.S.Nos.18 and 59 of 2001 and dismissed the suit in O.S.No.912 of 1992 and decreed the suit in O.S.No.165 of 1993.

18. Per contra, the learned counsel for the respondents in S.A.No.1863 of 2001 and the first respondent in S.A.No.1864 of 2001 has submitted that the Government had issued patta vide Ex.A1 dated 20.08.1990 assigning the suit site in favour of the plaintiff namely, Chandra Ammal. He further submitted that if the sister of the said Chandra Ammal namely, Muniammal is having any grievance against the issuance of patta in favour of Chandra Ammal, she would have filed an appeal before the Competent Authority but she has not filed any appeal before the Competent Authority and as such, the said patta cannot be questioned before the civil Court. He further submitted that there is no evidence that a patta was granted in favour of Gopala Moopan on 12.10.1969 and the same has been taken away by the plaintiffs namely, Chandra Ammal. He further submitted that in Ex.B11 it

is stated as true copy and that there is no evidence as to the particulars mentioned in the said documents were taken from which documents and hence, the first Appellate Court has rightly rejected the said document. He further submitted that the defendants failed to prove that Ex.B2 sale agreement is a true agreement. He further submitted that the defendants failed to prove that the plaintiff namely Chandra Ammal had signed in the said agreement. He further submitted that taking into consideration of all the aforesaid facts, the first Appellate Court had rightly rejected the contention of the defendants and dismissed the suit which was filed by Pachaippan and decreed the suit which was filed by the Chandra Ammal and in the said factual findings, this Court cannot interfere and therefore, he prayed to dismiss the Second Appeal.

19. It is an admitted fact that originally, the suit property was the Government Poramboke land. According to the respondent, namely, Chandra Ammal, the Government had assigned the suit property to her by granting patta dated 20.08.1990. She had produced the original patta and marked as Ex.A1. A perusal of Ex.A1 would show that the Government had granted patta in respect of the suit property to the said Chandra Ammal on 20.08.1990.

20. The case of the defendants is that the plaintiff and the first defendant are daughters of one Gopala Moopan and the said Gopala Moopan had occupied the suit property 40 years ago and considering his long possession, the Government had granted patta in his favour. Their further case is that after death of the said Gopala Moopan, and his wife Lakshmi Ammal, their daughters namely, the first defendant and the plaintiff succeeded to the said property. In support of their case, they relied upon Ex.B1. Ex.B1 is said to be true copy of patta which was granted in favour of the said Gopala Moopan. In the said document it is stated that the land measuring 3 cents in S.No.75/2 of Cho.Keezlnochipatti Village, has been assigned in favour of one Gopala Moopan son of Kariya Moopan. Though the said document is mentioned as true copy and a Deputy Thasildar, Tiruvannamalai, also had signed, it is not stated in the document when the original was issued and the said document was prepared on the basis of which document. Further, in Ex.B1 it is simply mentioned that in S.No.75/2 3 cents assigned to Gopalamoopan son of Kariya Moopan, but the boundaries for the said land has not been given. S.No.75/2 may contain vast extent of land and in order to identify the land which was assigned to the said Gopalamoopan, the boundaries necessarily have to be given but no such boundaries given. All the aforesaid facts, would raise the suspicion over the genuines of the said document. Taking into consideration of the aforesaid facts, the first Appellate Court has rightly rejected the said document.

21. The learned counsel for the appellants drew the attention of this Court to the deposition of PW1 and contended that PW1 has admitted in her chief examination itself that her father resided in the suit property till his life time and after his death, her mother was in possession and enjoyment of the same and hence, no more proof is required to hold that the suit property was occupied by the father of the first plaintiff and the first defendant and till his death, he was in possession and enjoyment of the said property and after his death, his wife was in possession and enjoyment of the said property and as such, the first defendant and the plaintiff got equal share in the suit property.

22. The relevant portion of the deposition of PW1 which relied upon by the learned counsel for the appellants is extracted hereunder:-

“அவர் உயிருடன் இருக்கும் வரை தாவா சொத்தை அவர்தான் அனுபவித்து வந்தார் என்றும் அதற்கு பிறகு என்னுடைய தாயார் தாவா சொத்தை அனுபவித்து வந்தார் என்றும் சொன்னால் சரி.”

23. PW1 in her chief examination, while adverting the averments made in the written statement that her father had occupied the suit property 40 years ago, and also denied the averments that patta was granted in the year 1969. She also denied the averments that after the death of her mother a Panchayat was held and in the said Panchayat the suit property was divided and the western half was given to her sister (first defendant) and that the eastern half was allotted to her. A perusal of the entire evidence of PW1 would show that she would not have answered that till his life time, her father was residing in the suit property and after his death her mother was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The aforesaid answer might have been recorded due to typographical error and she would have denied the averments that his father was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property, till his time and after his death, her mother was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property.

24. At this juncture, it would also be relevant to refer to the decision in Boramma Vs. Krishna Gowda and others, (2000) 3 MLJ 199 (SC), wherein, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para No.10 has held as follows:-

“10....In our view It will not be a sound rule of appreciation of evidence to pickup an answer from the cross examination of a witness and draw inference taking it in isolation. The Court must see as to how consisted the testimony of the witness is and as to how what

answer fits in with the rest of the evidence and probabilities of the case.”

25. From the aforesaid decision, it is clear that it will not be a sound rule of appreciation of evidence to pickup an answer from the cross examination of a witness and draw inference taking it in isolation. The Court must see as to how consistent the testimony of the witness is and as to how and what answer fits in with the rest of the evidence and probabilities of the case.

26. In this case, as already pointed out that a perusal of the entire evidence of PW1 would clearly show that she attempted to deny the allegation made in the written statement but due to typographical error it was recorded as if she has admitted the said allegations. Therefore, based on the said statement, the appellants cannot contend that the respondent has admitted that her father was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property till his death and after his death, her mother was in possession and enjoyment of the suit property.

27. It is also the case of the appellants that the first appellant and the respondent had entered into a sale agreement with the second appellant for selling the suit property on 26.08.1992 but subsequently, the first appellant alone came forward to execute the sale deed and accordingly, she executed the sale deed in respect of the western half of the suit property in favour of the second appellant on 04.09.1992 and the respondent refused to execute the sale deed and hence, the second appellant was constrained to issue lawyer's notice and even after receipt of the said notice, the respondent did not come forward to execute the sale deed and hence, the second appellant has filed the suit for specific performance of the said sale agreement. In order to prove the aforesaid facts, the second appellant has filed the alleged sale agreement and marked as Ex.B2 and also produced a copy of the lawyer's notice and marked as Ex.B9. Further, he has examined the scribe of Ex.B2 sale agreement as DW3 and examined the witness as DWs 4 and DW5.

28. The respondents has sent a reply notice vide Ex.B10 denying the fact that she has not executed any sale agreement. In the written statement also she has categorically denying the execution of the said sale agreement and further examined herself as PW1. She has taken a categorically stand that she has not executed such any agreement. If really the first appellant and the respondent had executed Ex.B2 sale agreement in favour of the second appellant and in pursuance of the said sale agreement, the first appellant had executed a registered sale deed dated 04.09.1992 (Ex.B3) in favour of the second appellant, the said sale agreement would have been referred to in the said sale deed. But in Ex.B3 sale deed no reference has been made about Ex.B2 sale agreement and that itself would show that Ex.B2

agreement would not to be a true agreement. The Courts below taking into consideration of all the aforesaid facts, has rightly rejected the contention of the appellants that the first appellant and the respondents had executed Ex.B2 sale agreement and in the said factual concurrent findings, this Court cannot interfere.

29. As already pointed out that the respondent has produced the patta which was granted to her father marked as Ex.A1. Challenging the said patta, the first appellant has not filed any appeal before the Competent Authority. Further, the Courts below has rejected Ex.B1 and also Ex.B2 and in the said circumstances, this Court is of the view that the appellants failed to prove their case. Accordingly, the substantial questions of law are answered against the appellants.

30. In the result, both the Second Appeals are dismissed. Confirming, the judgments and decrees passed by the first Appellate Court. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-V)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

dna

To

1. The Principal District Judge,
Tiruvannamalai.
2. The II Additional District Munsif,
Tiruvannamalai.

copy to: The Section Officer,
VR Section, High Court, Madras.

+1 cc to Mr.P.Jagadeesan, Advocate, S.R.No.23760

S.A.Nos.1863 and 1864 of 2001

SSV(CO)
SSM(22/10/2019)

WEB COPY