



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
[THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING]

DATED : 21.02.2019

WEB COPY

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.KIRUBAKARAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

O.S.A. Nos.60, 61, 138 and 139 of 2017
and
C.M.P. No.4976, 4977, 9203 and 9204 of 2017

Meenakshi Achi ... Appellant/Petitioner in O.S.A.Nos.60 &
61/2017

1.M.Veerappan (deceased)
2.V.Prema
3.V.Umashankar
4.V.Bharath
5.V.Sridhar

... Appellants in O.S.A.Nos.138 &
139/2017

(Cause Title Accepted vide order of
Court dated 24.04.2017 by (IB, CJ) & MSJ
made in CMP Nos.7023 & 7022 of 2017
in OSA SR.Nos.27092 & 27129 of 2017)

(Appellants 2 to 5 brought on record as LRs of
the deceased sole Appellant viz. Veerappan
vide court order dated 27.11.2018 made in
CMP Nos.21180 to 21186/2018 in OSA Nos.
138 & 139/2017)

-vs-


1.Good Shepherd Evangelical Mission
Private Limited, Formerly known as
"The Siloam Evangelical Mission
Private Limited" represented by its
Chairman Pastor Gideon Jacob
9, Ranga Nagar, Subramaniapuram
Trichy - 620 020.

PL.CT.PL Palaniappa Chettiar (Died),



- 2.CT.Senthilnathan Chettiar
Sivakami Achi (Deceased)
Umayal Achi (Deceased)
3.Valliammai Achi (Deceased)
4.M.Veerappan (Died)
5.S.P.Meenakshi Sundaram
6.S.P.Chidambaram
7.S.P.Palaniappan
8.S.P.Ravindran
9.S.P.Subramanian
10.V.Umayal
11.S.Meenal
12.C.Sivagami
13.S.Sivagami
14.M.Meena
15.PL.Valli
16.L.Meenal
17.E.Swarna
18.CN.Meenakshi Narayanan
19.Namagiri Narayanan
20.L.Sivagami Lakhsmanan
21.B.Renganayaki Balachandran
22.V.Usha Vellyan
23.V.Shanthi Venkatachalam
24.VR.Vijayalakshmi Veerappan
25.Lakshmi Narashiman
26.PL.Senthil
27.C.Chellammai Chidambaram
28.M.Muthulakshmi
29.N.Meenal
30.Nalini Arulmozhi
31.S.Vadivel @ L.Senthilvadivel
32.L.Chidambaram @ Kittu
33.T.Sivagami
34.V.Prema
35.V.Umashankar
36.V.Bharath
37.V.Sridhar ... Respondents in O.S.A.Nos.60 &
61/2017
38.K.Velusamy
39.V.Ananthanayagi
40.K.Samikannu
41.R.Rajammal ... Respondents 38 to 41 in
O.S.A.60/2017


RR34 to 37 brought on record as LR's of the
deceased R4 viz. Veerappan vide court
order dated 27.11.2018 made in CMP Nos.
20989 to 20992/2018 in OSA Nos.60 & 61/2017.



(Respondents 38 to 41 were impleaded as per order of this Court dated 21.02.2019 in C.M.P.Nos.21727 to 21729 and 21731 of 2018 in O.S.A.No.60 of 2017)

WEB COPY

1. Good Shepherd Evangelical Mission Private Limited, Formerly known as "The Siloam Evangelical Mission Private Limited" represented by its Chairman Pastor Gideon Jacob
9, Ranga Nagar, Subramaniapuram
Trichy - 620 020.
2. Meenakshi Achi
PL.CT.PL Palaniappa Chettiar (Died),
3. CT.Senthilnathan Chettiar
Sivakami Achi (Deceased)
Umayal Achi (Deceased)
4. Valliammal Achi (Deceased)
5. S.P.Meenakshi Sundaram
6. S.P.Chidambaram
7. S.P.Palaniappan
8. S.P.Ravindran
9. S.P.Subramanian
10. V.Umayal
11. S.Meenal
12. C.Sivagami
13. S.Sivagami
14. M.Meena
15. PL.Valli
16. L.Meenal
17. E.Swarna
18. CN.Meenakshi Narayanan
19. Namagiri Narayanan
20. L.Sivagami Lakshmanan
21. B.Renganayaki Balachandran
22. V.Usha Vellyan
23. V.Shanthi Venkatachalam
24. VR.Vijayalakshmi Veerappan
25. Lakshmi Narashiman
26. PL.Senthil
27. C.Chellammai Chidambaram
28. M.Muthulakshmi
29. N.Meenal
30. Nalini Arulmozhi
(Respondents 21 to 30 were impleaded as legal heirs of the deceased 2nd Respondent as per order dated 28.01.2015 in A.Nos.7616 & 7619/2015)
31. L.S.Vadivel @ L.Senthilvadivel
32. L.Chidambaram @ Kittu



33.T.Sivagami

... Respondents in O.S.A.Nos.138 & 139/2017

34.K.Velusamy

35.V.Ananthanayagi

36.K.Samikannu

37.R.Rajammal

... Respondents 34 to 37 in O.S.A.138/2017

(Respondents 34 to 37 were impleaded as per order of this Court dated 21.02.2019 in C.M.P.Nos.21734, 21738, 21733 and 21732 of 2018 in O.S.A.No.138 of 2017)

COMMON PRAYER : Appeals filed Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the order of the learned Single Judge dated 03.03.2017, made in Application Nos.3108 and 3694 of 2012 in Civil Application No.4085 of 1984 in C.S.No.83 of 1965.

A.No.3108 of 2012:Application praying that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to implead the applicant as a respondent in Application No.4085 of 1984 in C.S.No.83 of 1965 as 10th respondent.

A.No.3694 of 2012:Application praying that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to appoint an Fresh Advocate Commissioner to not down the physical features of the Property mentioned in the Schedule to the Judges summons and submit a report thereon with necessary photographs and necessary sketches and with measurements from the Revenue officer.

C.S.No.83 of 1965: Prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to pass a decree:

a. Directing a partition of the under mentioned properties by metes and bounds and allotting and delivery one such share to the plaintiff.

b. directing defendants 1 to 3 render an account of the income of the under mentioned properties from 18.08.1964 the date of chidambaram chettiar's death to the date of plaint and to pay one-seventh share therefore the plaintiff with interest on the sum found sue.

c. directing ascertainment of probits of the under mentioned properties from the date or plaint till separate possession is given to the plaintiff and awarding to the plaintiff on seventh share thereof with interest.

d. directing an account to be taken the plaintiff's moneys invested with the deceased in his Devakottai account and making suitable provisions for the plaintiff being the amount found to her as a first change over the under mentioned properties.



e. directing the defendant to pay the plaintiff's the cost of the suit.

O.S.A.Nos.60 & 61/2017:

For Appellant	:Mr.K.Ravi for M/s.Rugan and Arya
For 1 st Respondent	:Mr.Ramakrishnan Vijayaraghavan Senior Counsel for M/s.G.Sivashankaran
For 2 nd Respondent	:Mr.Ashwin Prem Sundar
Respondents 3 and 4	:Died
For Respondents 5 to 9, 13 : and 17	Mr.V.Ayyadurai Senior Counsel for M/s.V.B.Perumal Raj
For Respondents 10, 11, 14: and 15	Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan Senior Counsel for M/s.AL.Gandhimathi
For 16 th Respondent	: Ms.P.Rajarajeshwari
For Respondents 18 to 27	: Mr.V.Bhiman
For Respondents 28, 29, & 30 31 to 33:	Mr.M.Sriram
For Respondents 34 to 37	: Mr.Rahul Balaji
Respondents 38 to 41 in O.S.A.: No.60/2017	Ms.Hema Sampath

O.S.A.Nos.138 & 139/2017:

For Appellants	: Mr.Rahul Balaji
For 1 st Respondent	: Mr.Ramakrishnan Vijayaraghavan Senior Counsel for M/s.G.Sivashankaran



For 2nd Respondent

: Mr.K.Ravi
for M/s.Rugan and Arya

For 3rd Respondent

: Mr.Ashwin Prem Sundar

4th Respondent

: Died

For Respondents 5 to 9, 13 :
and 17

Mr.V.Ayyadurai
Senior Counsel for
M/s.V.B.Perumal Raj

For Respondents 10, 11, 14 :
and 15

Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan
Senior Counsel for
M/s.AL.Gandhimathi

For 16th Respondent 19

: Ms.P.Rajarajeshwari

For Respondents 18 to 27 :

Mr.V.Bhiman

For Respondents 28 to 33 :

Mr.M.Sriram

Respondents 34 to 37 in O.S.A.: Ms.Hema Sampath
No.138/2017

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of this Court was delivered by N.KIRUBAKARAN,J.)

These appeals are directed against a common order dated 03.03.2017, by which, the learned Judge allowed two applications filed by the first respondent in these appeals, namely, Good Shepherd Evangelical Mission Pvt. Ltd. One application was in Application No.4085 of 1984, which was filed for passing a final decree in respect of the property described as item (a) in the 3rd schedule to the plaint, hereinafter called the Subject Property; the other one in Application No.3694 of 2012 was filed for appointing an Advocate Commissioner to note down the physical features of the Subject Property.

2. The suit was filed in the year 1965 for partition of the estate left behind by one PL.CT.PL.Chidambaram Chettiar. The suit was filed by his eldest daughter Meenakshi Achi. Originally, there were 6 defendants. Three brothers of the plaintiff were defendants 1 to 3; her mother was the 4th defendant and her two sisters were defendants 5 and 6. The plaint, as originally filed, contained two schedules, viz., schedule 1 and 2. The 1st schedule contained the immovable properties left behind by the deceased. The 2nd schedule



contained the movable properties left behind by him. Subsequently, the 3rd schedule was added to include certain properties ostensibly standing in the names of certain third parties though the contentions were that those properties belonged to the estate, but had been transferred by the estate owner in the names of such third parties, such transfers were sham and nominal and therefore, those properties continued to be part and parcel of the estate.

3. The subject property is item 'a' in the 3rd schedule and it is a vacant plot of about 77.39 acres in Edamalampatti Village on the outskirts of Trichy. A preliminary decree was passed on 22.11.1968 declaring that the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 6 were equally entitled to a 1/7th share in the properties of the estate described in schedule 1 and schedule 2, however, relegating the issue whether the 3rd schedule properties belonged to the estate or to the ostensible owners who were added as defendants 7 to 10, to be decided after trial.

4. After trial, another decree was passed on 21.11.1977 holding that the transfer of the Subject property by the estate owner to the name of the 7th defendant was sham and nominal. It was decreed that such transfer did not affect the title of the estate and therefore, the subject property continued to belong to the estate. The appeal filed by the 7th defendant Aandiyappan against such decree was dismissed and became final. During the pendency of the suit, defendants 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 died and their legal heirs were duly brought on record.

5. By an order dated 28.02.2002, in O.S.A.No.1 of 2002, a Division Bench of this Court passed a final decree in terms of the final report dated 04.12.2000, filed by the then Advocate Commissioner Mr. Rosi Naidu, accepting the same in toto and in respect of all the properties of the estate. Eight years later, a company called Siloam Evangelical Mission Limited filed 3 applications, Application Nos.2357 etc., of 2010. In sum and substance, the prayer of the said company was to get impleaded in the suit on the ground that the company had purchased a portion of the subject property from the 7th defendant Andiappan earlier during the pendency of the suit. The said applications were dismissed by a common order dated 29.04.2011 and it became final after dismissal of O.S.A. Nos.186 to 188 of 2011 and dismissal of SLP(Civil)Nos.16355 to 16357 of 2012 by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Subsequently, the 1st respondent herein filed Application Nos.3108 and 3694 of 2012, claiming that it is the same entity as the aforesaid company Siloam Evangelical Mission Pvt. Ltd., which got its name changed under the provisions of the Companies Act. Application No.3108 and of 2012 was filed for getting impleaded in the final decree Application No.4085 of 1984 in this suit and Application No.3694 of 2012 was filed for



appointing an Advocate Commissioner to note down the physical features of the property.

WEB COPY

6. During the pendency of the said applications, the sharers filed a memo of compromise dated 22.07.2015, making some mutual adjustments among themselves. After hearing the parties, both the applications filed by the first respondent herein were allowed by a common order dated 03.03.2017, against which, the present appeals have been filed. O.S.A.Nos.60 and 61 of 2017 have been filed by the Plaintiff in the suit. O.S.A.Nos.138 and 139 of 2017 have been filed by the 26th defendant who had been earlier impleaded as the sole legal heir of the deceased 5th defendant.

7. Since the major issue in the appeal related to the 1st respondent not having access to another piece of land, they owned and which is situated behind the Subject property, on the suggestion made by this Court, the appellant (since deceased and now represented by his Legal heirs added as Appellants 1 to 4) in O.S.A. Nos.138 & 139 of 2017 and also the Respondents 28 to 33 herein who were impleaded as the legal heirs of the original defendant No.6, offered to purchase peace by giving up a total extent of 3 acres from their respective shares in the bits allotted to them in the final report of Mr.Rosi Naidu, the Advocate Commissioner which was accepted earlier in the final decree passed by the Division Bench of this Court.

8. By an order dated 01.11.2018, this Court appointed two joint Advocate Commissioners to identify, measure and demarcate the boundaries of various shares in the Subject Property as set out in the previous Advocate Commissioner's Report dated 04.12.2000 and further to mark and prepare a sketch of the same showing an extent of three acres that could be allotted to the 1st Respondent as an exclusive access-pathway to their land behind the Subject property, as identified by parties, so that the parties may consider allotting the same to the first respondent in O.S. Appeals. Pursuant to the said order, the Advocate commissioners inspected the subject property measuring 77.39 acres of land and filed their report dated 23.11.2018 into this Court with the sketch prepared by Government Surveyor. While allotting the said 3 acres to the first respondent along the Northern boundary of the subject property, the six bits as originally demarcated in the earlier Commissioner's Report have been realigned, however, there being no reduction in extent in the bits allotted to the sharers except in the two bits allotted to the 5th defendant and the 6th defendant, deducting therefrom the said 3 acres equally and further deducting 1.68 acres from the bit allotted to the share of the 6th defendant representing



land acquired by the National Highway Authorities.

9. The extents of the land allotted to the plaintiff, the defendants 1, 2 and 3 are not reduced by re-alignment and each of them, got 12.77 acres. There is a reduction in extent only in respect of Bit Nos. 5 and 6 allotted to the Legal Heirs of defendants 5 and 6, for which, they have no objection. Subsequently, at the request of the 1st respondent that the 3 acre pathway demarcated within BIT No.1 and shown along its Northern Boundary may instead be culled out along the Southern Boundary of BIT No.1, to avoid its being a zig-zag pathway, the parties readily agreed to do so.

10. When the matter is called today, the learned counsel for the parties seek to dispose of the matter based on the Memo of Compromise dated 22.07.2015, in which, all the parties except the male legal heirs of first defendant and the first respondent in these appeals have not signed. Similarly, in the Memo of Compromise dated 28.02.2002, it is stated that all the parties have signed except the two female heirs of the deceased first defendant and the first respondent herein. If both the Memos of Compromise are taken together, all the parties have signed at one point of time or the other except the first respondent, who is a third party. Even with respect to the first respondent, a Joint Memo of Compromise has been entered into between the appellants and the first respondent. Therefore, there cannot be any hindrance for the disposal of the appeals.

11. Mr. V. Ayyadurai, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the male legal heirs of the first defendant viz., Respondents 5 to 9 in these appeals and defendants 50 to 54 in the suit being male heirs of first defendant Subramanian Chettiar would contend that the shares of deceased Subramanian Chettiar is to be given only to the aforesaid persons and not to his female heirs as they have already executed release deed. In this regard, the parties have already filed Application No. 5516 of 2015 to modify the preliminary decree of the year 1968 and 1977.

12. It is evident from the contentions made by Mr. V. Ayyadurai, learned Senior Counsel that it is an inter se dispute between the legal heirs of deceased Subramania Chettiar. In this case, share to an extent of 12.77 acres is allotted to the legal heirs of the first respondent. There is no reduction of extent of property or there is no dispute regarding the identity or boundary of the said share. If at all any dispute is there, it is between the female legal heirs and male legal heirs. It is always open for them to take separate proceedings before the competent Court. The dispute between the legal heirs of first respondent regarding their shares cannot be a hindrance for this Court to dispose of these appeals. The application for



modification of the preliminary decree filed by the male heirs of first defendant cannot be a hindrance to dispose of these appeals.

13.C.M.P.Nos.21727 to 21729, 21731 to 21734, 21738 of 2018 have been filed by the third parties. Impleading petitioners contended that they are third party purchasers and they purchased the properties from V.R.M.Meenakshi Sundaram H/o. Umayal Achi and Sivagami D/o. Valliammal. Mrs.Hema Sampath, learned Senior Counsel contended that their rights have to be safeguarded.

14.Mr.Rahul Balaji, learned counsel appearing for the fourth respondent submitted that the issue has already been settled by a Division Bench of this Court by order dated 09.02.2012 in O.S.A.Nos.186 to 188 of 2011. By placing reliance on paragraphs 10 to 13, the learned counsel submitted that as the issue was already decided, it is not open to the impleading petitioners to re-agitate the same.

15.A perusal of the aforesaid judgment would reveal that the exact issue was already raised before the Division Bench in the above appeals and in categorical terms, the Division Bench of this Court has already held that even if some of the vendors of the appellant, being the relatives of the sharers, receive any share, ultimately in the final decree to be passed in the partition suit, by virtue of inheritance due to the death of the sharers, the appellant can always proceed against their respective shares.

16.Paragraphs 10 to 13 of the said judgment are usefully extracted as follows:

"10. The appellant cannot claim better title than their transferors. Their transferors (vendors), in their turn, having purchased from Andiappan (7th defendant in C.S.No.83 of 1965), cannot claim better title than Andiappan. Now that the transactions in the year 1960 between Andiappan (7th defendant in C.S.No.83 of 1965) and T.S.PL.P.Chidambaram Chettiar have been held by this Court as sham and nominal, which has become final, it is yet to be seen as to whether the second suit (C.S.No.686 of 2000) filed by the vendors of the appellant, in effect to annul the second preliminary decree dated 21.11.1977, is maintainable in the light of the dismissal of their own applications to implead themselves in O.S.A.No.85 of 1979.

11. As far as the implead petition filed by the appellant to implead in C.S.No.83 of 1965, which is a suit for partition in which the shares of the plaintiff and defendants 1 to 6 have been ascertained in the



WEB COPY

preliminary decree dated 22.11.1968, it is to be seen as to whether in the absence of the appellant the final decree can be passed effectively (or) as to whether the presence of the appellant will facilitate the proper adjudication of the partition suit, so as to come to a conclusion that the appellant is either a necessary or proper party.

12. On the face of it, it is clear that the presence of the appellant is neither necessary for adjudication nor it is a proper party for arriving at a proper conclusion in the partition suit. It is not as if by not impleading the appellant, the appellant is left in the lurch. The contention raised by the learned Senior Counsel for the appellant that the appellant has parted with huge amount of consideration in respect of the purchase and, therefore, it cannot be denied relief, even though appears to be attractive, in our considered opinion, is without substance. It would have been different if the appellant has paid the consideration to the sharers. Having paid consideration to the non-sharers in the joint family property, it is certainly not open to the appellant to make a hue and cry that enormous amount has been parted with. Even if some of the vendors of the appellant, being the relatives of the sharers, receive any share ultimately in the final decree to be passed in the partition suit, by virtue of inheritance due to the death of the sharers, the appellant can always proceed against their respective shares. Even in the absence of such shares having been received by the vendors of the appellant, there are other remedies available. If it is taken as a commission of cheating by a non-owner, the larger issue to be decided is as to whether the doctrine of caveat emptor will be applicable against the appellant.

13. It is not the case of the appellant that it is not a pendente lite purchaser, but the case of the appellant, as contended by Mr.P.S.Raman, learned Senior Counsel, is that the doctrine of lis pendens would apply only if the suit is not a collusive suit. The case of the appellant is that the suits are collusive in nature and, therefore, the transfer effected in favour of the appellant is not affected by lis pendens."

17. In view of the finding of the Division Bench of this Court in O.S.A.Nos.186 to 188 of 2011, it is not for the impleading petitioners to reopen the matter. Therefore, their contentions are rejected reiterating the very same finding of the Division Bench of this Court that it is always open for them to file appropriate application seeking for their relief. With the above findings, this Court finds that both the contentions



made by Mr.V.Ayyadurai, learned Senior Counsel and Mrs.Hema Sampath are liable to be rejected and hence, they are rejected. Accordingly, the sketch prepared by the same Government Surveyor and approved by all the parties and filed herewith as Annexure 'A' is taken on file. The appeals are disposed in the terms of the following Final decree. A Final Decree by consent of all the parties is passed as follows:

(i) A final Decree is now passed in terms of the Memo of Compromise dated 22.07.2015 already filed by the parties except in respect of item (a) of Schedule III to the plaint which is the subject matter of the present appeals;

(ii) The allotment to the parties in the subject property, that is, item (a) in the III Schedule to the plaint, will be as shown in the sketch now annexed herewith, whereby Bit No.1 is allotted to the Plaintiff;

(b) Bit No.2 to the Legal Heirs of the 1st defendant;

(c) Bit No.3 to the Legal Heirs of the 2nd defendant;

(d) Bit No.4 to the 3rd defendant;

(e) Bit No.5 to the Legal Heirs of the 5th defendant;

(f) Bit No.6 to the Legal Heirs of 6th defendant; and

(g) the pathway access measuring three Acres along the Southern Boundary of Bit No.1 is hereby allotted to the 1st respondent herein, namely Good Shepherded Evangelical Mission Private Limited.

Except the allotments now made in the subject property, in all other respects the provisions in the Compromise Memo dated 22.07.2015 will be binding on all the sharers and be given effect;

(iii) The first respondent is hereby impleaded as party respondent in those proceedings for the above purpose;

(iv) In respect of any other dispute among the legal heirs of any of the original defendants or in respect of any claim by any third party, the same may be agitated independently in the manner known to law;

(v) The sale deed dated 26.03.1960, by which the original estate owner T.S.P.L.P. Chidambaram Chettiar transferred the subject property to the name of the 7th defendant, Andiappan, already having been declared as sham and nominal by the judgment and decree dated 21.11.1977 and the same having become final, all sales further to the same are hereby declared as null and void and not binding on the Estate of the sharers;

(vi) Any sale deed executed by any of the parties or their legal heirs, pendente lite, in respect of any portion of the 'subject property' shall not, in any manner, affect the title or interest of any of the allottees under the judgment and allotments made hereby will prevail;

(vii) The Joint Compromise Memos filed by the parties on 22.07.2015 and on 28.02.2002 shall form part of the final decree; and

(viii) The suit is finally disposed of by this Final Decree



and the parties are directed to bear their own costs.

(ix) Since the matter is pending from the year 1965, if any obstruction is made by any third party, necessary police protection shall be given to the parties to take possession of their respective shares.

WEB COPY

18. All the parties have come forward to make contributions to some of the institutions, since the long pending case has been disposed of. The appellant in O.S.A.No.60 and 61 of 2017 has come forward to contribute a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to the Adayar Cancer Institute, Chennai. The appellants in O.S.A.No.138 and 139 of 2017 undertakes to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to Women Lawyers' Association Creche, High Court Buildings, Chennai - 104. The first respondent in both the appeals undertakes to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to Anbagam, Home for Mentally Challenged, D.R.O. Colony, Madurai. The respondents 28 to 33 undertakes to pay of sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to Adayar Cancer Institute, Chennai. The respondents 5 to 9, 13 & 17 undertake to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to The Banyan - Mental Health NGO, 6th Main Road, Muggapair Eri Scheme, Muggapair West, Chennai. The respondents 18 to 27 undertake to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to the Blind School at Paravai, Madurai. The respondents 10, 11, 14 and 15 undertake to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- to the The Banyan - Mental Health NGO, 6th Main Road, Muggapair Eri Scheme, Muggapair West, Chennai. This Court record their contributions with appreciation. Connected MP's are closed.

-s/d-

Assistant Registrar(CSII)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

sj

To

1.The Sub Assistant Registrar
original side section
High Court, Madras

2.The Adayar Cancer Institute Chennai

3.The Secretary Women Lawyers Association Creche
High court Building Chennai-104



4. Anbagam
Home for mentally challenged
D.R.O. Colony Madurai

WEB COPY

5. The Banyan Mental health
NGO, 6th Main Road, Muggapair Eri Scheme,
Muggapair West Chennai

6. The Blind School at Paravai
Madurai

+4 cc to Mr.M.Sriram Advocate sr16288
+4 cc to M/s.Rugan & Arya sr16089 & 16090
+4 cc to M/s.R.Meenal Advocate sr15845
+2 cc to M/s.G.Sivashankaran Advocate sr16499

O.S.A.No.60, 61, 138 and 139 of 2017
and
C.M.P.No.4976, 4977, 9203 and 9204 of 2017

nmI (co)
aa01/10/2019