



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

RESERVED ON : 22.09.2023

PRNOUNCED ON: 20.10.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

S.A.(MD)No.280 of 2017

K.Venkatachalapathy

... Appellant/Appellant/

Defendant

Vs.

1.K.Subramanian (Died)

... Respondent / Respondent /

Plaintiff

2.S.Chinnamani

3.S.Jeyapandiyan

4.S.Prabakaran

5.S.Ramesh Kannan

(R2 to R5 are brought on record as LR's

of the deceased sole respondent vide

Court order, dated 25.04.2013, made in

CMP(MD)No.4072 of 2023)

... Respondents 2 to 5/ LR's of R1

Prayer: Second Appeal filed under Section 100 of the Code of Civil Procedure, against the judgment and decree, dated 28.02.2017, passed in A.S.No.8 of 2016, on the file of the District Judge, Sivagangai, confirming the decree and judgment, dated 10.03.2016, passed in O.S.No.143 of 2010



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

on the file of the Sub Court, Sivagangai.
WEB COPY

For Appellants : Mr.K.Sekar

For Respondents : Mr.N.Tamil Mani for R2 to R5
: R1 died

JUDGMENT

The appellant is the appellant /defendant, the first respondent is the respondent / plaintiff before the Court below. the respondents 2 to 5 herein are the Legal Heirs of the deceased first respondent/plaintiff.

2. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per their rank before the trial Court.

3. **The plaint in brief is as follows:**

The suit property originally belongs to one Pala.Karuppiiah Servai. The said Pala.Karuppiiah Servai had 6 sons and 2 daughters. The plaintiff is the elder son, the defendant is the youngest son. The plaintiff submits that the said Pala.Karuppiiah Servai has executed a registered Will under document No.18/2005, dated 13.04.2005 in respect of the suit property. As per the Will, the plaintiff is entitled to get eastern ½ share of the suit properties. The plaintiff also submits that his father Pala.Karuppiiah



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

Servai, though executed a previous Will, dated 30.06.1999, the same was cancelled in the Will, dated 13.04.2005. After the demise of Pala.Karuppiah Servai, on 25.05.2009, the Will came into effect. The house tax receipts were also changed in the name of the plaintiff and the defendant. Since the defendant has been residing in the village and taking advantage of the cancelled Will, dated 30.06.1999, he claims full ownership over the suit property. The plaintiff further submits that there were exchanges of notices in respect of division of property. However, the defendant did not come forward to divide the property. Hence, the plaintiff come forward with the suit for partition and for other reliefs.

4. The written statement in brief is as follows:

This defendant stoutly dispute the alleged Will, dated 13.04.2005. This defendant submits that the suit property was originally Gramanatham. Since the property was in the possession and enjoyment of his father -Pala.Karuppiah Servai, he prescribed title over the same. During his life time, he gave properties to the plaintiff as well as the 4 sons to put up house there on. This defendant would further submit that the plaintiff never took care of his father and mother and he evinced interest only in his family.



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

WEB COPY

This defendant submits that the said Pala.Karuppiah Servai was in care and protection of the defendant. While being so, during the life time of Pala.Karuppiah Servai, he executed a Will in favour of the defendant with sound disposing state of mind. Though he executed a Will in favour of the defendant, he has handed over the possession and enjoyment of the suit property, and that the Kist and Tax receipt as well as the Electricity connection were transferred in the name of the defendant. According to this defendant, the alleged Will dated 13.04.2005 is a rank one forgery and has been fabricated by the plaintiff with the aid of their brother – one Mr.Ravi. This defendant submits that during 2005, his father was not hale and healthy and was not in sound disposing state of mind. It is also the submission of the defendant that, in respect of the second schedule property, since he has been in continuous possession for more than a statutory period, he has perfected title by way of adverse possession over the same. Therefore, this defendant submits that the very suit is liable to be dismissed.



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

Brief statement in respect of findings of the Trial Court and First Appellate Court:-

5. Before the Court below, the plaintiff has examined 4 witnesses as P.W.1 to P.W.4 and has marked 15 documents as Ex.P1 to Ex.P15. On behalf of the defendant, 3 witnesses were examined as D.W.1 to D.W.3 and 7 documents were marked as Ex.B1 to Ex.B7. As a third party document, one document has been marked Ex.X1.

6. After considering the pleadings, evidence and material on record, the trial Court has framed as many as 9 issues, and has found that the Will Ex.A6, dated 13.04.2005 is true and binding. Hence, the trial Court partly decreed the suit and negated the relief in respect of the injunction (issues 3,4, and 8).

7. Aggrieved with the above order, the defendant has filed an Appeal in A.S.No.8 of 2016. The first appellate Court, after elaborately reappreciating the evidence, has found that the finding of the trial Court is liable to be confirmed and dismissed the first Appeal.



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

8. Aggrieved with the above concurrent findings of the trial and the first Appellate Court, the appellant has come forward with the instant Second Appeal.

Submissions of the Counsel on either side:-

9. The learned counsel for the appellant/defendant would contend that the findings recorded by the Trial Court as well as the First Appellate Court is contrary to the evidence and law. It is also the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant/defendant that there are numerous, legitimate suspicious circumstances. However, the Court below has not considered those factum, and that the suspicious circumstances has not been dispelled by the propounder of the Will. The learned counsel for the appellant/defendant would also submit that the Court below has not considered the active participation of the propounder of the Will, and the close association and harmony of the defendant with his father. It is also the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant/defendant that the non-production (non marking) of the Will under challenge qua Ex.A6 through the plaintiff himself is a serious suspicious circumstances, hence, prayed to allow this appeal.



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

10. In support of their case, the learned counsel for the appellant/defendant relied on the following judgements:-

(i) ***Rani Purnima Debi and another Vs. Kumar Khagendra Narayan Deb & another*** reported in ***AIR 1962 SC 567***;

(ii) ***Pushpa Bala Jagam Vs. K.Ananda Kumar and others*** reported in ***(2010) 6 MLJ 182***;

(iii) ***H.Venkatachala Iyengar Vs. B.N.Thimmajamma and others*** reported in ***AIR 1959 SC 443***;

(iv) ***Balathandayutham and another Vs. Ezhilarasan*** reported in ***(2010) 5 SCC 770***.

11. Per contra, the learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff would submit that there are no suspicious circumstances and would further submit that the mere presence of the propounder of the Will, in no way be a suspicious circumstances as he was present only on the instruction of the Testator. He would further submit that even the defendant was provided with the share in the suit property through the Will under challenge, therefore, would submit that this cannot be a legitimate suspicious circumstances. Thus, the Ex.A6-Will has been proved in a manner known



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

to law. The so called suspicious circumstances are fanciful and illusory. It is the further submission of the learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff that the finding of fact recorded by the Trial Court as well as the First Appellate Court cannot be interfered with, unless there are sound reasons. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff that there are no grounds in favour of the defendant to interfere with the well considered finding of the Courts below, hence prayed to dismiss the appeal.

12. The learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff has also relied on the following judgements to support their case:-

(i) ***K.Laxmanan Vs. Thekkayil Padmini and others*** reported in ***(2009) 4 MLJ 681 (SC)***;

(ii) ***S.Murugesan Vs. V.Vijay Sai and others*** reported in ***2006 (5) CTC 560***.

13. This Court, after hearing both side, admitted the appeal on 06.07.2017, with the following substantial question of law:-

“1. Whether both Courts are not followed the statutory requirement when there are suspicious circumstance in the execution of the Will dated 13.04.2005 under Ex.A6?



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

WEB COPY

2. *Whether both Courts are right in accepting the Will dated 13.04.2005 under Ex.A6 without looking into the suspicious circumstances and unnatural recitals found in the Will dated 13.04.2005 under Ex.A6?"*

Analysis:-

14. The substantial question of law formulated by this Court is in respect of the suspicious circumstances over the Will in question. According to the appellant/defendant, the suspicious circumstances are that there are unnatural recitals found in the Will, and that the respondent/plaintiff viz., the propounder of the Will has actively participated in the execution of the Will, and the very Will-Ex.A6 has not been produced through the plaintiff and thereby, avoided questions in respect of the suspicious circumstances during the cross-examination. In this connection, the learned counsel for the appellant/defendant by relying ***Pushpa Bala Jagam***'s case (cited supra) would contend that the active participation of the propounder is one of the suspicious circumstances, and that the burden is heavier upon the propounder to remove such suspicion. In this regard, he also relied upon the oft quoted ***H.Venkatachala Iyengar***'s case (cited supra) and would contend that the participation of the propounder in the execution of the Will and conferring on him a substantial



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

benefit would be a suspicious circumstances. He also relied upon yet another judgment in ***Rani Purnima Debi's*** (cited supra) to strengthen the above line of argument.

15. Now let us consider the above suspicious circumstances one by one, starting with the alleged active participation of the propounder of the Will, in the making of the Will. While considering the written statement, the defendant did not plead anything in regard to the active participation of the plaintiff, late Mr.K.Subramanian except referring that Ex.A6-Will is a fabricated document. It is settled principle of law that, notwithstanding any specific pleading, depends upon the surrounding circumstances, when any suspicion about the execution of the Will surfaces then, it is the duty of the propounder to dispel the same.

16. At this juncture, this Court deems it appropriate to refer the judgment of a three-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Shivakumar and others Vs. Sharanabasappa and others*** reported in ***(2021) 11 SCC 277***, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court, after referring various precedents which have been ruling this field, had summarised the relevant principles emerging from the various precedents, concerning the proof of Will. For ready reference, the relevant portion of the above



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

judgment is extracted hereunder:-

WEB COPY

“12. For what has been noticed hereinabove, the relevant principles governing the adjudicatory process concerning proof of a will could be broadly summarised as follows:

*12.1. Ordinarily, a will has to be proved like any other document; the test to be applied being the usual test of the satisfaction of the prudent mind. **Alike the principles governing the proof of other documents, in the case of will too, the proof with mathematical accuracy is not to be insisted upon.***

12.2. Since as per Section 63 of the Succession Act, a will is required to be attested, it cannot be used as evidence until at least one attesting witness has been called for the purpose of proving its execution, if there be an attesting witness alive and capable of giving evidence.

12.3. The unique feature of a will is that it speaks from the death of the testator and, therefore, the maker thereof is not available for deposing about the circumstances in which the same was executed. This introduces an element of solemnity in the decision of the question as to whether the document propounded is the last will of the testator. The initial onus, naturally, lies on the propounder but the same can be taken to have been primarily discharged on proof of the essential facts which go into the making of a will.

12.4. The case in which the execution of the will is surrounded by suspicious circumstances stands on a different footing. The presence of suspicious circumstances makes the onus heavier on the propounder and, therefore, in cases where the circumstances attendant upon the execution of the document give rise to suspicion,



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

WEB COPY

the propounder must remove all legitimate suspicions before the document can be accepted as the last will of the testator.

12.5. If a person challenging the will alleges fabrication or alleges fraud, undue influence, coercion et cetera in regard to the execution of the will, such pleas have to be proved by him, but even in the absence of such pleas, the very circumstances surrounding the execution of the will may give rise to the doubt or as to whether the will had indeed been executed by the testator and/or as to whether the testator was acting of his own free will. In such eventuality, it is again a part of the initial onus of the propounder to remove all reasonable doubts in the matter.

12.6. A circumstance is “suspicious” when it is not normal or is “not normally expected in a normal situation or is not expected of a normal person”. As put by this Court, the suspicious features must be “real, germane and valid” and not merely the “fantasy of the doubting mind”.

12.7. As to whether any particular feature or a set of features qualify as “suspicious” would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case. A shaky or doubtful signature; a feeble or uncertain mind of the testator; an unfair disposition of property; an unjust exclusion of the legal heirs and particularly the dependants; an active or leading part in making of the will by the beneficiary thereunder et cetera are some of the circumstances which may give rise to suspicion. The circumstances abovenoted are only illustrative and by no means exhaustive because there could be any circumstance or set of circumstances which may give rise to legitimate suspicion about the execution of the will. On the other hand, any of the circumstances qualifying as being suspicious could



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

WEB COPY

be legitimately explained by the propounder. However, such suspicion or suspicions cannot be removed by mere proof of sound and disposing state of mind of the testator and his signature coupled with the proof of attestation.

12.8. The test of satisfaction of the judicial conscience comes into operation when a document propounded as the will of the testator is surrounded by suspicious circumstance(s). While applying such test, the court would address itself to the solemn questions as to whether the testator had signed the will while being aware of its contents and after understanding the nature and effect of the dispositions in the will?

12.9. In the ultimate analysis, where the execution of a will is shrouded in suspicion, it is a matter essentially of the judicial conscience of the court and the party which sets up the will has to offer cogent and convincing explanation of the suspicious circumstances surrounding the will.”

(Emphasis supplied by this Court)

17. It is equally pertinent to mention, a subsequent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kavita Kanwar Vs. Pamela Mehta and others*** reported in ***(2021) 11 SCC 209***, which followed ***Shivakumar***'s case (cited supra) has distinguished and explained as to the participation of the propounder in making of the Will. The relevant paragraph is paragraph 28 and the same reads as follows:-



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

WEB COPY

“28. There is no doubt that any of the factors taken into account by the trial Court and the High Court, by itself and standing alone, cannot operate against the validity of the propounded will. That is to say that, the will in question cannot be viewed with suspicion only because the appellant had played an active role in execution thereof though she is the major beneficiary; or only because the respondents were not included in the process of execution of the will; or only because of unequal distribution of assets; or only because there is want of clarity about the construction to be carried out by the appellant; or only because one of the attesting witnesses being acquaintance of the appellant; or only because there is no evidence as to who drafted the printed part of the will and the note for writing the opening and concluding passages by the testatrix in her own hand; or only because there is some discrepancy in the oral evidence led by the appellant; or only because of any other factor taken into account by the courts or relied upon by the respondents. The relevant consideration would be about the quality and nature of each of these factors and then, the cumulative effect and impact of all of them upon making of the will with free agency of the testatrix. In other words, an individual factor may not be decisive but, if after taking all the factors together, conscience of the court is not satisfied that the will in question truly represents the last wish and propositions of the testator, the will cannot get the approval of the court; and, other way round, if on a holistic view of the matter, the court feels satisfied that the document propounded as will indeed signifies the last free wish and desire of the testator and is duly executed in accordance with law, the will shall not be disapproved merely for one doubtful circumstance here or another



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

factor there.”

WEB COPY

(Emphasis supplied by this Court)

18. As per the above ratio, any of the individual factor may not be decisive, but while taking all the factors together, if the conscience of the Court is not satisfied that the Will was signed by the testator after knowing the contents of the same, and that the said Will is the last wish, the same cannot be approved as that of the last testament. However, if on a holistic view of the matter, if the document propounded is indeed signifies a last free wish of the Testator, shall not be disapproved merely for one doubtful circumstances here and there. Therefore, what is essential while considering the execution of the Will is not the mere existence of some suspicious circumstances, but even with such existence of suspicious circumstances, if on a holistic approach if the Court satisfies that the Will was consciously executed by the Testator after knowing the contents, then the said Will can be approved by the Court.



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

19. Here, the main attack upon the Ex.A6-Will is that, while executing the Will, the original plaintiff Mr.K.Subramanian was along with his father qua the testator, and that the plaintiff's son, who is the 4th respondent herein, was an attesor. Therefore, there is a possibility of their influence in getting the Will in their favour. Hence, the Will in question is not the last wish of the Testator. As it very often said, the Will will come into operation only after the death of the Testator and therefore, it is attached with the solemnity in its interpretation as the testator is not alive to explain his intention. In this regard, the learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff would submit that, it is very common for his father to seek the assistance of his sons. During the execution of Ex.A6-Will, it was not only the plaintiff but his other brother Mr.Ravichandran was also along with the testator. It is relevant to mention here that though the testator's another son Mr.Ravichandran has attested the Will-Ex.A6, no share was allotted to him in the suit property.

20. At this juncture, it is appropriate to refer about the attesor of the another Will - Ex.B4, which was admittedly executed in favour of the defendant on 30.06.1999. In the said Will, the another brother of the plaintiff and defendant, one Mr.Dharmaraj, who was examined as DW2



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

herein was the attesor. Therefore, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for the respondent/plaintiff, it was the normal conduct of the Testator to make their relative to accompany him to the Registrar Office and to ensure them to attest the documents.

21. However, it was the contention of the defendant that there was disharmony, and no cordial relationship between the Testator and the propounder, and that the Testator was under the care and custody of the defendant. Therefore, contended that there could not have been any necessity for the Testator to execute a Will in favour of the plaintiff.

22. The sum and substance of the above contention is that there was no cordiality between the Testator and the propounder. But the said contention was dislodged through the admission made by the sibling of the plaintiff and defendant, qua DW2-Mr.Dharmaraj. According to DW2, during his cross-examination, he unequivocally admitted that there was a absolute harmony between the plaintiff and Testator. For ready reference, this Court deem it appropriate to extract the admissions made by DW2:-

"என் பெற்றோர் எதாவது விசேஷ உங்களுக்கு வந்தால் மதுரையில் உள்ள எனது அண்ணன் வீட்டிற்கு போய் வருவார்கள். என் அண்ணன் எதாவது விசேஷ உங்களுக்கு வந்து எனது பெற்றோரை பார்த்து செல்வார். என் பெற்றோர் இறக்கும் வரை என் அண்ணனிடம் சுமுகமான



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

WEB COPY

உறவுடன் இருந்தார்."

23. Therefore, the contention putforth by the defendant that the plaintiff had never cared about his parent is far from truth. The defendant took yet another defence that the Testator was not hale and healthy at the relevant point of time, and as had gangrene in his foot fingers. Therefore, contended that the alleged Will qua Ex.A6 could not have been executed by him in sound, disposing state of mind. But again, the above contention is falsified through the cross examination of DW2, who is the son of the testator. According to DW2, till the date of death of the Testator, he was hale and healthy and was able to move and roam around. It was the further admission of DW2 that he was very much interested in daily affairs and used to read newspapers and watch Tele Vision. It is also admitted that he knew read and write Tamil. For ready reference, this Court deem it appropriate to extract relevant admissions made by DW2:-

"2007 ல் (sick) இறக்கும் வரை திடகாத்திரமாக நடமாடிக்கொண்டு இருந்தார்.....
..... என தகப்பனார் இருக்கும்போது நான் தினசரி அவரை பார்ப்பது உண்டு, அவருக்கு தமிழ் எழுத படிக்க தெரியும், தினசரி செய்தித்தாள் படிப்பார், என தகப்பனார் இறக்கும் வரை தொலைக்காட்சி பார்ப்பார், அப்போது முடியாமல் இருந்தார்."



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

As per the above admission, though the testator had some health issues, while appreciating the above admissions in a holistic way, the same would reflect the sound disposing mental status of the Testator.

24. At this juncture, this Court would also like to refer the admission made by DW1 qua the defendant. According to the defendant, the active participation of the plaintiff in the making of the Will is one of the suspicious circumstances. He sustained his contention on the admission of the plaintiff that at the time of execution of the Will, the plaintiff alone was with his father. Though such stand projected as one of the suspicious circumstances, while considering the conduct of the defendant, during the execution of Ex.B4-Will in favour of this defendant DW1, the above instance pales into insignificance. Even while executing Ex.B4-Will, which stands in the name of the defendant, the defendant knew about the execution simultaneously when it was executed. During cross-examination, DW1 admits as under:-

"என் அப்பா 1999ல் உயில் எழுதும் போது சொத்து கொடுத்ததாக என்னிடம் சொன்னார். 1999ல் அப்பா எழுதி கொடுத்தது எனக்கு அப்போதே தெரியும்."

25. Therefore, it manifest the natural conduct and the style and individuality of the testator. Even while executing the Ex.B4-Will, it was



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

with the knowledge of it's beneficiary qua the defendant. Thus, this Court is of the firm view that the mere presence of the beneficiary qua the plaintiff alone cannot be a suspicious circumstances. In other words, it appears to be the testator's natural conduct and his individuality. With the risk of repetition, in order to reiterate the above aspect, it is necessary to mention that, in Ex.B4-Will, the Testator's son, who is DW2, was the attesor, similarly in Ex.A6-Will, another son Mr.Ravichandran, who was examined as PW2 was an attesor. Therefore, though the presence of the beneficiary is there, the same cannot be the legitimate suspicions according to the facts of this case. Besides, the defendant is not in a position to establish any active participation of the plaintiff except the proof about his presence. Even in the pleading, there is no allegation as to the nature of active participation.

26. It is the further submission of the defendant that there are unnatural recitals in the Will. In this regard, the appellant would submit that there is a contradiction between the recital in Ex.B4-Will and Ex.A6-Will. For which, he would rely upon Ex.B1-Settlement Deed and would contend that in Ex.A6-Will, there is a recital that no property was given to the plaintiff, but contrary to the said recital, there was a Settlement Deed in



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

favour of the plaintiff under Ex.B1. But on a plain reading of Ex.A6-Will, what the Testator dealt is in respect of the property for construction of the house. Admittedly, the plaintiff did not have any house at T.Puthur village.

27. The reliance of Settlement Deed-Ex.B1, can be looked at in a different perspective. The defendant contended that the 1st plaintiff and the Testator have no cordial relationship and that the 1st plaintiff did not care about the Testator. However, Ex.B1-Settlement Deed manifest a different emotions of the Testator with his elder son qua the 1st plaintiff, where the settlement deed-Ex.B1 in categorical terms speaks about the harmony and love and affection towards his elder son. Therefore, the submissions made by the learned counsel for the appellant that there are unnatural recitals in the Will cannot be countenanced.

28. Yet another strange argument put forth by the learned counsel for the appellant is that the Ex.A6-Will was not marked through the plaintiff thereby, avoided questions in respect of Ex.A6-Will during the cross examination. It is settled principle of law that, under Section 68 of The Indian Evidence Act and Section 63 of Indian Succession Act, the Will has to be proved only through the attesor. Therefore, the Will-Ex.A6 was rightly marked through PW2-attesor. When the plaintiff laid this case



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

based upon the Will, the defendant was expected to cross examine the witness towards all aspects. Such cross examination is endogenous vestige in these type of this case. Hence, the submission of the defendant that the non marking of the Will through the plaintiff, at any stretch of imagination cannot be a suspicious circumstances, as he laid the case and plaint only upon the foundation of the Will.

29. At this juncture, this Court would like to refer the judgements referred by the plaintiff in ***K.Laxmanan***'s case, it has explained the impact of Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act, the relevant portion is as follows:-

“22. So far as Section 68 of the Act is concerned, it categorically provides that a Will is required to be attested and therefore, it cannot be used as evidence until at least one of the attesting witnesses is called for the purpose of proving its execution provided such attesting witness is alive, and subject to the process of the Court and capable of giving evidence.”



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

30. In the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Thangam @ Chellammal & another Vs. Sivakami & 5 others*** reported in **2016 (4) CTC 702**, wherein, the Hon'ble Single Judge of this Court has held that it is the duty of the son to accompany his father to help him. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows:-

*“39. At this juncture, the learned counsel appearing for the Appellant would submit that they are entitled the share and hence, they are beneficiaries. Considering the arguments made by the learned counsel for the Appellants, I am of the view that once the Will has been cancelled and the Executant died intestate, all the Legal Heirs of the deceased Sankarakumara Pillai are entitled equal share in the property, since it is self acquired property of Sankarakumara Pillai. In such circumstances, they are entitled only a fraction of the property and not the entire property and they are not the legatees under the Will. **It is the duty of the son to help his father for his work to be done. Merely because, he is accompanying with his father and taking part will not vitiate the document Ex.B4. Hence, the arguments advanced by the learned Counsel for the appellants that they played a vital role is unacceptable.**”*

(Emphasis supplied by this Court)



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

CONCLUSION:-

WEB COPY

31. Therefore, in view of the above detailed discussion, this Court is of the indubitable view that there are no suspicious circumstances in executing the Will-Ex.A6, and that due execution of Ex.A6-Will proved in a manner known to law. Further, there are no materials available to interfere with the well considered concurrent findings of the both Courts below, and the appellant has not put forth any acceptable ground so as to interfere with the well considered orders. Hence, the substantial question of law are answered in favour of the respondent/plaintiff. Hence, the Second Appeal is dismissed, confirming the judgment and decree passed by both the Courts below. However, there is no order as to costs.

20.10.2023

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Ls/kmi

To
1.The District Judge,
Sivagangai.
2. The Sub Court,
Sivagangai.
3.The Section Officer,
VR Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



SA(MD)No.280 of 2017

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

Ls/kmi

S.A.(MD)No.280 of 2017

20.10.2023