



A.No.1522 of 2024
in TOS.No.94 of 2013

WEB COPY

P.B.BALAJI, J.,

This application has been taken out to receive eight documents in support of the case of the plaintiff in TOS.No.94 of 2013.

2.The dependent claims to be the daughter of the original plaintiff, Y.Ranganathan, who was the executor of the Will of late B.Chengavalli Thayaramma. According to the applicant, these documents are relevant for the purposes of the TOS, especially, since the applicant's status as adopted daughter of the original plaintiff, Y.Ranganathan, is in dispute.

3.Mr.Siddarth Bahety, learned counsel for the respondents would oppose the application in so far as two documents, namely documents 6 and 7, stating these documents are absolutely not relevant for the purposes of TOS. Moreover, according to the learned counsel for the respondents, the documents pertain to the executor, who is not a beneficiary. However, the learned counsel for the applicant would submit that the applicant is also one of the beneficiaries and only for such purposes, the documents 6 and 7 have been sought to be marked.



WEB COPY

4.I have heard the learned counsel on either side and keeping in mind their respective contentions, I deem it fit and proper to permit the applicant/plaintiff to mark the documents subject to the proof and relevancy. The status of the applicant No.2 as daughter of the executor being disputed, those documents would assume significance and therefore, subject to proof and relevancy, all the documents may be received in evidence.

5.Post the matter before the Additional Master III on 10.04.2024.

01.04.2024
(2/2)

ata



WEB COPY



P.B.BALAJI, J.

ata

A.No.1522 of 2024
in TOS.No.94 of 2013

01.04.2024
(2/2)