



WEB COPY



TOS.No.19 of 1998

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 27.09.2023

PRONOUNCED ON : 06.02.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.A.NAKKIRAN

T.O.S.No.19 of 1998 (O.P No.424 of 1997)

and

T.O.S No.1 of 2017 (O.P No.4 of 1996)

T.O.S No.19 of 1998

Srinivasulu (deceased)

1.W.Rajalakshmi

2.W.Ramji

(The plaintiffs 1 & 2 were brought on record as legal heirs of the deceased plaintiff vide Application No.762 of 2022 by order dated 03.03.2022)

... Plaintiffs

..Vs..

1.W.Venkatesa Perumal Chetty(deceased)

2.Amrutha alias Vedavalli

3.Andal

4.Nalini

5.Sridevi

6.W.Balaji

(The 6th defendant was brought on record as legal heir of the deceased plaintiff in Application No.762 of 2022 vide order dated 03.03.2022)

... Defendants



TOS.No.19 of 1998

T.O.S No.1 of 2017

1.W.Venkatesa Perumal Chetty(deceased)  
2.Amrutha alias Vedavalli  
3.Andal  
4.Nalini  
5.Sridevi  
(Respondents 1 to 4 in  
O.P No.4 of 1996 were transposed as  
plaintiffs as per order dated 25.01.2016  
made in A.No.4153 of 2015)

... Plaintiffs

..Vs..

1.W.Srinivasulu (deceased)  
2.W.Balaji  
3.W.Ramji  
(The defendants 1 & 2 were  
brought on record as legal heirs  
of the deceased sole defendant.)

.. Defendants

**Prayer in T.O.S No.19 of 1998:** Original Petition has been filed under Sections 232 and 276 of the Indian Succession Act XXXIX of 1925 for grant of Letters of Administration in respect of the last Will and Testament of the deceased W.Padmamma. Against this petition, a Caveat and Objection affidavit was filed by the Caveators. As per order of this Court, the Original Petition No.424 of 1997 was converted into Testamentary Original Suit No.19 of 1998.



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

**Prayer in T.O.S No.1 of 2017:** Original Petition has been filed under Sections 276 and 222 of the Indian Succession Act for grant of Probate in respect of the last Will and Testament of the deceased W.Padmalu Amma. As per order of this Court, the Original Petition No.4 of 1996 was converted into Testamentary Original Suit No.1 of 2017.

For Plaintiffs in  
TOS No.19 of 1998 &  
Defendants in  
T.O.S No.1 of 2017

: Mr.Siva Mohan  
For Mr.D.Venkatesh

For Defendants in  
T.O.S No.19 of 1998 &  
Plaintiffs in T.O.S No.1 of 2017 : Mr. E. Senthilkumar  
: For M/s.Sampathkumar and Associates

### **COMMON JUDGMENT**

#### **T.O.S No.19 of 1998**

This Testamentary Original Suit has been filed to grant Letters of Administration with the Will, dated 17.08.1992, executed by the deceased Testatrix W.Padmalamma, annexed, in favour of the Plaintiff namely W.Srinivasulu, as her only son / beneficiary under the said Will, having effect throughout the State of Tamil Nadu and limited to the property mentioned in the affidavit of assets.



TOS.No.19 of 1998

2.The case of the Plaintiffs, as set out, in the plaint is as

follows:-

(i)The Petitioner/Plaintiff, namely W.Srinivasulu and the defendants 1 to 5 are the son, husband and daughters respectively of the deceased Testatrix namely Padmaluamma. The deceased Testatrix Padmaluamma, had executed a registered Will, dated 17.08.1992, at Thirupathi, in the presence of the witnesses, who attested at the foot, bequeathing the suit property in favour of the Plaintiff, namely 1),V.Radhakrishnan, 8, Ayya Street, Chintadripet, madras-2, 2) M.Lakshman, 105, Egmore High Road, Egmore, Madras-8, 3) M.Subramaniam Reddy, Advocate, Notary, residing at No.506, Reddy Colony, Thirupathi, Andhra Pradesh, 4) P.Chandrasekhariah, Son of Srinivasan, residing at No.17-6-349 Aryanalli, Thirupathi, Andhra Pradesh.

(ii)The Testatrix died on 29.08.1995 at Thirumurthy Street, T.Nagar, madras-600 017, where she was residing. The deceased at the time of her death was possessed of property within the state of Tamil Nadu. The Testatrix was the owner of the immovable properties bearing Door Nos.15 and 16, Reddy Raman Street, G.T Madras, besides jewels,



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

movables. She had bequeathed the immovable properties to the plaintiff as her only son under the aforesaid Will.

(iii) The amount of assets, which is likely come into the hands of the Plaintiff does not exceed in the aggregate sum of Rs.11,26,235.65 and the net amount of the said assets, after deducing all the items, which the Plaintiff, is by law allowed to deduct, is only of the value of Rs.10,26,301/- The legal heirs of the deceased are the petitioner and the respondents 1 to 5 herein. All next of kin have been impleaded. There is no other person interested to be impleaded.

(iv) The Plaintiff undertakes to duly administer the property and the credits of the said deceased Testatrix, in any way concerning her Will, by paying first her debts and then, the legacies therein bequeathed so far as the assets will extend the same in this Court within 6 months from the date of grant of Letters of Administration of the Will to the petitioner/plaintiff and also to render a true account of the said property and credits within one year from the said date. No application has been made to any District Court or delegate or to any other High Court for probate of any Will of the said deceased or Letters of Administration with or without the Will annexed to her property and credits, except the application for grant of



TOS.No.19 of 1998

probate of the Will dated 14.08.1987 by the deceased and subject matter of O.P No.4 of 1996 before this Court filed by the fifth respondent and the petitioner/plaintiff has filed his caveat in the said matter. Hence, this Testamentary Original Suit has been filed, seeking the reliefs, as stated above.

3.The case of the 5th respondent in O.P/1st Defendant, in a nutshell, as set out in his written statement, is as follows:-

(i) All the allegations contained in the plaint are denied except those that are specifically admitted herein. The plaintiff is the only son of this defendant and the deceased Testatrix. The respondents 1 to 4/defendants 2 to 5 are their daughters. As such he was brought up with all the special attention normally given to the only male offspring. This defendant owned several properties in Sait Colony, 2nd Street, Egmore, admeasuring about 11 grounds, House Door Nos.17 & 18, Thirumurthy Street, T.Nagar, Chennai-17, house and ground bearing Nos.15 & 16, Reddy Raman Street, George Town, Chennai and the property covered under the alleged Will which is the subject matter of the T.O.S. Even during the life time of the testatrix, an extent of 6 grounds in Sait Colony



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

with building were given to the plaintiff by way of Family Arrangement dated 24.06.1970 to the exclusion of their daughters. The plaintiff became a vagabond and led a life of spend thrift leading an immoral life. As wayward individual that the plaintiff turned out to be, he lost all the properties allotted to him. They are now worth several crores of rupees. He left this defendant and the testatrix in their old age in lurch and started living separately since 1978. He did not even care for his wife and children and they had to live with this defendant. After squandering away the valuable assets allotted to him, he filed O.S No.8376 of 1981 on the file of City Civil Court for partition and obtained exparte order of appointment of Commissioner to take inventory of the business carried on by this defendant. This defendant paid him Rs.2,00,000/-. In fact, the profligacies of the plaintiff has led him being adjudicated an insolvent in I.P No.99 of 1991 on the file of this Court. Eversince 1978, there has not been any interaction or contact between him and the testatrix or any of the defendants. This state of estrangement is continuing till today.

(ii) It is denied that late W.Padmaluammal executed the alleged Will on 17.08.1992 at Tirupathi in favour of the plaintiff as the executor/beneficiary when this defendant is still alive is nothing but a



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

blatant lie. She had been living at No.17, Thirumurthy Street, T.Nagar, Chennai-600 017 with this defendant till her death on 29.08.1995 and she did not leave the station anywhere without this defendant accompanying her. She had also been suffering from mobility related disabilities and had been taking treatment from time to time. She did not go to Tirupathi on 17.08.1992 nor execute any Will. The plaintiff is silent about as to who took her to Tirupathi and who accompanied her to the Notary's office. The signature in the alleged Will dated 17.08.1992 is forged and is not that of late W.Padmaluammal. She never had any favourable disposition of mind towards the plaintiff to bequeath even a paise worth of her estate to him. Whiles, it is false to claim that she executed a Will of this nature.

(iii) In fact, the Testatrix has executed a Will dated 14.08.1987, registered in S.R.O, T.Nagar which is her last Will with this defendant as the executor. This defendant has already filed O.P No.4 of 1996 pending on the file of this Court for grant of probate which is still pending. A comparison of the signature in this registered Will dated 14.08.1987 and that in the Will produced by the plaintiff will establish that the Will produced by the plaintiff is a forged one. Hence the Testatrix never executed a Will on 17.08.1992 at Thirupathi. She had no acquaintances



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

unknown to this defendant. The witnesses mentioned in para 4 of the O.P were not known to the deceased or this defendant. The allegations as to attestation of the Will are denied as false. They are no witnesses at all but accomplices of the plaintiff for concocting the Will.

(iv) The Testatrix was not in talking terms with the plaintiff after 1978 and had no favourable disposition to give any property to him. Hence, if at all this Court comes to a conclusion that the Will dated 17.08.1992 was executed by her, the only conclusion is that at the same time, when she was alone, the plaintiff would have bolted in, and forced her to sign on a paper, not out of her free will but out of coercion and deceit that the plaintiff has brought about the Will. Hence, the suit is liable to be dismissed.

### **T.O.S No.1 of 2017**

4. This Testamentary Original Suit has been filed by the Executor of the Will, namely Mr.Venkatesa Perumal Chetty, praying for the grant of Probate and as per the order of this Court, Original petition was converted as T.O.S.No.1 of 2017.



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

5.The case of the Plaintiffs, as set out, in the plaint is as follows:-

(i) The plaintiffs 1 to 5 and the 1st defendant, namely W.Srinivasulu are the husband, daughters and son, respectively of the deceased Testatrix namely Padmalu Amma. The deceased Testatrix Pamaluamma, had executed a registered Will, dated 14.08.1987 at Madras, in the presence of the witnesses, who attested at the foot thereof. The 1st plaintiff is the Executor named in the said Will. The only legal heirs of the deceased are the plaintiffs and the respondent herein. The plaintiffs 2 to 5 have already given their consent affidavits for this petition in favour of the 1st plaintiff, as they were the respondents 2 to 4 in the petition. All the next kin have been impleaded. There is no other person interested to be impleaded.

(ii) The Testatrix died on 29.08.1995 at No17,Thirumurthy Street, T.Nagar, Chennai-600 017, where she was residing. The deceased at the time of her death was possessed of property within the state of Tamil Nadu.

(iii) The amount of assets, which is likely come into the hands of the Plaintiff does not exceed in the aggregate sum of Rs.11,26,235.85 and



TOS.No.19 of 1998

the net amount of the said assets, after deducting all the items, which the Plaintiffs, by law are allowed to deduct, is only of the value of Rs.10,22,800.30.-.

(iv)The Plaintiffs undertake to duly administer the property and the credits of the said deceased Testatrix, in any way concerning her Will, by paying extend and to make a full and true inventory thereof and exhibit the same in this Court within 6 months from the date of grant of the Will to be plaintiffs and also to render a true account of the said property and credits within one year from the said date.

(v)No application has been made to any District Court or delegate or to any other High Court for probate of any Will of the said deceased or Letters of Administration with or without the Will annexed to her property and credits. Hence, this Testamentary Original Suit has been filed, seeking the reliefs, as stated above.

6. The case of the respondent in O.P/1st Defendant, in a nutshell, as set out in his written statement, is as follows:-

All the allegations contained in the plaint are denied except those that are specifically admitted herein. The defendant is the only son of the



TOS.No.19 of 1998

1st plaintiff - W.Venatesaperumal Chetty and the deceased testatrix W.Padamaluammal. The plaintiffs 2 to 5 are their daughters. The plaintiffs have filed the present suit by suppressing the later Will dated 17.08.1992 which was executed by the Testatrix wherein she has cancelled all her previous Wills. The Testatrix has executed the said Will at Thirupathi in the presence of the witnesses whose names appear at the foot thereof. The Testatrix has bequeathed the property to this defendant as her only son under the said Will. It is a settled law that the subsequent Will shall prevail over the earlier Will. It is unfathomable that the testatrix would exclude her only son from her Will. If at all the testatrix has signed the Will, she would have been forced by Venkatesaperumal Chetty to sign the Will and he has clandestinely registered the same with a view to cheat the defendant. In any event, as the testatrix has executed the Will dated 17.08.1992, the earlier Will dated 14.08.1987 shall be superseded and the Will dated 17.08.1992 shall be in force. Hence, the suit is liable to be dismissed.



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

7. On the pleadings of the parties and hearing the learned counsel on either side, the following issues were framed for determination:-

T.O.S No.19 of 1998

- (1) Whether the Will, dated 17.08.1992 executed by Late W.Padmamma at Thirupathy is valid and genuine?*
- (2) To what relief, the plaintiff is entitled?*

T.O.S No.1 of 2017

- (1) Whether the registered Will, executed by W.Padmalu Amma on 14.08.1987 in favour of the first plaintiff which was duly registered as Doc.No.61 of 1987 is valid and genuine?*
- (2) To what relief, the plaintiff is entitled?*

8. On the side of the Plaintiffs, Ex.P1 to Ex.P9 were marked and PW.1 and PW.2 were examined. On the side of the Defendants, DW1 was examined and Ex.D1 was marked.

9. The learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.19 of 1998 and the Defendants in TOS No.1 of 2017 would submit that since Mother of deceased Plaintiff W.Srinivasalu, namely, W.Padmalu Amma, wanted the



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

said Will to be executed in Telugu and hence went to Tirupathi for executing the Will dated 17.08.1992 in vernacular language i.e., in Telugu being the mother tongue of the testatrix on 16.08.1992. The same was attested by a Notary and identified by two witnesses. While being so, it cannot be dispute about the Will dated 16.08.1992, being executed at Tirupathi.

10. The learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.19 of 1998 and the Defendants in TOS No.1 of 2017 would further submit that both the attesting witnesses are no more (died sometimes back) and therefore they could not be examined and their addresses were also not known to him by now for him to lead secondary evidence.

11.It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.19 of 1998 and the Defendants in TOS No.1 of 2017 that in the evidence of the attesting witness PW-2, T.N. Srivarda Desikan, who claimed to have signed as one of the attesting witnesses in the Will dated 14.08.1987, he has stated that his father, T.Narasimhachariar, had only prepared the Will dated 14.08.1987 (Ex. P1) whereas it was not



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

prepared by the testatrix or by her husband, but prepared by a different person. Further, PW-2 would further state that he was not present when his father prepared the said Will. Hence, it create suspicion with regard to preparation of the Will dated 14.08.1987.

12. The learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.19 of 1998 and the Defendants in TOS No.1 of 2017 would further submit that in the course of chief examination, attesting witness -PW-2 would say that Testatrix had signed in his presence before the Sub-Registrar, SRO, T.Nagar whereas in the cross examination, he would say, Padmalu amma signed the Will in her house at Thirumoorthy Street. Therefore, his evidence is unbelievable.

13.It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.19 of 1998 and the Defendants in TOS No.1 of 2017 that the disparity in the dates of the Will dated 16.08.1992 that the Notary had signed on 17.08.1992 cannot be said to be a forged one and it should be treated as an error. Further, the testatrix W.Padmalu Amma, knew to read and write Telugu and not in English which would evidently and



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

categorically prove that the Will dated 16.08.1992 was executed by none else but by the testatrix W.Padmalu Amma.

14. The learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.19 of 1998 and the Defendants in TOS No.1 of 2017 would further submit that it is a settled law that the latest Will would prevail ie the Will dated 16.08.1992 and supersede the earlier Wills ie. Will dated 14.08.1987. As per the observation of the Hon'ble High Court and the Apex Court, though the Will dated 14.08.1987 was a registered one, the later Will dated 16.08.1992, would always prevail.

15.It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.19 of 1998 and the Defendants in TOS No.1 of 2017 that though Section 68 of the Evidence Act mandates that one attesting witness should be examined to prove the execution of the Will, the rule of exemption is that in the absence of attesting witness, the circumstances would have to be taken note of as to the genuineness of Will and cannot be shunned away in treating the Will as invalid in the eye of law. Therefore, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to allow the T.O.S No.19 of 1998 and



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

consequently pray for dismissal of the T.O.S No.1 of 2017 with costs and thus render Justice.

16.The learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.1 of 2017 and the Defendants 1-5 in TOS No.19 of 1998 would submit that the Will of V.Padmalu Amma, dated 14.08.1987 was duly executed by her and registered as Document No. 61 of 1987 in the SRO, Thyagaraya Nagar, Chennai which has been marked as Ex.P1 and the same was duly proved by the 1st Attesting Witness viz., T.N.Srivarada Desikan by giving evidence before this Hon'ble Court as per Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872.

17. It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.1 of 2017 and the Defendants 1-5 in TOS No.19 of 1998 that in the said Will dated 14.08.1987, the Testatrix clearly stated that if her son ie. the plaintiff in TOS No.19 of 1998 comes to perform obsequies on her death, he should be paid Rs.5,000/- by her husband. There shall be no obligation on any one to invite her son for that purpose. Further, it has been stated that in the event of her husband predeceasing



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

her, whatever given to her husband under this Will shall be taken by her four daughters (the plaintiffs 2 to 5) equally with full powers of alienation.

In the aforesaid contents in the said Will, makes clear that the testatrix V.Padmalu Amma did not have the intention of giving any share in her property to her son.

18. The learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.1 of 2017 and the Defendants 1-5 in TOS No.19 of 1998 would further submit that the son of the Testatrix who is the plaintiff in TOS No.19 of 1998 has forged and fabricated an unregistered Will by forging his mother's signature and written the same in Telugu language, as if it was executed by his mother in Tirupathi on 16.08.1992, which was attested by a Notary on 17.08.1992 at Tirupati, as if it was signed by the testatrix before him. Even though the alleged Will dated 17.08.1992 is said to have been attested by two attesting witnesses, neither affidavit of them has been nor any evidence was recorded by producing them before this Court while it is mandatory procedure at the time of filing petition for grant of Letters of Administration. Hence, it is categorically proved that the Will dated 17.08.1992 is a forged and fabricated one.



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

19. It has been further submitted by the learned counsel for the plaintiffs in TOS No.1 of 2017 and the Defendants 1-5 in TOS No.19 of 1998 that even though the Will was prepared on 16.08.1992, as per the evidence of P.W.1, when the Testatrix returned to Chennai on the same day ie.16.08.1992, how can the Advocate Notary would sign in the alleged Will on 17.08.1992. It creates suspicion. Therefore, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to allow the T.O.S No.1 of 2017 and consequently pray for dismissal of the T.O.S No.19 of 1998 with costs and thus render Justice.

20. Heard both sides and perused the material available on record.

21. On a perusal of the records, it is seen that the son of the Testatrix, being the plaintiff in TOS No.19 of 1998 and the Husband of the Testatrix being the plaintiff in 1 of 2017 seek this Court to grant letter of Administration based on the Will dated 17.08.1992 and 14.08.1987 respectively executed by W.Padmalu Amma.



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

22. As far as the the Will dated 16.08.1992 is concerned, it was executed in the language of Telugu at Tirupathi attesting by a Notary on 17.08.1992 and witnessing by two persons. On a perusal of the said Will, it can be seen that the address of the Two attesting witness was located at Chennai and those are now no more. In the evidence of the plaintiff, he has said that he and her mother went to Tirupathi and executed the said Will. However, he has not explained how two attesting witnesses came to Tirupathi and signed in the said Will dated 16.08.1992 as attesting witnesses, while they were living at Chennai during the period of execution of Will. Hence, it creates suspicion. Further, the proper reason was not explained by the plaintiff for executing the Will dated 17.08.1992 at Tirupathi in the Telugu Language while the Testatrix was staying in Chennai.

23. The plaintiff in TOS No.19 of 1998 is at the obligation of proving the Will dated 17.08.1992 in accordance with the provisions of Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act. Even though two attesting witnesses are no more, the plaintiff being the son of the Testatrix is bound to prove the signature of the Testatrix by producing oral and documentary evidence. If



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

the Plaintiff is unable to produce any one of the witnesses to prove the signature, at least, he has to examine the person, who can identify and prove the signature of those attesting witnesses. In this case, the Plaintiff failed to prove the Will, by examining the person as a witness, who can identify and prove the signatures of the attesting witnesses. So he miserably failed to take steps to examine the witnesses. Therefore, the Plaintiff has not proved the Will by oral and documentary evidence. Accordingly, Issue No.1 is answered against the plaintiff. Since issue no.1 is answered against the Plaintiff, issue no.2 does not arise and it need not be considered at this stage. The Plaintiff is not entitled to Letters of Administration or any other relief.

24. As far as the the Will dated 14.08.1987 is concerned, it was executed and duly registered as Document No.61 of 1987 in the SRO, T.Nagar, Chennai in the presence of Two attesting witnesses ie. (i) T.N.Srivarada Desikan and (ii) C.B. Rajagopal residing at Chennai. When the affidavit and evidence of the attesting witness PW2 are perused, he would speak to the effect that he was present on the day of execution of the Will on 14.08.1987 and yet another witness namely Mr.B. Rajagopal, was



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

also present and they saw the testatrix, putting her signature in the Will and the testatrix saw them putting their signatures as witnesses and thereby she has also spoken about the attestation of the document, in accordance with law. The affidavit and evidence of P.W.2 would also go to show that the testatrix was in a sound and disposing state of mind and was in a good health, at the time of execution of Ex.P1 Will. The said evidence of PW-2 would prove the attestation, execution of the Will and also the sound and disposing state of mind of the testator at the time of execution of Ex.P1 Will. The testamentary jurisdiction is invoked only for the purpose of deciding the proof of the Will in order to grant issuance of Letters of Administration. Therefore, the dispute in between the defendant and other persons including the plaintiff would not in any way be considered as an impediment for this Court to grant Letters of Administration in favour of the plaintiff, on the proof of the Will dated 14.08.1987. Accordingly, Issue No.1 is answered in favour of the plaintiff. Since issue no.1 is answered in favour of the Plaintiff, the plaintiff in TOS No.1 of 2017 is entitled to grant Letters of Administration in favour of the plaintiff, on the proof of the Will dated 14.08.1987. Accordingly, issue No.2 is answered in favour of the plaintiff.



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

25. In the result, the TOS No.1 of 2017 pertaining to the Will dated 14.08.1987, is decreed as prayed for and the plaintiff in TOS No.19 of 1998 pertaining to the Will dated 17.08.1992, stands dismissed. No costs.

06.02.2024

Index:Yes/No  
Web:Yes/No  
Speaking/Non Speaking  
uma/lbm

1. List of Witnesses examined on the side of the Plaintiff:-

1. PW.1 – B.Nalini
2. PW.2 - T.N.Srivarada Desikan

2. List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Plaintiff:-

1. Ex.P1 is the Original Will dated 14.08.1987.
2. Ex.P2 is the original Death Certificate of deceased Testatrix W.Padmalu Amma dated 31.08.1995.
3. Ex.P3 is the original Death certificate of the deceased father W.Venkatesa Perumal Chetty dated 10.10.2014.
4. Ex.P4 is the xerox copy of the Legal Heir Ship Certificate of W.Venkatesa Perumal Chetty dated 24.12.2014.
5. Ex.P5 is the original Affidavit of Assets filed by the 1st plaintiff



TOS.No.19 of 1998

WEB COPY

6. Ex.P6 is the xerox copy of deed of Family Arrangement and partition

7. Ex.P7 is the xerox copy of sale agreement entered between W.Srinivasulu and Francis Ilango.

8. Ex.P8 is the Encumbrance certificate dated 03.10.2011

9.Ex.P9 is the certified copy of the plaint in O.S.No.4379 of 2016 on the file of the VII Asst. City Civil Court, Chennai.

3. List of Witnesses examined on the side of the Defendants:-

DW1 – W.Srinivasulu

4. List of Exhibits marked on the side of the Defendants:-

1. Ex.D1 is the xerox copy of the subsequent Will of Testatrix dated 17.08.1992.

06.02.2024

**Note:** The plaintiff in TOS No.1 of 2017 shall execute a security bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) in favour of the Assistant Registrar (O.S.II), High Court, Madras, within a period of three (3) months as required under law.



WEB COPY



TOS.No.19 of 1998

A.A.NAKKIRAN, J.

uma/lbm

Pre-Delivery Common Judgement in  
TOS.Nos.19 of 1998 and 1 of 2017

06.02.2024