



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-10-2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

SA No. 1270 of 2009 and

M.P.No.1 of 2009

N.Thiruvengadam
S/o. Natesa Mudaliar, 12/12, Anna Nagar, Cheyyar
Town, Tiruvannamalai Dist.

..Appellant/ Plaintiff

Vs

1. Subburaya Mudaliar(died)
S/o. Late Govindaraju, Nethapakkam Village,
Arni Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.
2. Vajravelu Mudaliar
S/o. Late Govindaraju, Nethapakkam Village,
Arni Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.
3. Ramasamy Mudaliar
S/o.Late Govindaraju, Nethapakkam Village,
Arni Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.
4. Rukmani Ammal
W/o. Govindan, Thasarapettai, Nethupakkam
Madura, Arni Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.
5. Ammani Ammal
W/o. L.M.Parasurama Mudaliar, Ladapadi
Village, Mamandur Post, Arni Taluk,
Tiruvannamalai Dist.
6. V.Parasuraman
S/o.Vajravel Mudaliar, 1171, Appar Street,



M.P.T.Nagar, Tharambakkam Village,
Kancheepuram Taluk & Dist.

WEB COPY

7. V.Kasinathan
S/o. Vajravel Mudaliar, 1, Manager Murugesan
Street, Arunagiri Chatram, Arani.
8. V.Ranganathan
S/o. Vajravel Mudaliar, 1/3, Road Street,
Dhasarapet Village, S.V.Nagaram, Arani,
Tiruvannamalai Dist.
9. G.Manimegalai
W/o. Gnanasekaran, Then Iliuppai Village,
Purasai Post, Cheyyar Taluk.
- 10.M.Tamilaselvi
W/o. Murugesan, Thenpallipattu Post,
Kalasapakkam, Polur Taluk.
- 11.J.Abirami
W/o. Jayavel, B/37, Housing Board,
Mullipattu, Arni.
- 12.A.Dharmakasthuri
W/o. Amirthalinga, 3/102-d, Vellalar Street,
Kangeyanallur Village And Post, Vellore.
- 13.SAMINATHAN
S/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.



14. VISVANATHAN

S/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

15. JAGANNATHAN

S/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

16. MANGAYARKKARASI

D/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

17. PARVATHAVARTHINI

D/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

18. PUNITHAVARTHINI

D/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

19. VINAYAGAM

S/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.



20.KAMATCHI

D/O. SUBBURAYA MUDALIAR, RES. AT 1/1
PILLAYAR KOIL STREET,
THASARAPETTAIMADHURA,
NETHUPAKKAM VILLAGE, S.V. NAGARAM
POST, ARNI TALUK, THIRUVANNAMALAI
DISTRICT - 317.

r1 died, rr13 to 20 are brought on record as lrs of
the deceased r1 vide court order dated
08/09/2025 made in cmp .nos.816,818 and 821 of
2025 in S.A.No.1270 of 2009(RNMJ)

..Respondents /
Defendants

PRAYER : Appeal filed under Section 100 of C.P.C., against the judgment and
decree in A.S.No.74 of 2003 on the file of the District Judge, Tiruvannamalai
dated 24.04.2009 in reversing the judgment and decree in O.S.No.162 of 1987
on the file of the Sub-Judge, Tiruvannamalai dated 05.09.2003.

For Appellant : Mr.S.Arokia Maniraj

For Respondents : Mr.R.Rajarajan

JUDGMENT

This Second Appeal has been filed challenging the judgment and decree
in A.S.No.74 of 2003 on the file of the District Judge, Tiruvannamalai dated
24.04.2009 reversing the judgment and decree in O.S.No.162 of 1987 on the
file of the Sub-Judge, Tiruvannamalai dated 05.09.2003.



WEB COPY

2. Heard Mr.S.Arokia Maniraj, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr.R.Rajarajan, learned counsel for the respondents and perused the materials available on record.

3. The appellant is the plaintiff who has filed a suit for seeking the relief of declaration and permanent injunction in respect of the suit property. The Trial Court has decreed the suit on 05.09.2003 by granting the relief as prayed by the plaintiff. The defendants have filed a First Appeal in A.S.No.74 of 2003 and the First Appellate Court had allowed the First Appeal by setting aside the judgment and Decree of the Trial Court and dismissing the suit. Aggrieved over that, the plaintiff has preferred the present Second Appeal.

4. The short facts pleaded in the plaint are as under:

The suit property was originally belonged to the plaintiff's grand father Sami Mudaliar, which he obtained through minor inam. Later, in a family partition occurred between Sami Mudaliar and his sons Natesa Mudaliar, Govindaraju and Murugesu Mudaliar, an extent of 1 acre and 33 cents in the suit schedule property was allotted to the share of Sami Mudaliar. In the rest of the property, an extent of 49 cents were allotted to Natesa Mudaliar. The



plaintiff is the son of Natesa Mudaliar and the first defendant is the brother of Natesa Mudaliar and paternal uncle of the plaintiff. So from the year 1933, the plaintiff's father was in enjoyment of 49 cents. Subsequent to the death of Sami Mudaliar, 1 acre and 33 cents allotted to Sami Mudaliar and other properties were divided between the sons of Sami Mudaliar and in which, the plaintiff's father has got 42 cents. The remaining 91 cents was enjoyed by Murugesa Mudaliar and he later sold it to the first defendant.

4.1. The first defendant and the plaintiff's father had been jointly cultivating 91 cents. Later, through an oral exchange and for a convenient enjoyment, the first defendant had obtained some other property and handed over 91 cents to Natesa Mudaliar. This had happened in the year 1946 and hence, the plaintiff's father has been in enjoyment of 1 acre and 82 cents. The plaintiff's father died in the year 1963. Thereafter, the plaintiff inherited the said property and in enjoyment of the same.

4.2. When the Minor Inam Act came into force, the Government has resumed the inam and later, during resettlement, due enquiry was made and the enjoyment of the plaintiff's father and then the plaintiff over the suit property was confirmed and thereafter, ryotwari patta has been issued in the name of the



plaintiff in the year 1968. The plaintiff was working in the Cooperative Department at Tiruvannamalai for two years. By taking advantage of the plaintiff's absence, the defendants 1 to 4 had tried to grab the suit property by encroaching the same. They also sold the trees in the suit property to the fifth defendant for a rock bottom price. As the defendants have caused trouble to the plaintiff's title and lawful enjoyment of the suit property, he filed a suit for declaration and a consequential permanent injunction.

5. The averments made in the written statement of the first defendant are as follows:

The suit property belonged to Sami @ Chinnasamu Mudaliar, the father of the first defendant. In a family partition, half of the property went to the share of the plaintiff's father Natesa Mudaliar, while the other half was allotted to another brother Murugesu Mudaliar. After the division, the first defendant had purchased 91 cents from his brother Murugesu mudaliar through a registered sale deed dated 05.06.1942. The above sale deed was attested by the first defendant's father Sami Mudaliar and the plaintiff's father Natesa Mudaliar. In a survey and settlement made after the abolition of inam, joint patta was issued in the name of the first defendant and the plaintiff's father in Patta No.681. The first defendant was in enjoyment of 91 cents which is eastern



half of the suit property for a long time before and after settlement. Hence, he also prescribed title over the same. The first defendant is cultivating the land by establishing pumpset in Service Connection No.18. The first defendant had also planted mango trees and in a family arrangement, the above property in the enjoyment of the first defendant has been orally allotted to the second defendant.

5.1. The plaintiff has already filed a suit in O.S.No.272 / 1985 disputing the title in respect of the suit property, but that was dismissed. Even the Appeal filed in A.S.No.291 of 1976 was also dismissed. The plaintiff has got the *exparte* order of injunction by suppressing the material facts. The claim of adverse possession is false. The allegation of oral exchange is also not true. Hence, the suit should be dismissed.

6. On the basis of the above pleadings, the Trial Court has framed the following issues:

“(i) Whether it is true that the plaintiff's father Natesa Mudaliar was allotted 0.49 cents in the suit property in the partition held in 1933?”

“(ii) Whether it is true that the plaintiff's father Natesa Mudaliar was allotted 0.42 cents in the 1.33 cents enjoyed of



WEB COPY

Sami Mudaliar in this partition effected after the demise of Sami Mudaliar?

(iii) Whether it is true that the plaintiff's father exchanged the remaining 0.91 cents with Murugesu Mudaliar in the suit property for the convenient enjoyment in 1946?

(iv) Whether it is true to state that the plaintiff obtained patta for the suit property in the year 1968 and enjoying the same thereafter by paying kists?

(v) Whether it is true that after the abolition of minor inam both the defendants and the plaintiff's father were granted joint patta under patta No.681 in respect of the suit property?

(vi) Whether it is true to state that the eastern 0.91 cents in the suit property has been in the possession and enjoyment of the first defendant?

(vii) Whether it is true that the first defendant had orally given the suit property in favour of the second defendant and the suit property is in possession and enjoyment of the second defendant?

(viii) Whether the plaintiff is entitled to obtain the reliefs of declaration and permanent injunction against the defendants as prayed for?"

7. During the course of the trial, on the side of the plaintiff, one witness has been examined as P.W.1 and Exhibits A1 to A27 have been marked. On the



side of the defendants, 4 witnesses were examined as D.W.1 to D.W.4 and Exhibits B1 to B19 were marked. At the conclusion of the trial, the suit was decreed as prayed by the plaintiff. The First Appeal preferred by the defendants to set aside the judgment and decree of the Trial Court was allowed and the suit was dismissed. Now, the plaintiff has filed the present Second Appeal and the same is admitted by raising the following substantial questions of law:

“1. Whether the Lower Appellate Court is right in allowing the appeal when the defendants failed to challenge the adjudication of the authorities under the Tamil Nadu Minor Inam (Abolition and Conversion into Ryothwari) Act, 1963?

2. Whether the patta granted by the Government would confer title to the property after the same was acquired by the competent authority?

3. Whether the judgment of the First Appellate Court is vitiated by non-appreciation of evidence on record and failure to adhere to the correct principles of law?”

8. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the first defendant was examined as D.W.1 and he has admitted in his evidence that the plaintiff's father Natesa Mudaliar was allotted with 49 cents in a family partition and again he received 42 cents after the death of his father. The defendants failed to produce any documents that their predecessors were in enjoyment of the



property. Ex.B1 was ceased to be in operation in pursuant to the Tamil Nadu Minor Inam (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act. Hence, no weightage can be given to those documents which were obtained prior to the said Act. The defendants did not challenge the grant of patta or reassignment of land granted by the Government before the Competent forum. The patta issued in favour of the plaintiff is absolute and individual patta. The adjudication of the authorities and the Tamil Nadu Minor Inam (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1963 is not final and the same could be questioned in a Civil Court. The first defendant has not challenged the adjudication of the authorities by way of preferring any proceedings before the Civil Court. The documents produced by the defendants were obtained after the institution of the suit. Hence, the Trial Court has rightly rejected the same.

8.1. The learned counsel further submitted that once the land was acquired and reassigned to the plaintiff by the Government, the prior title to the property becomes void and the patta granted by the Government would only be the document establishing the title of the same. The plaintiff has perfected the title by adverse possession and the finding of the Appellate Court that the plaintiff has not established title against the real owner is erroneous. The Lower Appellate Court ought to have drawn adverse inference against the defendants



as they have not challenged Ex.A10. Hence, the judgment passed by the First Appellate Court should be set aside.

9. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that with regard to the pleadings of adverse possession, no details have been supplied by the plaintiff and no materials have been produced before the Court. The patta issued under Minor Inam Act can be treated as final only for the purpose of Inam Abolition Act and that cannot be considered as a basic document for enforcing title in a suit for declaration. The first defendant has got the title deeds Ex.B1 in his favour and that was admitted by the plaintiff. The patta has been granted to the plaintiff behind the back of the first defendant who is the real owner. The plea of oral exchange as taken up by the plaintiff is also not proved before the Court. The plaintiff has failed to prove the title and hence, it is right for the First Appellate Court to allow the First Appeal.

Discussion:

10. The fact that the suit property and its larger extent of 1 acre 82 cents belonged to the plaintiff's grandfather Sami Mudaliar is not denied. The first defendant was examined as D.W.1 and he has also admitted the fact that in a family partition between his father, himself and his brothers, 49 cents have



been allotted to Natesa Mudaliar. The said Natesa Mudaliar is the plaintiff's father. Samy Mudaliar has been allotted with the extent of 1 acre 33 cents. Subsequent to the death of Sami Mudaliar, 42 cents have been allotted to the plaintiff's father Natesa Mudaliar and that fact is also not denied. So the dispute is only with regards to 91 cents out of 1 acre 82 cents claimed by the plaintiff on the eastern side.

11. The first defendant did not have any objection as to the enjoyment of the plaintiff towards western side. The plaintiff did not deny the fact that the first defendant had purchased 91 cents from his brother Murugesa Mudaliar even during the life time of Natesa Mudaliar by virtue of a sale deed dated 05.06.1942. The attestors for the said deed were the plaintiff's father and the plaintiff's grandfather Sami Mudaliar. So, the plaintiff cannot deny the above said sale deed executed in favour of the first defendant.

12. Even though the first defendant has got his title deed in respect of eastern half of 91 cents as he acquired it by way of purchase from his brother Murugesa Mudaliar, it is claimed by the plaintiff that the first defendant had entered into an exchange with the plaintiff's father and thereby the plaintiff's



father had become entitled to the eastern half of the 91 cents, totally 1 acre 82 cents. The above exchange is said to be an oral exchange.

13. On perusal of Ex.A21 registered Exchange Deed dated 25.01.1953, it is seen that the said deed has been executed between the first defendant and one Raju Mudaliar who is the son of Annamalai Mudaliar. Since the exchange has been made between the first defendant and one third party, Raju Mudali, Ex.A21 cannot come to the support of the appellant / plaintiff for his claim in respect of the suit property.

14. So in the absence of any proof to show the exchange, the only plea that has to be considered would be perfection of title through adverse possession. In the plaint pleadings, it is claimed by the plaintiff that exchange had taken place in the year 1946. But Ex.A21 is of the year 1953. Neither in the plaint nor in the evidence, the plaintiff has stated from when onwards the plaintiff's father was in enjoyment of the eastern part of 91 cents with the knowledge of the original owner, the first defendant and without his objection. However, the plaintiff claimed that subsequent to the Minor Inam Abolition Act and during resettlement, the possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff's father has been confirmed and on that basis, ryotwari patta has been granted in



his name in the year 1968. So, it is claimed by the plaintiff that he has been in enjoyment of the suit property to the knowledge of the first defendant for more than the statutory period.

15. Exs.A2 and A3 are the orders passed by the Settlement Officer in the year 1972. But the settled preposition of law is that the orders passed by the Settlement Officers under the Inam Abolition Act is only for the purpose of that Act and the proceedings issued by the Settlement Officer cannot be the basis for claiming any title for the properties before the Civil Court and the claimant has to establish his title through independent title deeds. In support of the above position of law, the attention of this Court was drawn to the decision of the Full Bench of this Court held in the case of ***Srinivasan and 6 others Vs. Sri Madhyarjuneswaraswami, Pattavaithalai, Thiruchirapalli District, reported in 1998 2 Law Weekly 189***. In the said judgment, this Court has held as under:

“15. Further, the mere fact that the orders passed or decisions rendered under these Acts were given finality for the purposes of those Acts or that the issues, which they are obliged or required to be decided, when so decided are ordained to bind the parties to the proceedings or their privies and successors~in~interest applying the principles of res judicata, does not have the effect of ousting the jurisdiction of the Civil Court once and for all. It is by now well settled that



WEB COPY

even in cases where finality is accorded to any decision or order, there are certain well settled exceptions and proved and existence of such exceptional factors, the Civil Court is entitled to nullify any or all such decisions. Similarly, even in cases where the principles of res judicata are rendered applicable, the jurisdiction of the competent Civil Court to go into the question and find out whether the necessary ingredients to apply the principles of res judicata exist in a given case or not cannot be denied to the Civil Courts and from the mere fact of according finality to the orders or decisions rendered under the Act or the application of the principles of res judicata, a total or complete bar or ouster of the jurisdiction of the Civil Courts for all and any purpose cannot be automatically inferred or implied. Before a plea of res judicata can be given effect to, it must be sufficiently pleaded and established that the litigating parties must be the same, that the subject matter of the suit and the other proceedings also are identical, that the questions arising in the suit and the other proceedings were directly and substantially in issue and the same was finally decided and that too by an authority or Court of competent jurisdiction.

... ..

... ..

18. For all the reasons stated above, we answer the question referred to the Full Bench in the negative by holding that the jurisdiction of the Civil Court to entertain a suit for



WEB COPY

declaration of title and injunction is not barred by reason of the grant of patta under the provisions of Tamil Nadu Act 30 of 1963.”

16. The claim of relief of declaration of title and consequential injunction by the other party, the grant of patta under the provisions of Act 30 of 1963 (Inam Abolition Act) cannot act as a complete bar. It means that the party aggrieved can still file a civil suit challenging the grant of patta by establishing his title through independent title deeds.

17. However, the learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the first defendant at no point of time had filed any Civil Suit by ignoring the patta granted by the Settlement Officer in pursuant to the Act and hence, the issuance of patta in the name of the plaintiff's father had attained finality.

18. No doubt there are entries in the settlement register made in the name of the plaintiff's father in respect of the suit property even in the year 1969, that could have been considered as a factor only for the purpose of Inam Abolition Act. In order to establish the continuous and uninterrupted possession over the suit property in pursuant to the above orders of the Settlement Officers by the plaintiff's father, adverse to the original owner, the first defendant, relevant



documents ought to have been produced by the plaintiff. But on perusal of the plaintiff's documents, it is seen that the plaintiff could only produce adangal, and chitta only from the year 1992, which are no doubt subsequent to the suit.

19. The settlement proceedings of the Settlement Officer Passed under the Inam Abolition Act alone cannot confer title in favour of a person and that can be a supportive document to establish his continuous possession, unless that person could produce documents showing uninterrupted possession. In the instant case, the plaintiff could produce only an order of the Settlement Officer and the said order can be treated as final only for the purpose of the said Act. With that alone the plaintiff cannot claim title by prescription also.

20. On the other hand, the first defendant has produced the registered sale deed executed in his favour by his brother Murugesu Mudaliar on 05.06.1942 which was marked as Ex.B1 and for which, the plaintiff's father and grandfather have stood as witnesses. The defendant also produced Ex.B15 sale deed dated 01.05.1953 executed by the plaintiff's father in favour of the first defendant. So the other exchange deed Ex.A21 between the first defendant and the third party would also prove that the family members of the plaintiff's father were in the habit of conveying the properties between themselves and



with the third parties only through a registered documents and not through the oral transfer.

21. Even in the absence of the first defendant's challenge to the proceedings of the Settlement Officer, the plaintiff cannot claim title only based upon the above patta without the aid of any independent title deeds. In other words, the first defendant who has title deeds in his favour is placed in a better position with regard to his title than the plaintiff's father who is said to have got patta only under the Inam Abolition Act.

22. As stated already, the plaintiff failed to produce any documents to show his father's and thereafter his continuous enjoyment over the suit property from the year 1968. It has been held by the various judgments of this Court and most particularly, in the judgment cited supra that the inam patta cannot be the basis for anyone to claim title before the Civil Court. The same is squarely applicable to the case of the plaintiff. Hence, the plaintiff has not proved the title of his father and his consequent inheritance in respect of eastern half of 91 cents in the suit property. Hence, I do not find any error of appreciation of evidence or position of law committed by the First Appellate Court.



Accordingly, the substantial questions of law 1 to 3 are answered against the appellant.

23. In the result, this Second Appeal stands **dismissed**. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is also closed.

08-10-2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
GSK

To

1. SUBBURAYA MUDALIAR(died)
S/o. Late Govindaraju, Nethapakkam Village,
Arni Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.
2. Vajravelu Mudaliar
S/o. Late Govindaraju, Nethapakkam Village,
Arni Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.
3. Ramasamy Mudaliar
S/o.Late Govindaraju, Nethapakkam Village,
Arni Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.
4. Rukmani Ammal
W/o. Govindan, Thasarapettai, Nethupakkam
Madura, Arni Taluk, Tiruvannamalai Dist.



5. Ammani Ammal

W/o. L.M.Parasurama Mudaliar, Ladapadi
Village, Mamandur Post, Arni Taluk,
Tiruvannamalai Dist.

6. V.Parasuraman

S/o.Vajravel Mudaliar, 1171, Appar Street,
M.P.T.Nagar, Tharambakkam Village,
Kancheepuram Taluk & Dist.

7. V.Kasinathan

S/o. Vajravel Mudaliar, 1, Manager Murugesan
Street, Arunagiri Chatram, Arani.

8. V.Ranganathan

S/o. Vajravel Mudaliar, 1/3, Road Street,
Dhasarapet Village, S.V.Nagaram, Arani,
Tiruvannamalai Dist.

9. G.Manimegalai

W/o. Gnanasekaran, Then Iliuppai Village,
Purasai Post, Cheyyar Taluk.

10.M.Tamilaselvi

W/o. Murugesan, Thenpallipattu Post,
Kalasapakkam, Polur Taluk.

11.J.Abirami

W/o. Jayavel, B/37, Housing Board, Mullipattu,
Arni.



12. A.Dharmakasthuri

W/o. Amirthalinga, 3/102-d, Vellalar Street,
Kangeyanallur Village And Post, Vellore.

13. SAMINATHAN

S/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

14. VISVANATHAN

S/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

15. JAGANNATHAN

S/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

16. MANGAYARKKARASI

D/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

17. PARVATHAVARTHINI

D/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni



Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

18.PUNITHAVARTHINI

D/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

19.VINAYAGAM

S/o. Subburaya Mudaliar, Res. At 1/1 Pillayar
Koil Street, Thasarapettaimadhura,
Nethupakkam Village, S.V. Nagaram Post, Arni
Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District - 317.

20.KAMATCHI

D/O. SUBBURAYA MUDALIAR, RES. AT 1/1
PILLAYAR KOIL STREET,
THASARAPETTAIMADHURA,
NETHUPAKKAM VILLAGE, S.V. NAGARAM
POST, ARNI TALUK, THIRUVANNAMALAI
DISTRICT - 317.



WEB COPY

SA No. 1270 of 2



DR.R.N.MANJULA, J.

GSK

SA No. 1270 of 2009 and

M.P.No.1 of 2009

08-10-2025