



S.A. No. 588 of 2013

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on 29.11.2024

Pronounced on 20.01.2025

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Ms. JUSTICE R.N.MANJULA

S.A. No. 588 of 2013

K.V.Ramaraj

...Appellant

Vs.

1.K.V.Selvaraj

2.V.Jayaraj

3.V.Durairaj

4.V.Senthilkumar

5.C.Vasantha

6.C.S.Manikandababu

7.S.G.Kavitha

... Respondents

PRAYER: Second Appeal is filed under section 100 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, to set aside the judgment and decree dated 06.11.2012 made in A.S. No.29 of 2012 on the file of the I Additional Subordinate Judge, Coimbatore, confirming the judgment and decree dated 23.12.2011 made in O.S. No. 301 of 2004 on the file of the Principal District Munsif, Coimbatore.

For Appellant : Mr.P.Valliappan, Senior Counsel

Assisted by

Mr.S.M.S.Sriram Narayanan

For Respondents : Mr.R.Bharath Kumar (RR1, 6 & 7)

JUDGMENT



The appellant is the plaintiff, who has filed the suit for partition claiming 1/6th share. The trial Court had dismissed the suit and the first appeal preferred by the plaintiff, also got dismissed. Aggrieved over that, the plaintiff has preferred the second appeal.

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

The plaintiff is the son of late Vengadasamy Chettiar, who died intestate. The defendants 1, 2, 3, 4 and the plaintiff are the sons and the 5th defendant is the daughter of the deceased Vengadasamy Chettiar. The defendant No.6 is the purchaser and the son of the first defendant and in whose favour the first defendant had executed the sale deed and the 7th defendant is the purchaser from the sixth defendant.

2.2 The suit property belongs to late Vengadasamy Chettiar by virtue of a sale deed dated 05.07.1968. He constructed two storied RCC building and at the back portion he constructed a house. On 15.03.2000 the Vengadasamy Chettiar executed two sale deeds in favour of the first and fourth defendants and sold the house portion to the first defendant and the vacant site to the fourth defendant. The suit property still remains undivided and it is being



enjoyed by the plaintiff and the defendants jointly.

WEB COPY

2.3. On 02.07.2001 Vengadasamy Chettiar died leaving behind his children, wife along with his mother Venkittammal. After the death of the Vengadasamy Chettiar his (mother)wife Venkittammal was collecting rents from the suit property. She also died on 02.05.2010. After her demise, the first defendant unlawfully collected the rents by himself from the month of April 2001. A panchayat was held in the presence of the village elders and relatives at KR.Krishnamurthy House at Kavanai. In the said panchayat, a compromise was arrived but the first defendant did not accept the compromise.

2.4. The plaintiff and the defendants are living separately due to some misunderstanding between themselves. Hence, the plaintiff demanded for partition by issuing legal notice on 08.10.2003 by claiming 1/6th share. But the first defendant has sent a reply notice with false allegations that Vengadasamy Chettiar had executed a Will in his favour.

2.5. In view of the false claim made by the first defendant, the plaintiff has filed a suit for partition by claiming 1/6th share to him. As the defendant sold his property to the sixth defendant when the suit was pending and the sixth



defendant in his turn had sold the property to the 7th defendant and those sale deeds are invalid. The defendants 6 and 7 have also been added as parties to the suit.

3. The short facts pleaded in the written statement are as under:-

Sri Vengadasamy Chettiar during his life time had executed a Will on 20.05.2000 in respect of the suit property and bequeathed the same in favour of the first defendant. Subsequent to the death of Vengadasamy Chettiar the Will came into effect and the revenue records also got mutated in the name of the first defendant and thereafter, the first defendant sold the suit property to the sixth defendant and the 6th defendant in turn sold the suit property to the seventh defendant.

3.2 The suit has been filed with false allegations. As the suit properties is the self acquired property of Vengadasamy Chettiar and he had also executed Will in favour of the first defendant, the plaintiff is not entitled to the relief as prayed for. The first defendant also filed O.S. No. 578 of 2008 for partition claiming 1/6th share before the I Additional District Munsif Court, Coimbatore.



3.3 The plaintiff in this suit is the fourth defendant in that suit. The suit is for partial partition and it is not maintainable. The sixth and seventh defendants have also filed written statement on the same line in which the first defendant had taken his defense.

4. During the course of trial, on the side of the plaintiff, three witnesses were examined as PW1 to PW3 and Exhibits A1 and A22 were marked and on the side of the defendants, four witnesses were examined as DW1 to DW4 and Exhibits B1 to B23 were marked.

5. At the conclusion of the trial and after considering the materials available on record, the suit was dismissed. The first appeal preferred by the plaintiffs challenging the said judgment was dismissed by confirming the judgment of the trial Court. Hence, the plaintiff has preferred the second appeal. The substantial question of law that arises in this Second Appeal is as follows:

(i) *Whether in law the Courts below are right in concluding that Ex.B1-Will is genuine when there are many suspicious circumstances surrounding the Will and the non-production of notary's register are patent on record and in contrary to the proof of Will under Section*



63(c) of the Succession Act ?

WEB COPY

6. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the first defendant claims his right only on the basis of the Will and if the Will proves to be false and not genuine then the plaintiff would get his share as claimed. The Will has got suspicious circumstances as it does not have any signature on the first and second pages and there is only one signature on the third page. In the schedule of the property there is an interleniation and that also s doubts. The material part of the Will has been stated only in first and second pages and there is no signature of the executant in those pages.

6.1. D.W.1 has given self contradictory evidence with regard to the knowledge of the Will and at one point of his cross-examination he has stated that even the plaintiff is aware of the Will and at some other point he has stated that he came to know about the Will subsequent to his father's death. The Will itself states that the Will has been handed over to D.W.1 and the contradiction in the evidence of D.W.1 would show that the Will is false.

6.2. DW1 has stated that he came to know about the Will on 16th day ceremony of his father and that the Will has been handed over to him by one



WEB COPY

Venugopal. Despite the Sub-Registrar's Office is just four kilometer from the residence of the executant, it is unbelievable that he had travelled 11 kms to the office of the Notary Public. In Ex.P10 - reply notice sent by the first defendant he had stated the date of the Will. Since the Will is unregistered one, absence of date on the Will assumes more relevance. No reason has been stated in the Will to bequeath the property only in favour of the first defendant by excluding all other legal heirs. Notary register has not been produced to show that the executant had affixed his signature in the register.

6.3. D.W.3 has stated that the page number and Serial Number of the Notary Register ought to have been entered in the seal affixed on Ex.B1 Will, but the attestation does not have such details. In the property details there were some corrections, but the executant did not attest the same.

6.4. The contradictions in the Notary's evidence would only show that the Will has not been executed in the presence of the Notary. The first appellate court had not properly appreciated the suspicious circumstances surrounding the Will.

7. The learned counsel for the respondent submitted that in Ex.B1 Will,



WEB COPY

the executant had stated that the first defendant alone is taking care of his wife. As the first defendant was very affectionate towards his parents, the father had executed the Will in his favour. The suit property is adjacent to the property which was sold by the the father in favour of the first defendant. Suit property being the adjacent property has been bequeathed to him for his convenient enjoyment. The evidence of D.W.2 is sufficient to meet out the requirements of Section 63(c) of the Indian Succession Act and Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act. D.W.2's evidence is very cogent and convincing. Since the Will was executed on Saturday it could not be registered. The Courts below got convinced about the genuineness of the Will Ex.B1 executed in favour of the first defendant and on that score dismissed the suits for partition claimed by the plaintiff.

8. The plaintiff and the defendants are the children of one K.V.Vengadasamy Chettiar and V.Venkittammal, who died on 28.01.2001 and 12.05.2001 respectively. The fact that the suit property including the other properties are the self-acquired properties of the plaintiff's father, K.V.Vengadasamy Chettiar is not denied. While the plaintiff claims himself as one of the legal heirs of his parents and he is entitled to 1/6th share in the suit property, the first defendant claims that his father has executed a Will and



bequeathed the property in his favour and hence, the other siblings do not have any right over the same. The defendants 2 to 5 did not dispute the execution of the Will in favour of the first defendant and they did not prefer to file any suit against the first defendant. Subsequent to the death of his father, K.V.Vengadasamy Chettiar, the first defendant had sold the suit property in favour of the 6th defendant and the 6th defendant in turn had sold the property in favour of the 7th defendant on 26.04.2005 and the 7th defendant is said to be in enjoyment of the same.

9. The appellant claims that there are doubtful circumstances surrounding the Will dated 20.05.2000 (Ex.B1), and the same has not been properly appreciated by the Courts below. Some of the suspicious circumstances alleged by the plaintiff are enlisted below:-

- (i) When the portion attached to the suit property have been sold by Vengadasamy Chettiar in favour of the defendants 1 and 4 through a registered sale Deed dated 14.03.2000, there is no necessity for him to execute a Will in respect of three shops alone in favour of the first defendant.
- (ii) There is no reason to disinherit the other legal heirs of Vengadasamy Chettiar.



WEB COPY

- (iii) The Sub-Registrar Office is just nearby to the residence of the Vengadasamy Chettiar. Hence, it is unbelievable that the testator had travelled to Coimbatore, which is beyond 11 k.m. To meet the Advocate's.
- (iv) From the evidence of the attesting witness about the fact that he is not known whether the testator of the Will was hale and healthy and he had understood the contents of the Will.
- (v) The testator had not signed in each and every page of the Will and his signature is found only in the last page.
- (vi) In the recitals of the Will, it is stated that the testator had handed over the Will to the first defendant, but DW2-attesting witness has stated that the Will has been handed over to him and he only had given the Will to the first defendant after the demise of the said Vengadasamy Chettiar.
- (vii) The corrections made in the Will has not been attested by the Vengadasamy Chettiar.
- (viii) In the seal of the Notary Public, Mr.Karikalan, affixed on the Will, the essential details are missing.

10. Since the first defendant claims right over the suit property in pursuant to the Will dated 20.05.2000 (Ex.B1), the burden is on the first defendant to



prove the genuineness of the same. He examined himself as DW1 and one of the attesting witness of the Will as DW2 and the Advocate, who prepared the Will as DW3.

11. The suit property is consisting of three shops situated in a portion out of the total extent of 10 cents. After purchasing 10 cents on 05.07.1968 the owner Vengadasamy Chettiar had put up certain constructions like houses and shops on a portion of the property. The remaining vacant site would be nearly 5 ½ cents. The vacant site and the two houses built in the 10 cents have already been sold to the defendants 1 and 4 on 15.03.2000 through a sale deed. Only for the rest of the constructions, viz., three shops in the suit property, the Will has been executed.

12. As per the recitals of the Will, the testator had chosen only the first defendant to acquire the three shops constructed in the suit property. The testator has stated in the Will that it is the first defendant, who was maintaining both the Testator and his wife. The Testator has also imposed a duty on the beneficiary to maintain his wife from and out of the rental income derived from the said shops and only after the death of the wife of the testator, the first defendant would get the property. The testator died on 28.01.2001 and



his wife died on 12.05.2001.

WEB COPY

13. Though disinheritance of other legal heirs can also be a ground for raising a suspicion that alone cannot defeat the genuineness of the Will. The testator has given a special reason as to why he preferred the first defendant by excluding his other children. There are recitals to the effect that the testator had preferred the first defendant, because he had been maintaining himself and his wife by attending their needs, including medical expenses. As the said Vengadasamy Chettiar and his wife Venkittammal were living along with the first defendant during the last phase of their life, it is quite possible to have some special consideration for the first defendant.

14. In the judgment cited by the learned counsel for the appellant reported in *2011 (5) CTC 262* in the case in ***G.Lalitha -vs- G.Ponnurangam and Others***, it is held that excluding one legal heir can be a suspicious circumstance only if sufficient reasons were not given by the testator. In the instant case, the testator had stated specific reasons as to why he had preferred to bequeath the suit property to the first defendant, by excluding the other sharers.



15. As per section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act, the first defendant has got a paramount duty to prove the Will by examining atleast one attestator of the Will. In compliance of the same, DW2 was examined on the side of the first defendant. DW2 has stated in his evidence that the testator had taken him and the other attesting witness to an advocate's who is also a notary and showed the Will to that advocate; the advocate read the Will loudly; after that Vengadasamy Chettiar asked the advocate to carry out one small correction and after the corrections were carried out he affixed his signature on the Will. He has stated that himself and the other attesting witness Ganesan had seen Vengadasmy Chettiar signing Will and thereafter, he had attested the Will.

16. It is claimed by the appellant that for the small corrections made in the Will, Vengadasamy Chettiar did not affix his signature. It is the Advocate, who had carried over the corrections at the instruction of the testator and he affixed his signature as a Notary.

17. As a missing detail was included in the property details by DW3, at the instructions of said Vengadsamy Chettiar, it is seen to have written in pen. The whole of the Will is printed and the interlineation alone is made in ink. Even though the testator had not attested the above corrections, DW3 who had



WEB COPY

carried out the corrections had affixed his initials. Further, he had also affixed his Notary seal along with his signature on the Will. DW3 has stated that he has seen that the Vengadasamy Chettiar signing the Will in his presence. Both the attesting witness and the notary advocate who had signed the Will have stated in their evidence that they had seen for seeing the testator signing the Will.

18. The evidence of DW2 and DW3 would only show that every effort was taken to make the testator to know about the contents of the Will. Only after understanding the contents, the testator had affixed his signature. So the arguments of the learned counsel for the appellant that there is no proof that the testator had affixed his signature after understanding does not hold water.

19. The learned counsel for the respondents had cited the judgment of the Supreme Court held in *Meena Pradhan and Others -vs- Kamla Pradhan and Another* reported in (2023) 9 SCC 734, wherein it is held that if relevant materials have been produced to show that the Will has been executed in the presence of the witnesses by the testator in a sound and disposing state of mind, there is no need to doubt its genuineness. The relevant part of the above judgment is given as under:-



WEB COPY



S.A. No. 588 of 2019

“11. In short, apart from statutory compliance, broadly it has to be proved that : (a) the testator signed the will out of his own free will, (b) at the time of execution he had a sound state of mind, (c) he was aware of the nature and effect thereof and (d) the will was not executed under any suspicious circumstances.

12. Coming to the facts of the case, a careful perusal of the relevant material on record and applying the provisions and the case laws it is evident that the will was duly executed by the testator in the presence of witnesses out of his free will in a sound disposing state of mind and the same stands proven through the testimony of one of the attesting witnesses, namely, Suraj Bahadur Limboo who was examined as PW 2 by the civil court. This witness categorically states that the testator executed the will in question and, both he and the testator signed the will in the presence of each other.

13. As far as allegations made by the defendants are concerned, we are of the opinion that there is no evidence on record to conclude that the deceased was not in a fit or stable mental condition at the time of execution of a will, or that a will was executed under suspicious circumstances, or the presence



of any element of undue influence.

14. *Thus, in the case at hand, we are of the opinion that both the courts below have rightly noted that the relevant provisions were complied with, and given the well-reasoned order upholding the validity of the will, the same does not warrant interference of this Court.”*

20. The manner in which the testator had participated in executing the Will by the witnesses would show that the testator was hale and healthy at the time when he had executed the Will and that he had understood the contents of the Will. When the propounder could establish the said fact, the burden would shift upon the party who denied the sound and disposing mind of the testator. The evidence adduced on the side of the plaintiff did not disclose that the testator was not in a sound disposing state of mind at the time he executed the Will. In other words, the plaintiff has not proved the contrary to show that the testator was not in a sound and disposing state of mind at the time when the Will was executed.

21. In *Niranjan Umesh Chandra Joshi -vs- Mridula Jyoti Rao* reported in **2007 (2) CTC 172 (SC)** the Supreme Court has culled out the following



circumstances as circumstances:-

WEB COPY

“33. The burden of proof that the Will has been validly executed and is a genuine document is on the propounder. The propounder is also required to prove that the testator has signed the will and that he had put his signature out of his own free will having a sound disposition of mind and understood the nature and effect thereof. If sufficient evidence in this behalf is brought on record, the onus of the propounder may be held to have been discharged. But, the onus would be on the applicant to remove the suspicion by leading sufficient and cogent evidence if there exists any. In the case of proof of will, a signature of a testator alone would not prove the execution thereof, if his mind may appear to be very feeble and debilitated. However, if a defence of fraud, coercion or undue influence is raised, the burden would be on the caveator. (See Madhukar D. Shende v. Tarabai Aba Shedage [(2002) 2 SCC 85] and Sridevi v. Jayaraja Shetty [(2005) 2 SCC 784] .) Subject to above, proof of a will does not ordinarily differ from that of proving any other document. ”



22. Insofar as the sound disposing state of mind of the testator is concerned, the first defendant has proved the same beyond any doubt. As stated already the plaintiff has not produced any contrary evidence to disprove the soundness of mind of the testator at the time when he executed the Will. As the testator thought it fit to bequeath the suit property in favour of his son (the first defendant), who had maintained himself and his wife, during the 15 last days, there is no unfairness appears to be present in the disposition.

23. It is quite natural on the parents to prefer any of the children who take care of them during their last days. In the instant case, it is the first defendant and hence, his father has chosen him as a person to inherit the portion of his property, which is the suit property. The propounder, viz., the first defendant, did not play any role in getting the Will executed and that circumstance is not present in the instant case.

24. Just because the predominant portion attached to the suit property have been sold by the testator in favour of the defendants 1 and 4, the genuineness of the Will cannot be suspected. It is at the option of the testator either to register the Will in the Sub-Registrar Office or get it verified by an Advocate.



WEB COPY

The circumstances would show that the testator had preferred to travel to the Advocate's office along with the attesting witnesses in order to get clarified whether the contents of the Will were correct. DW3 who deposed evidence had stated that the testator had brought the Will and asked him to verify whether the contents were correct. In fact, DW3 has read out the Will to the testator and made him to understand its contents and then the testator got satisfied and asked him to make a tiny correction.

25. In fact, the Will is seen to have got executed on a day falling on Saturday and probably it could also be the reason why the testator went to the Advocate's office without opting to go to the Sub-Registrar Office for registering it. Normally, the registered Will is safer than an unregistered Will. But non-registration alone cannot be the reason to suspect the genuineness of the Will, when the other circumstances surrounding the Will do not create any doubt about its genuineness. So the testator's option to choose to go to the Advocate's office though it is at a longer distance cannot be considered as the ground to dispel the genuineness of the Will.

26. The evidence on record would show that the requirement of Section



63(c) of the Indian Succession Act has been complied. The witnesses have already spoken in their evidence that they have seen the testator had signed the Will. No doubt the proof of the Will has to pass the tests under Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act and Section 63 (c) of the Indian Succession Act. But the proof cannot be expected to be of mathematical certainty. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held the above position in the case ***H.Venkatachala Iyengar -vs- B.N.Thimmajamma*** reported in AIR 1959 SC 443.

27. The other suspicious circumstances raised by the learned counsel for the appellant is that the testator has not signed each of the page of the Will and he had signed only at the last page of the Will. This position has already been well settled in many decisions rendered. In this regard, it is worthwhile to make a reference of the judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court held in ***Ammu Balachandran -vs- U.T.Joseph(died) and Ors*** reported in ***AIR 1996 Madras 442*** on this aspect. In the said judgment, it is held that the Will is only a declaration of the last Will of the testator; once the signature is affixed, on the last page itself would be sufficient. The relevant part of the judgment under para 49 is extracted hereunder:-

49. The third suspicious circumstance alleged by the appellant is that there is unnatural bequest provided in Ex. P-1. In this



WEB COPY



S.A. No. 588 of 2010

connection, it is better to look into the law reported in AIR 1962 Andh Pra 180 (sic), where a Division Bench of that High Court, following the earlier decisions, has held thus:—

“As to the second rule formulated by Baron Parke, it has been pointed out by Lindley and Davy L. JJ. in Tyrrell v. Painton, 1894 p. 151 that it is not confined merely to a case in which a Will is prepared by or on instructions of the person taking large benefits under it, but, extends to all cases in which circumstances exist which excite the suspicion of the Court. The principle of the decision in 1894, p. 151 has been consistently upheld in several cases by the Privy Council (vide Sarat Kumari Bibi v. Sakhi Chand, 56 Mad LJ 180 : (AIR 1929 PC 45) and Vellaswamy Servai v. Sivaraman Servai, 58 Mad LJ 114 : (AIR 1930 PC 24)). The suspicion referred to in the decision of 1894, p. 151 must be, as pointed out by Jenkins, C.J”. and Woodroffee, J. in Jarat Kumari Dassi v. Bissessur Dutt, (1912) ILR 39 Cal 245.

“one inherent in the transaction itself, and not the doubt that may arise from a conflict or testimony



WEB COPY



S.A. No. 588 of 2010

which becomes apparent on an investigation of the transaction.”

What these suspicious circumstances are, cannot be defined precisely, or enumerated exhaustively. They must depend necessarily upon the facts of each case. Though a propounder has the obligation to prove the Will in accordance with law and remove all well grounded suspicions, the quantum of proof that can be expected cannot conform to scientific exactitude or mathematical precision. The standard of proof can only be one that will satisfy a normal prudent person.

It may, however, be observed that when a question arises as to whether the Will is genuine or a forgery, normally the fact that nothing can be said against the reasonable nature of the provisions will be a strong and material element in favour of the probability of the Will (vide Bamasundari Debi v. Tara Sundari Debi, (1892) ILR 19 Cal 65 (PC)). In Mt. Jagrani Koer v. Durga Parshad, ILR 36 All 93 at p. 98: (AIR 1914 All 72) (PC). Lord Shaw observed as follows:—

“In the case of a Will reasonable, natural and proper in its terms, it is not in accordance with sound rules of



WEB COPY



S.A. No. 588 of 2019

construction to apply to it those canons which demand a rigorous scrutiny of documents of which the opposite can be said, namely, that they are unnatural, unreasonable, or tinged with impropriety.”

These principles long established by the wisdom of the Judges of the Highest Courts are not valued only for general guidance, for ultimately, whether a Will has been really executed by the testator in a sound and disposing state of mind is purely a question of fact which will have to be decided in each case on the circumstances disclosed and on the nature and quality of the evidence adduced.”

28. In fact, the above judgment makes out the distinction between the standards adopted in the English Law and Indian Succession Act. In English Law, no Will can be valid unless it was signed at the foot or end of the Will. Insofar as the Indian Succession Law is concerned, the signature need not be at the end of the Will. When the Will is executed in a vernacular language, it is usual to put the signature on the top of the Will and that would also make the Will valid. So the above point that the testator did not sign at each of the pages alone cannot be considered as doubtful circumstance to discredit the



genuineness of the Will.

WEB COPY

29. The next point that was argued on behalf of the appellant is that the recitals of the Will would show that the testator had handed over the Will to the first defendant. But the first defendant who was examined as PW2 has stated that the Will was given to him only after the death of the testator. Just because the testator has handed over the Will to DW2 instead of the first defendant contrary to the recitals, the genuineness of the Will cannot be suspected. The testator could have changed his mind and handed over the Will to one of the attestators of the DW1. So, that cannot be the reason for suspecting the genuineness of the Will.

30. Insofar as the role played by the DW3 is concerned, he has signed as a person who prepared the Will. Even though the testator has brought the Will by preparing DW3 had approved its correctness and affixed his signature with seal. DW3's evidence has to be read along with the other evidence on record. The lack of details in the Notary seal affixed by DW3 can be of no consequence and that cannot be considered as a only circumstance on which the genuineness of the Will should be suspected.



WEB COPY

31. DW1 has been examined as one of the attesting witness in compliance of Section 68 of the Indian Evidence Act and the attesting witness has also deposed evidence that he has seen the testator signing the Will in his presence and that would show that the Will has been executed in terms of the Section 63(c) of the Indian Succession Act.

32. The holistic reading of the evidence available on record would only satisfy a prudent mind that the Will came to be in existence only at the instance of the testator and there is no fraud proved to have been played. Hence, no suspicion can be attached to the same. As the Courts below had rightly appreciated the merits of the matter and had chosen to dismiss the suit filed by the appellant. As the First Appellate Court had also applied its mind while appreciating the correctness of the judgment of the trial Court and confirmed the same, I find no reason for interference.

33. As the Courts below have done the rightful exercise and only thereafter they had chosen not to grant the relief as sought by the plaintiff, I find the substantial question of law against the appellant.



S.A. No. 588 of 2012

34. In view of the above stated reasons, the second appeal stands dismissed by confirming the judgment and decree dated 06.11.2012 made in A.S. No.29 of 2012 on the file of the I Additional Subordinate Judge, Coimbatore. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. No costs.

Index : Yes/No
Speaking order : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No

20.01.2025

Maya



WEB COPY



S.A. No. 588 of 2013

R.N.MANJULA, J.

Maya

To

1. I Additional Subordinate Judge,
Coimbatore.
2. The Principal District Munsif,
Coimbatore.
3. The Section Officer,
V.R. Section,
High Court, Madras.

S.A. No. 588 of 2013

20.01.2025