



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 19.06.2019
PRONOUNCED ON : 10.07.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T.RAVINDRAN

S.A.No.71 of 2016
and
CMP No.1876 of 2016

1. N.Pandurangan
2. P.Selvaraj
3. P. Muruganandhan ...Appellants/Respondent/Defendant

Vs.

N. Kannaboss ...Respondent/Appellant/Plaintiff

Prayer:

Second Appeal filed under Section 100 of Civil Procedure Code, to set aside the judgment and decree of the Sub Judge, Vellore dated 31.08.2015 passed in C.A.S.No. 64 of 2014 and reversing the judgment and decree of the District Munsif, Katpadi, Vellore District dated 24.09.2014 passed in O.S.No.863 of 2009.

For Appellants : Mr.N.R.Elango, Senior Counsel
for M/s. M.V.Vijayabaskar

For Respondent : Mr. R.Sunil Kumar

JUDGMENT

In this Second Appeal, challenge is made to the judgment and decree dated 31.08.2015 passed in C.A.S.No. 64 of 2014 on the file of the Subordinate Court, Vellore reversing the judgment and decree dated 24.09.2014 passed in O.S.No.863 of 2009 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Katpadi, Vellore District.

2. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per their rankings in the trial court.

3. Suit for declaration and permanent injunction.

4. The case of the plaintiffs, in brief, is that one



WEB COPY

Narayana Mandiri and Arputhammal had three sons, namely, Pandurangan (first defendant), Krishnan, Kannaboss (plaintiff) and one daughter by name Kanniammal and all the abovesaid members constituted joint Hindu family and during the year 1960, Narayana Mandiri died intestate leaving behind his wife, three sons and daughter to succeed to his property in survey No.693/1A with a well with an extent of 2.38 cents. After the demise of Narayana Mandiri, his legal heirs continued in joint family status without division of the properties and the first defendant, being the eldest member, acted as the kartha of the family and out of the income derived from the joint family nucleus and also by pledging the plaintiff's mother's jewels of five sovereigns during the year 1969, the suit property was purchased by the joint family for a valid consideration in the name of the first defendant, he being the kartha of the joint family and since then the members of the joint family were enjoying the suit property and the suit property had acquired the character of the joint family property and the members of the joint family were unable to continue to enjoy the family properties unitedly and as a result, effected partition of the joint family properties on 30.03.1982 in the presence of the witnesses and in the abovesaid partition, the suit property and the other joint family properties were allotted to the plaintiff's share as per the partition deed effected on 30.03.1982 and since then, it is only the plaintiff who has been in the possession and enjoyment of the shares allotted to him in the abovesaid partition including the suit property by paying kists etc., and however, as regards the suit property, the patta had not been transferred in the name of the plaintiff despite his request to the revenue officials with reference to the same and the revenue officials colluded with the first defendant acted adversely against the plaintiff and hence, the plaintiff had submitted a petition during the year 2002 to include the suit property in the patta issued to him, but, due to non cooperation of the first defendant, no further order has been passed in the abovesaid petition and despite the same, it is only the plaintiff, who has been in the possession and enjoyment of the suit property as the absolute owner beyond the statutory period to the knowledge of the defendants and therefore, the defendants are estopped from questioning his right, title and interest in respect of the suit property and the defendants, without any authority, are attempting to disturb the plaintiff's possession and enjoyment of the suit property and also created the sale deeds in their names and hence, according to the plaintiff, he has been necessitated to levy the suit against the defendant for appropriate reliefs.

5. The defendants resisted the said suit contending that the suit laid by the plaintiff is not maintainable either in law or on facts. The allegation that after the demise of the father,



the plaintiff's mother and his brothers continued in the joint family status without division of the properties and that the first defendant has been acting as the kartha of the joint family and that out of the joint family nucleus and by pledging their mother's jewels, the suit property had been acquired in the name of the first defendant as the kartha of the joint family and since then, the suit property has been in the possession and enjoyment of the joint family as the joint family property are all false and it is stated that the suit property had been originally acquired by the in-laws of the first defendant and the same was sold to the defendant for a valid consideration by way of the registered sale deed dated 25.05.1969 and therefore, the suit property is the self acquired property of the first defendant purchased out of his self earned income and the patta No. 701 in respect of the suit property has been in the name of the first defendant and it is he who has been paying the kists in respect of the suit property and the plaintiff is not entitled to claim any right over the same and the plaintiff has never been in the possession and enjoyment of the suit property at any point of time and therefore, the claim of the plaintiff that he has been in the possession and enjoyment of the suit property by paying the kists beyond the statutory period is false. The plaintiff has no locus standi to file the suit against the defendants and the suit has not been properly valued and therefore, the suit laid by the plaintiff is liable to be dismissed.

6. In support of the plaintiff's case P.Ws.1 to 3 were examined and Exs.A1 to A23 were marked. On the side of the defendants D.Ws.1 and 2 were examined, Exs.B1 to B3 were marked. Exs.C1 and C2 and Exs.X1 and X2 were also marked.

7. On the basis of the oral and documentary evidence of the respective parties and the submissions made, the trial court was pleased to dismiss the plaintiff's suit. On appeal by the plaintiff, the first appellate court, on a consideration of the materials placed on record and the submissions made, was pleased to set aside the judgment and decree of the trial court and by way of allowing the appeal preferred by the plaintiff, granted the reliefs as prayed for. Challenging the same, the defendants have come forward with the second appeal.

8. At the time of admission of the second appeal, the following substantial questions of law were formulated for consideration.

"(i) Whether in the absence of any proof of the respondent that the suit property had been purchased out of the income from the joint family property, could he claim the same as allotted in the partition effected among the family members?



WEB COPY

(ii) When once a division was effected as early as 1974, whether a claim as a joint family property could be made in 2008 after a period of 34 years?

(iii) Whether in the absence of any title and enjoyment, could the respondent make a claim whereas the document of title of the appellant was of the year 1969 and when not questioned at any point of time?

9. The plaintiff claims title to the suit property based on the partition deed dated 30.03.1982 marked as Ex.A1. It is found that the abovesaid partition deed is neither stamped nor registered as per law. According to the plaintiff, he, the first defendant and one Krisnan are the sons and Kanniammal is the daughter of Narayana Mandiri and Narayana Mandiri died intestate leaving behind his wife and his abovesaid sons and daughter to succeed to his property comprised in survey No.693/1A with an extent of 2.32 cents inclusive of a well and according to the plaintiff, after the demise of Naraya Mandiri, the first defendant being the eldest brother acted as the kartha of the joint family and it is further stated that out of the income derived from the abovesaid ancestral nucleus and by pledging his mother's jewels of five sovereigns, the suit property had been acquired during the year 1969 in the name of the first defendant for the joint family as he was the kartha of the joint family at that point of time and hence, according to the plaintiff, it is stated that the suit property had been enjoyed jointly by the members of the abovesaid joint family and by way of the partition effected on 30.03.1982, it is put forth that the suit property had been allotted to the plaintiff's share and thereby, according to the plaintiff, it is he who has title to the suit property and the same is in his possession, and the defendants, without any authority, are attempting to interfere with his possession and enjoyment by denying his title and hence, he has been necessitated institute the suit against the defendants for appropriate reliefs.

10. Per contra, the defendants resisted the suit contending that there is no joint family consisting of the plaintiff, the first defendant and Krishnan following the demise of Narayana Mandiri and further pleaded that there is no ancestral nucleus and disputed the case of the plaintiff that the suit property had been acquired out the income derived from the ancestral nucleus and by pledging their mother's jewels and also disputed the fact that the suit property had been purchased in the name of the first defendant as the kartha of the joint family and enjoyed as the joint family property by the members and



according to the defendants, the suit property is the self acquired property of the first defendant purchased by him by way of the registered sale deed dated 25.05.1969 for a valid consideration and it is only the first defendant who has been in the possession and enjoyment of the suit property by obtaining the patta and paying kists, etc. and the plaintiff has no manner of right or interest in respect of the suit property and never been in the possession and enjoyment of the same and hence, according to the defendants, the suit laid by the plaintiff is totally misconceived, unfounded and without any cause of action and liable to be dismissed.

11. According to the plaintiff, following the demise of Narayana Mandiri, his legal heirs constituted the joint family and that the first defendant was acting as the kartha of the joint family. The abovesaid fact itself is put in dispute by the defendants. Despite the same, there is no material on the part of the plaintiff worth acceptance to hold that the legal heirs of the deceased Narayana Mandiri constituted the joint family and that the first defendant was the kartha of the joint family. Furthermore, though the plaintiff would claim that Narayana Mandiri had ancestral properties and out of the income derived from the ancestral nucleus, the suit property had come to be acquired in the name of the first defendant as the kartha of the joint family. With reference to the same, other than marking the sale deeds standing in the name of Naraya Mandiri as Exs.A19 and A20, there is no material on the part of the plaintiff to hold that the abovesaid properties were capable of yielding income and the suit property had come to be acquired out of the said income as put forth by him. Therefore, as rightly found by the trial court, merely on the production of the sale deeds marked as Exs.A19 and A20, we cannot presume that the properties comprised therein constituted adequate nucleus and they were capable of yielding income and with the aid of the said income, the suit property had come to be acquired. Pointing to the same, absolutely, there is no proof placed on the part of the plaintiff and therefore, to say that the suit property had come to be acquired out of the income derived from the ancestral nucleus, as put forth in the plaint and also as put forth during the evidence, cannot be accepted sans any acceptable material with reference to the same. As regards the case of the plaintiff that his mother's jewels were utilised for the acquisition of the suit property, absolutely there is no proof. Therefore, there is no material, at all, on the part of the plaintiff to hold that the suit property had been acquired out of the income of the ancestral nucleus and his mother's jewels and furthermore, there is no proof on the part of the plaintiff to hold that the suit property acquired during the year 1969 in the name of the first defendant had been enjoyed by all the alleged joint family as put forth by the plaintiff. With



reference to the same, there is no material on the part of the plaintiff. From the documents projected in the matter, it is found that the suit property had come to be acquired by the first defendant by way of the sale deed dated 25.05.1969, the certified copy of which has been marked as Ex.B2 and considering the documents marked as Exs.B3, X1 and X2, it is found that it is only the first defendant who has been in the possession and enjoyment of the suit property by obtaining the patta, paying kists, etc., and there is no material on the side of the plaintiff to hold that either he or the other members of the joint family had ever been in the possession and enjoyment of the suit property. The plaintiff himself has admitted that the suit property has not been included in the patta issued to him with reference to the properties allotted to his share by way of the partition deed dated 30.03.1982. According to the plaintiff, in the abovesaid partition, the suit property had also been allotted to him. If the abovesaid case of the plaintiff is true, as rightly put forth, in the normal course of events, the patta would have been issued in favour of the plaintiff inclusive of the suit property. But, the plaintiff himself has admitted that despite the alleged allotment of the suit property and the other properties to his share by way of the partition deed effected on 30.03.1982, the patta in respect of the suit property has not been transferred in his favour despite his repeated representations to the revenue officials and accordingly it is found that there is absolutely no material at all on the part of the plaintiff to hold that the suit property has been in his exclusive possession and enjoyment pursuant to the so called partition said to have been effected on 30.03.1982. The case projected by the plaintiff that only at the instigation of the first defendant, the revenue officials had not endeavoured to change the patta in his favour in respect of the suit property is not supported by any material worth acceptance.

12. As above noted, the plaintiff claims title to the suit property based on the partition arrangement effected on 30.03.1982 by a deed, which document has come to be marked as Ex.A1. Ex.A1 is neither stamped nor registered as per law. On a perusal of Ex.A1 partition deed, as rightly put forth by the defendants' counsel, it is found that the recitals contained therein would show that till the date of Ex.A1 partition, the parties had remained joint and pursuant to Ex.A1 partition deed, the parties thereto had chosen to divide the properties and enjoy the same absolutely. Pursuant to the same, it is found that only by way of Ex.A1 partition deed, the parties had chosen to derive title to the shares said to have been allotted to them as recited therein. In the light of the abovesaid recitals contained in Ex.A1 partition deed, as rightly put forth by the defendants' counsel, the same requires to be properly stamped



and registered as per law and in the absence of the incorporation of the same without proper stamp papers and registration, the said document cannot at all be looked into for any purpose and with reference to his abovesaid contention, the counsel for the defendants rely upon the decision reported in 2001 (1) CTC 112 (A.C.Lakshmipathy and another vs. A.M. Chakrapani Reddiar and five others), wherein the deed of partition recorded in an unstamped and unregistered document has been held to be not in accordance with law and that the same cannot be looked into for any purpose and the position of law the law with reference to the same has been outlined in the abovesaid decision as follows:

Family arrangement - Essentials of - Parties to arrangement must be related to one another in some way and must have claim or possible claim to property or even semblance of claim or spes successionis or other ground like between parties affection or ignorance of parties of their rights - Object of family arrangement is to maintain peace and harmony in family - Family arrangement can be done orally - Family arrangement must be voluntary and entered into by parties on their own accord and free will.

Registration Act, 1908, Sections 17 and 49 - Necessity of Registration of Document - Admissibility of unregistered document and meaning of "collateral purposes" - Partition of immovable properties could be done orally - Oral partition or oral family arrangement need not be registered - Documents made to effectuate partition or in respect of any transaction specified in Section 17 should be registered to be admitted in evidence - Rigour imposed by Section 17 would apply even of such transaction is not required to be in writing -

Registration Act, 1908, Section 49 - Admissibility of unregistered document relating to immovable properties as evidence in court - Such document could be received in evidence to establish collateral purpose only and not to establish title - No exhaustive list of purposes which could be construed as collateral could be furnished - collateral purpose has to be decided according to facts of each case - Document stamped but not registered could be looked into for collateral purposes - Instances of collateral purpose discussed -

Stamp Act, 1899, Section 35 - Effect of - Unstamped



Registration Act, 1908, Section 17 - Stamp Act, 1899, Section 35 - Family arrangement relating to immovable properties - Necessity of Registration - Family arrangement requires registration if it is reduced to writing for using it as proof or arrangement and where such arrangement is brought about by document - Family arrangement which serves as memorandum of record of past arrangement or for information of court for making necessary mutation does not create or extinguish rights and it need not be registered.

Registration Act, 1908, Section 17 - Stamp Act, 1899, Section 35 - Deeds - Construction of deeds and documents - Document executed between father and two sons regarding immovable properties - Such document allotted properties to sisters out of affection - Affection between parties is sufficient to create family arrangement - Family arrangement document is family arrangement - Mere use of phrases that parties have divided immovable properties and are executing document to declare partition already made would not mean that document is record of past transaction - Document must be read as whole - Family arrangement has been executed with intention that document itself constitute sole repository as document of title - Family arrangement neither



WEB COPY

stamped nor registered - Family arrangement cannot be looked into as it is unstamped and unregistered.

.....

41. We hold that the document in question is being an unstamped and unregistered, the same cannot be looked into for any purpose. Similarly, oral evidence cannot be let in about the contents of the said document.

42. To sum up the legal position

(I) A family arrangement can be made orally.

(II) If made orally, there being no document, no question of registration arises.

(III) If the family arrangement is reduced to writing and it purports to create, declare, assign, limit or extinguish any right, title or interest of any immovable property, it must be properly stamped and duly registered as per the Indian Stamp Act and Indian Registration Act.

(IV) Whether the terms have been reduced to the form of a document is a question of fact in each case to be determined upon a consideration of the nature of phraseology of the writing and the circumstances in which and the purpose with which it was written.

(V) However, a document in the nature of a Memorandum, evidencing a family arrangement already entered into and had been prepared as a record of what had been agreed upon, in order that there are no hazy notions in future, it need not be stamped or registered.

(VI) Only when the parties reduce the family arrangement in writing with the purpose of using that writing as proof of what they had arranged and, where the arrangement is brought about by the document as such, that the document would require registration as it is then that it would be a document of title declaring for future what rights in what properties the parties possess.

(VII) If the family arrangement is stamped but not registered, it can be looked into for collateral purposes.

(VIII) Whether the purpose is a collateral purpose, is a question of fact depends upon facts and circumstances of each case. A person cannot claim a right or title to a property under the said document, which is being looked into only for collateral purposes.

(IX) A family arrangement which is not stamped



into for
bar in
Act.

and not registered cannot be looked
any purpose in view of the specific
Section 35 of the Indian Stamp

In the light of the abovesaid principles of law enunciated in the abovesaid decision, it is found that inasmuch as Ex.A1 partition deed is not stamped and unregistered as per the requisites of law, the said document even if it had been admitted as an exhibit on the part of the plaintiff without any objection put forth by the defendants, the same cannot at all be taken into consideration for any purpose, even for collateral purpose and therefore, the claim of the plaintiff that he has acquired the title to the suit property by way of Ex.A1 partition deed cannot, at all, be accepted and sustained in the eyes of law.

13. As regards the contention put forth by the plaintiff's counsel that Ex.A1 has been admitted and taken in evidence without any resistance on the part of the defendants and furthermore, it is also contended that the first defendant during the course of evidence has also not disputed the execution of Ex.A1 partition deed and would admit his signature in the same and accordingly contended that by way of the abovesaid admission and marking of the said document without any objection put forth on the part of the defendants, it is contended that the first appellate court is justified in accepting Ex.A1 partition deed for upholding the claim of the plaintiff. But the above contention does not merit acceptance. When it is found that Ex.A1 partition deed being an unstamped and unregistered document cannot be looked into for any purpose as adumbrated by the Division Bench in the decision above referred to, merely because the document had been marked without demur on the part of the defendants, that by alone, would not enure to the benefit of the plaintiff to contend that the defendants had admitted the truth and validity of the said document. With reference to the same, it is seen that when the partition deed projected by the plaintiff marked as Ex.A1 is found to be legally inadmissible and in such view of the matter, even if the said document had come to be marked without any resistance on the part of the defendants that would not give any lever to the plaintiff to contend that the defendants has admitted the validity of the same and in this connection, the counsel for the defendants relied upon the decision reported in (2003) 8 Supreme Court Cases 752 (R.V.E. Venkatachala Gounder vs. Arulmigu Viswesaraswami & V.P. Temple and another), wherein the principles of law outlining the marking of the documents has been analysed and it has been pointed out that the marking of the documents and the objection pertaining to the same could be classified as objection that the document sought to be proved is itself inadmissible and objection directed not against the admissibility of the document but against the mode of proof



there of on the ground of irregularity or insufficiency and it has been held in the abovesaid decision that the objection under the first part can be raised even if the document has been marked as an exhibit or even in appeal or revision. The position of law with reference to the same has been outlined in the abovesaid decision as follows:

B. Evidence Act, 1872 - S.65 - Secondary evidence relating to documents - Objection as to admissibility of - Stage at which can be raised - Held, such objections can be classified as (i) objection that the document sought to be proved is itself inadmissible, and (ii) objection directed not against the admissibility of the document but against the mode of proof thereof on the ground of irregularity or insufficiency - Objection under category (i) can be raised even after the document has been marked as "an exhibit" or even in appeal or revision, but the objection under category (ii) can be raised when the evidence is tendered but not after the document has been admitted in evidence and marked as an exhibit - In the present case the ledger books and photostat copies of the order in question and of the rent agreement were admitted in evidence by trial court without any objection from the opposite side - Therefore, the objection raised before the High Court in second appeal that in the absence of the deceased maker of the entries in the ledger books and in the absence of production of the originals the said document sought not to have been admitted, fell under category (ii) and High Court erred in upholding that objection in appeal - Civil Procedure Code, 1908, Or. 13 R.4 and Ss. 96 and 100 - Objection as to admissibility of document in evidence - Maintainability in appeal.

Therefore, considering the position of law as above pointed out, merely because Ex.A1 partition deed had been admitted without resistance on the part of the defendants, on that score alone, the plaintiff cannot be allowed to contend that the validity of the document has been accepted by the defendants in toto and they would be debarred from challenging the same in the second appeal. When Ex.A1 is found to be the document totally inadmissible in law, the same cannot be looked into for any purpose as above pointed. In such view of the matter, the admissibility of the same could be questioned and challenged by the defendants even in the second appeal and therefore, the abovesaid argument put forth by the plaintiff's counsel that the defendants are estopped from challenging the admissibility of Ex.A1 partition deed does not stand scrutiny in the eyes of law.



14. As regards the so called admission of Ex.A1 partition deed on the part of the defendants, during the course of evidence, no doubt, the first defendant examined as D.W.1 would tender evidence that his signature is available in Ex.A1 partition deed as well in the other partition deed projected in the matter marked as Ex.A17. However, when according to the defendants the suit property is the self acquired property and the same is not the joint family property of the plaintiff and the others as put forth by the plaintiff and when as above discussed, the plaintiff has failed to establish that the suit property had been acquired out of the aid of the joint family nucleus and other means as put forth by him and the plaintiff has failed to establish that the suit property has been enjoyed by the members of the joint family as pleaded by him and the plaintiff has failed to establish that the suit property has been in his exclusive possession and enjoyment following Ex.A1 partition deed and on the other hand, when the title deed in respect of the suit property has been in the name of the first defendant and it is only the first defendant who is found to be in the possession and enjoyment of the suit property by obtaining the patta, paying the kists etc., as could be gathered from the materials projected in the matter, the plaintiff is unable to secure the patta in respect of the suit property despite his so called allotment of the same towards his share by way of Ex.A1 partition deed and furthermore, when considering the admission on the part of the plaintiff, admitting in toto, the division of the status and the relinquishment of interest in respect of the suit property and accepting the title of the first defendant in respect of the suit property by way of Ex.B1 arrangement, in all, in the light of the abovesaid background, merely because the first defendant has admitted his signature contained in Exs.A1 and A17 and furthermore, when Ex.A1 partition deed and equally Ex.A17 partition deed, cannot be looked into for any purpose as above pointed out, they being not stamped and not registered as per law, the so called admission on the part of the first defendant with reference to the execution of the said documents, by itself, would not lend any validity and acceptance to the abovesaid documents for upholding the claim of the plaintiff to the suit property. The abovesaid position of law has been failed to be considered by the first appellate court and the first appellate court, without considering Ex.A1 partition deed with reference to its validity and admissibility as per law, is found to have accepted the plaintiff's case based on the so called truncated admission on the part of the first defendant with reference to the same. With reference to the effect of the admission made by a party to the suit, the defendants' counsel placed reliance upon the following decisions reported in

1. 92 L.W 736 (M.Manoharan Chetty and others vs. M/s. C.Coomaraswamy Naidu & Sons Madras)



2. 1975 SCC online All 426 : AIR 1976 All 23 (Ch. Birbal Singh vs. Harphool Khan and another)
3. 1995 AIHC 5751 (Vulsa Laxminarayan vs. Vulsa Bhoodamma and another)

The principles of law outlined in the above decisions, as regards the admissibility of admission, are taken into consideration and followed as applicable to the case at hand.

15. When, in particular, Ex.A1 is found to be totally inadmissible and also an invalid document, the plaintiff, by way of the same, would not be entitled to acquire any claim of title to the suit property and when the plaintiff has failed to establish the position that the suit property is the joint family property and allotted to his share by way of Ex.A1 partition deed and the plaintiff has also further failed to establish that it is he who has been in the possession and enjoyment of suit property following Ex.A1 partition deed and on the other hand, when it is seen that the first defendant is the absolute title holder of the suit property and the same is in his possession and enjoyment and the title of the first defendant in respect of the suit property has been admitted by the plaintiff and his brother Krishnan examined as P.W.3 by way of the partition arrangement dated 17.07.1974 marked as Ex.B1, in such view of the matter, even assuming for the sake of arguments that the first defendant has admitted the execution of Exs.A1 and A17 partition arrangement, the abovesaid documents not acquiring any validity in the eyes of law as above discussed, the admission on the part of the first defendant with reference to the same would not lend assistance to the plaintiff for seeking a valid claim of title to the suit property and in such view of the matter, the first appellate court is found to be erred in not considering the materials placed on record in the proper perspective as per law and the principles of law governing the same and seem to have blindly accepted the plaintiff's case based on the so called admission on the part of the first defendant qua the partition deed marked as Ex.A1. In such view of the matter, the reasonings and conclusions of the first appellate court for upholding the plaintiff's case being tainted with perversity and irrationality and also found to be not logical, in any count, the judgment and decree of the first appellate accepting the plaintiff's case have to be necessarily set aside and accordingly, the substantial questions of law formulated in this second appeal are answered in favour of the defendants and against the plaintiff.

16. For the reasons aforesaid, the judgment and decree dated 31.08.2015 passed in C.A.S.No. 64 of 2014 on the file of the Subordinate Court, Vellore are set aside and the judgment and decree dated 24.09.2014 passed in O.S.No.863 of 2009 on the file of the District Munsif Court, Katpadi, Vellore District,



are confirmed.

Accordingly, the second appeal is allowed with costs.
Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

WEB COPY

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CCC)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

bga

Copy to

1. Subordinate Court,
Vellore.
2. District Munsif Court,
Katpadi, Vellore District.
3. The Section officer,
V.R. Section, High Court,
Madras.

+1cc to Mr.R.Vivekanandhan, Advocate, S.R.No.58198
+1cc to Mr.R.Sunil Kumar, Advocate, S.R.No. 57763

S.A.No.71 of 2016

BS (CO)
GN(06/01/2020)