WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 12-11-2026

PRONOUNCED ON : 26-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.KARTHIKEYAN

S.A.No.931 of 2010
CNR:{HCMA010135222010}
and
M.P.No.1 of 2010

Case QR

1. Thandrayan
2. Chandra ..Appellants

Vs

1. Karuppaia
2. Palaniammal
3. Palaniappan
4. Perumal

..Respondents

Prayer: Second Appeal is filed under Section 100 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, against the decree and judgment dated 26.06.2008 passed in A.S.No.77 of 2004 on the file of the Sub Court, Namakkal reversing the decree and judgment dated 21.06.2004 passed in O.S.No.62 of 2000 by the District Munsif Court, Namakkal and District.

For Appellants : Mr. I.C. Vasudevan

For Respondents : Mr.D. Shivakumaran
for R1 and R2

R3 and R4 – *ex parte*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

JUDGMENT

The Plaintiffs, who lost in the First Appeal, have come up with the present Second Appeal.

2. The appellants herein have approached the Learned District Munsif, Namakkal, seeking for the relief of declaration to declare that the plaintiffs and the defendant-3 are together entitled to 2/3rd share in the common well situate in Survey No.164/4 of Bodinaickenpatty Village, Namakkal Taluk, and for a consequential injunction restraining the defendants-1 and 2 and their men, by way of a permanent injunction from preventing the plaintiffs in any manner, installing separately or jointly oil engine or an electric motor to pump out water from the said common well for irrigating the scheduled lands and interdicting the defendants-1 and 2 by a permanent injunction from taking the said common well water for irrigating the lands not intended for irrigation to any land including Survey Nos.163/6, 163/7, 163/9, 163/11 and 163/12 of Bodinaickenpatty Village, not intended for irrigation from the said common well and for costs.

3. It is the specific case of the appellants herein before the Trial Court that the plaintiff-1 and the defendant-3 are brothers. The second plaintiff is the brother's wife of the first plaintiff. According to the appellants, originally the lands purchased by the plaintiffs and the defendants in Survey Nos.164/4 of an

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

extent of 2.53 acres, 162/1A of an extent of 0.42 acres and 162/1B of an extent of 0.25 acres, all in Bodinaickenpatty Village belonged to one A.Raju Udayar family consisting of his sons Subramani, Chinnusamy and Chandrasekaran. The plaintiffs and the defendant-3 purchased the shares of the said Chinnusamy and Chandrasekaran on 22.11.1995, allotted to them in their family partition dated 16.04.1990. While the defendants-1 and 2 purchased the shares belonging to Subramanian *vide* a registered sale deed dated 22.11.1995. The plaintiffs and defendant-3 purchased together as above said land covered under Survey No.164/4 measuring 1 acre 28 cents and 2/3rd common share in 20 cents in Survey No. 164/4 under specific boundaries apart from Survey No. 162/1A, 0 acre 42 cents, Survey No.162/1B 0 acre 25 cents and Survey No.162/1C 0 acre 25 cents. It is the further case of the appellants before the Trial Court that the common well is in existence in the common 20 cents of land in Survey No.164/4 in which the plaintiffs and the defendant-3 are entitled to 2/3rd common share and the defendants 1 and 2 are entitled to 1/3rd common share.

4. The appellants further contended that the defendants 1 and 2 have installed an oil engine in the said common well in which the plaintiffs and defendant-3 have also been permitted to irrigate from the said common well, their lands more fully set out in the schedule appended to the plaint. Recently, there has been a misunderstanding between the plaintiffs on the one hand and the defendants 1 and 2 on the other hand not to utilize the said engine. From

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

December 1999, the plaintiffs had stopped using the oil engine which was used in their terms. The said estranged relationship was due to the result of competition in purchasing the share of third defendant in the scheduled land. Therefore, the third defendant has not joined with the plaintiffs in filing the suit. Since the defendants 1 and 2 have declined to permit the plaintiffs to use their oil engine, the plaintiffs together made an arrangement to install an electric motor after service is obtained. Until then, an oil engine for their use. On 30.01.2000, the defendants 1 and 2 told the appellants that they will not be allowed to use the common well at all as if the plaintiffs have no right to the common well, to use actually as mentioned. The plaintiffs and defendant-3 are entitled to 2/3rd share. The appellants further contended that the defendants-1 and 2 are openly taking the common well water to other lands, not covered for irrigation from the common well, since the plaintiffs discontinued the use of oil engine as aforesaid. Therefore, the appellants herein had come up with the above suit for a declaration and consequential injunctions.

5. The said suit was defended by first defendant by stating that the description of the suit scheduled property and the boundaries shown in the suit scheduled property are not correct. In the partition deed dated 16.04.1990 entered into between the vendors of the plaintiffs, namely, Chinnusamy, Chandrasekar and his father Raju Udayar and their brothers Subramaniam Prabhu, the property details were given wrongly. As on the date of partition

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

deed, no Well was there on the land. As per the said partition deed, a 20 cents of land was allotted for common usage, including digging a Well with regard to the properties described in the Schedule B, C and D. As on the date of partition deed, no Well was situate in the said 20 cents of land allotted for the common purpose. The first defendant had purchased 1 acre 05 cents of land comprised in Survey No.134/4 of Bodinaickenpatty Village along with 1/3rd share in 0.20 cents allotted for common purpose. The second defendant has not purchased any property and she has no share in the properties purchased by the first defendant. The first defendant in the land in his possession dug a Well on his own and used the same for the purpose of irrigation of the land of an extent of 1 acre 05 cents and the land belongs to his wife namely the second defendant comprised in Survey Nos.163/6, 163/7, 163/9, 163/11 and 163/12. The said Well was dug at his costs and utilizes the water for the purpose of irrigation of the above said lands. In this well, neither the plaintiffs nor the third defendant had any right. The first defendant can utilize the said water on his own to any land as per his wish and will. In the partition deed dated 16.04.1990, there is no mention about the well in Survey No.164/4. Even as per the partition deed, the sharers of “B, C, D” schedule requires to dig a well. The land required for passing of water until the digging of well be allowed to be used and thereafter, used for the irrigation by the said sharers. After the digging of the Well, the sharers of the schedule “B” and “D” have to give channel way to the owner of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

lands belong to schedule "C". Therefore, according to the first defendant, there is no Well in the 0.20 cents of land allotted for common usage.

6. Further, the first defendant contended that the plaintiffs have not revealed that when the Well was dug in the said land. While so, in the sale deed, they have claimed that the Well was dug and they have 2/3rd share in the said common well. The said sale deed is between the plaintiffs and their vendor which will not bind the defendants. Only with a view to claim right over the Well dug by the first defendant in his land, they, in their sale deed, claimed as if there is a well in the land of 0.20 cents. In the Well owned by the first defendant, the plaintiffs attempted to erect an oil engine and attempted to irrigate their land which was prevented by the first defendant. The third defendant had purchased the land jointly which they partitioned orally. The land comprised in Survey No.164/4 of an extent of 0.25 cents was allotted to the shares of third defendant and he requested for irrigation by the Well water belongs to the first defendant which he permitted. The third defendant had harvested paddy and after sold it to fourth defendant. To irrigate the shares allotted to the plaintiffs, there is no channel. The plaintiffs having known that the third defendant had already sold their property to fourth defendant, knowingly has filed the suit against the third defendant without impleading the fourth defendant. Therefore, the suit is bad for rejoinder of parties and non-joinder of parties.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

7. The second defendant has adopted the written statement filed by the first defendant. The third defendant did not appear and contest, as he has already sold the property to the fourth defendant. Though originally, the purchaser Perumal was not made as a party, pending suit, he was impleaded as fourth defendant, the fourth defendant, on his impleadment, had filed a separate written statement, however, admitted the case of the first defendant.

8. On the side of the Plaintiffs, the first plaintiff examined himself as P.W-1 and examined his vendor, Chinnusamy, as P.W-2. On the side of the plaintiffs, Ex.A-1 and Ex.A-2 were marked. On the side of the first defendant, the first defendant had examined himself as D.W-1 and exhibited Ex.B-1 to B-3. He examined his vendor, Subramani, as D.W-2. The trial Court has appointed an Advocate Commissioner to find out the physical features of the suit scheduled property. The Advocate Commissioner has filed Ex.C-1 report and Ex.C-2 Plan.

9. The trial Court, after hearing both sides, has decreed the suit in favour of the appellants herein by judgment dated 21.06.2004. Aggrieved by the said Judgment and Decree, the defendants 1 and 2 have preferred an appeal in A.S.No.77 of 2004 before the learned Subordinate Judge, Namakkal and the learned Subordinate Judge, Namakkal has reversed the findings of the Trial Court and dismissed the suit by Judgment and Decree dated 26.06.2008.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Aggrieved by the said decision, the appellants are before this Court with this Second Appeal.

10. On careful perusal of records, it is found that though this Second Appeal was filed in 2010 itself, the Second Appeal was not yet admitted. Therefore, after hearing the learned counsel appearing for the appellants and the respondents, this Court has formulated the following substantial questions of law for the purpose of consideration:

> *(1) Whether the Well situate in a common land could be held as absolutely belonging to one of the co-owner only?*
>
> *(2) Whether the appeal is maintainable by paying the part of the court fees paid by the plaintiff in the suit without giving any reasons and could be construed as a properly valued appeal?*

11. The learned counsel for the appellants contended that Ex.B-1 partition deed clearly discloses that 0.20 cents of land comprised in Survey No.164/4 was set apart for the purpose of common usage of the property set out in the schedules to Ex.B-1 partition deed. The partition deed makes it very clear that the said 0.20 cents of land was set apart only for the purpose of digging a Well for the common usage of all the lands allotted under the partition deed. Though Ex.B-1 partition deed does not reveal the existence of any Well, Ex.A-2 Adangal pertains to Fasli 1403, corresponding to the common era 1993,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

discloses that a Well is situate at Survey No.164/4. Thereafter, in the year 1995, the appellants herein had purchased the properties allotted to the shares of Chinnusamy and Chandrasekaran along with third defendant. The recitals of Ex.A-1 sale deed by and under which the appellants had purchased the property makes it very clear that in Survey No.164/4 they had right over the property of an extent of 0.20 cents and a Well situate in the said 20 cents of land bounded on the north to the property purchased by them, western south to the land belongs to Ammaasi Padayatchi vagaiyara, east to Subramani's land. Therefore, according to the learned counsel for the appellants, Ex.A-1 sale deed and Ex.A-2 adangal clearly discloses the existence of well in the land of an extent of 20 cents comprised in Survey No.164/4 set apart for the purpose of common usage and digging of well.

12. According to the learned counsel for the appellants, an oil engine was erected in the said well by the defendants and the plaintiffs and the third defendant had used the water from the said well for the purpose of irrigation until December 1999. Only thereafter, the problem arose. P.W-1 in his chief examination has spoken about the usage of well by him. According to the learned counsel for the appellants, the trial Court on appreciation of evidence has found that the appellants are entitled to 2/3rd share in the common Well and declared their right over the same, along with consequential permanent injunctions sought for. However, the First Appellate Court without considering

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the evidence in its proper perspective has turned down the findings of the trial Court, which according to the learned counsel for the appellants is against the materials placed before the Court. Therefore, the learned counsel for the appellants prays for allowing this appeal.

13. The sum and substance of the written submission of the learned counsel appearing for the respondents are as follows:

13.1. The trial court has taken an erroneous view that there is a recital in the sale deed dated 22.11.1995 about the Well that in the cultivation account for the Fasli 1403 to 1408, there is a mention about the existence of a Well in S.No.164/4 and the trial court misconstrued as if the Well is in the 1.28 acres of land purchased by the plaintiffs and the 3rd defendant.

13.2. Even though in the Commissioner's report and plan, the Well is clearly marked only in that portion of the lands in S.No.164/4 which the defendants 1 & 2 have purchased from Subramani, the trial court has erroneously decreed the suit on 21.04.2004.

13.3. Aggrieved by the same, the defendants 1 & 2 filed an appeal in A.S. No.77 of 2004 on the file of the Sub Court, Namakkal. The defendants 1 & 2 have also filed an application I.A. No.67 of 2008 under Order 44 Rule 21 C.P.C. for reception of additional documents, which is a sale deed dated 24.01.2000 executed by the 3rd defendant in favour of the 4th defendant.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

13.4. It is admitted by both the parties that 20 cents of the land was left in common for digging a Well in future. The lands allotted to Chinnusamy and Chandrasekaran, viz., 1.28 acres was sold to the plaintiffs and the 3rd defendant under Ex.A-1 sale deed dated 22.11.1995.

13.5. It is also admitted that the defendants 1 & 2 purchased another extent of 1.05 acres in the same S.No. 164/4 from another son of Raju Udayar Subramani under Ex.B-3 dated 07.03.1997.

13.6. It is also accepted that 1.05 acres is situated in the northern portion of S.No. 164/4 and the 1.28 acres is situated in the southern portion of S.No.164/4.

13.7. The plaintiffs have failed to prove that the Well is situated in the 20 cents of land earmarked in the partition deed Ex.B-1 dated 16.04.1990. A perusal of all the documents including the Commissioner's report clearly shows that the Well is situated in the North-Eastern corner of S.No. 164/4.

13.8. In paragraph 16 of the judgement, the lower appellate court has thoroughly analysed the boundaries which are shown in each and every one of the documentary evidence and has come to a clear conclusion based upon unassailable facts that the Well is not situate in the 20 cents of land which is earmarked in the sale deed dated 21.11.1995 and that the available evidence

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

shows the existence of the Well in the property purchased by the defendants 1 & 2 under Ex.B-3 dated 07.03.1997.

13.9. The lower appellate court has held that there is no evidence on the plaintiffs' side as to when Subramani, Chinnusamy and Chandrasekaran have dug a Well in the common area of 20 cents, earmarked for the Well as per the sharers in the partition deed dated 16.04.1990.

13.10. The lower appellate court has further held that the sale deed by the 3rd defendant to the 4th defendant which was executed even before filing of the suit contains a recital that in the earlier sale deed, there is an incorrect recital as if there is a Well in the above said 20 cents.

13.11. The lower appellate court has also analysed the cultivation account which contains a recital as if there is an Electric Motor Pump Set and a Well even, though it is the case of the parties that there is only an Oil Engine in the Well and not an Electric Motor. When there is no pleading by either party that there was an Electric Motor in the Well, the wordings in the cultivation account relied upon by the plaintiffs pale into insignificance.

13.12. Even though the PW1 has deposed that the sharers in the partition deed dated 16.04.1990 have dug the Well one year after the partition deed dated 16.04.1990, there is no pleading by the plaintiff as to how the three brothers who have partitioned the land already have dug a Well thereafter and were

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

taking water to the lands of Chinnusamy and Chandrasekaran who are the vendors of the plaintiff and 3rd defendant.

13.13. Even the case of the plaintiffs is that they were permitted by the defendants 1 & 2 to draw water from the Well. The plaintiffs have also admitted that the Oil Engine in the Well belongs to the defendants 1 & 2.

13.14. Further, the Commissioner's report also does not show any semblance of channels for drawing water from the Well to the lands of all the plaintiffs or the 4th defendant. The plaintiffs have not filed any objection to the Commissioner's report saying that the Commissioner has failed to note certain physical features.

13.15. A cumulative effect of these facts clearly show that the Well is not situate in the 20 cents earmarked for the Well in the partition deed dated 16.04.1990 and that the Well is situate only in the land separately purchased by the defendants 1 & 2 on 07.03.1997. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of this second appeal.

14. This Court has given its thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions put forth by either side.

15. On a careful perusal of records, it is found that the appellants herein had approached the learned District Munsif, Namakkal in O.S. No.62/2000 on a specific case that a common Well is in existence in the land

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

comprised in Survey No. 164/4 of an extent of 20 cents set apart for the purpose of the same. The learned counsel for the respondents contended that since the plaintiffs have come up with the above plea that there exists a common Well in 20 cents of land set apart in Survey No.164/4, it is for the plaintiffs to prove the same. As per Section 101 of Evidence Act, the burden is upon the person who approaches the court seeking for a relief. Since the plaintiffs have come up with the suit seeking for a declaratory relief and consequential permanent injunctions, the burden is only on the plaintiffs to prove that there exists a common Well in the land of 0.20 cents set apart for the purpose of common usage under Ex.B-1 partition deed.

16. On a careful perusal of Ex.B-1 partition deed, it is found that 0.20 cents of land were set apart for the purpose of digging of a well and taking the water from the well to the lands allotted under Ex.B-1 partition deed. The recitals makes it very clear that as on the date of execution of Ex.B-1 partition deed i.e., on 16.04.1990, there was no well in existence in the land set apart for the purpose of common usage. According to the learned counsel for the appellants Ex.A-2 adangal meant for the fasli 1403 discloses that in Survey No. 164/4 there exists a well. It is true that Ex.A-2 adangal produced by the plaintiffs discloses the existence of a well in Survey No.164/4. The total extent of the said Survey number, as per the adangal is 1.02.0 Hectare. The corresponding measurement in acre is 2 acre 53 cents. The said adangal

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

discloses that it stood in the name of Rasu Udaiyar, the father of the vendor of the plaintiffs and defendants.

17. It is an admitted case that the plaintiffs and 3rd defendant had purchased to an extent of 1 acre 28 cents vide Ex.A1 sale deed dated 22.11.1995, and the first defendant had purchased to an extent of 1 acre 05 cents vide Ex.B-3 sale deed. The remaining 0.20 cents were set apart for the purpose of digging of a well.

18. It is the case of the defendants that he has dug a well in the land purchased by him in Survey No.164 /4 of an extent of 1 acre 05 cents. However, no evidence was projected on the side of the defendant to show that he has dug a well in the land purchased by him. The land was purchased by him only in the year 1997 vide Ex.B-3 sale deed. However, the existence of well was recorded under Ex.A-2 adangal issued for the fasli 1403 which is corresponding to the common era 1993. Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the respondents that the Well came into being only after he purchased the property found to be incorrect.

19. However, the First Appellate Court has rejected Ex.A-2 only on the sole ground that it stood in the name of the original owner Rasu Udayar. Merely because the revenue records are not mutated, it cannot be said that the entries in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the adangal receipts are false. Nothing was brought on record by the defendant to discredit the entries in Ex.A-2 Adangal.

20. Further, on careful perusal of Ex.A-1 sale deed, it is found that in the schedule, it is clearly mentioned that in the Survey No.164/4, the land of an extent of 0 acre 20 cents set apart for the purpose of common usage and for digging of Well, the plaintiffs and the third defendant are entitled to 2/3rd right in the land and the well situate therein. Though the existence of Well was not mentioned in Ex.B-3 sale deed, the appellant herein, pending second appeal, recalled D.W-1 and cross-examined him before the First Appellate Court, wherein it is suggested to the witness that Ex.B-3 sale deed and Ex.B-4 sale deed were drafted by one Gopal and with his help in Ex.B-3 the existence of Well was not disclosed. Apart from that, with the connivance of defendant-3, in Ex.B-4 it was mentioned that the existence of Well stated in Ex.A-1 sale deed was wrongly mentioned. The said document came into being only after the controversies between the parties started and therefore, no importance can be attached to the said recitals.

21. From the documentary evidence projected, it is clear that even before the first defendant purchased the property in the year 1997 under Ex.B-3 sale deed, a Well was in existence in Survey No. 164/4 which was mentioned in Ex.A-1 Sale Deed and Ex.A-2 Adangal. Ex.A-2 is being a public document

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

cannot be doubted. It is pertinent to mention here that the lands comprised in Survey No.164/4 are nanja land (dry land). In nanja land, the cultivation will be done with the help of rain water or by way of Well water or bore Well water. Ex.A-2 adangal clearly discloses that in Survey No.164/4, coconut trees and groundnut were cultivated. Without water, there cannot be any cultivation in the nanja land, especially, coconut trees require more water. Therefore, it is clearly established by the Plaintiffs that there exists a Well even before the first defendant had purchased 1.05 acres of land from his vendor in the year 1997.

22. Apart from that the plaintiffs could not have anticipated in the year 1995 itself that the first defendant would purchase the property in the year 1997, would dig a Well thereafter and could have inserted the existence of well in Ex.A-1 sale deed. But on the reverse, the defendant having noted that there exists a well can omit the same in his sale deed which was later in point of time.

23. It is pertinent to mention here that the existence of well is not disputed by the defendant. It is the case of the defendant that the said well was dug by him after he purchased the said property from and out of his own money. Since the plaintiff has discharged the burden placed upon them by placing reliance upon Ex.A-1 and Ex.A-2, now the onus shifts to the defendant to prove the fact that he, in fact, dug a well in his land at his own costs. Except the oral claim of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the defendant, the defendant has not produced any material to show that he has dug a well in his land after the purchase.

24. Though the learned counsel for the defendant contended that the First Appellate Court on facts found that the Well situate on the 2 acres 05 cents of land situate on the north eastern side of the Survey No.164/4. The said finding cannot be unsettled unless it is perverse, this court, on careful perusal of records particularly Ex.C-2 plan found that the Well is situate on the north eastern side of the survey No.164/4. Therefore, even as found by the First Appellate Court, the Well situate only on the north eastern side and not on the land owned by the first defendant. Without any acceptable evidence, on erroneous calculation of the measurements, the First Appellate Court recorded its finding as if the well situate in the land of the defendants. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the findings of the Trial Court is to be restored and the findings of the First Appellate Court is to be interfered with.

25. Accordingly, the first substantial question of law is answered in favour of the appellant and as against the respondents.

26. The second question of law is relating to payment of Court fee before the First Appellate Court. According to the learned counsel for the appellant, the respondent herein had not paid proper Court Fee before the First Appellate Court and therefore, the First Appeal itself is not maintainable for

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

want of proper Court fee. However, on careful perusal of records, it is found that the said issue was not raised before the First Appellate Court. Without raising the said issue before the First Appellate Court, it is too late to raise the same before this Court.

27. Further, on a careful perusal of records, it is found that though the Trial Court has granted the relief sought for by the plaintiffs in the plaint in toto, while drafting a decree, it appears that the Drafting Section has omitted one of the reliefs granted in the decree. As per Order XX, Rule 6 of CPC, a decree shall agree with the judgment. Therefore, an omission in incorporating the relief granted in the decree can be suitably amended subsequently by filing an application under Section 152 of CPC. However, it appears that no such application was filed before the trial Court to amend the decree which was drafted with aforesaid error.

28. Further, it is curious to note that the defendants, while filing an appeal before the First Appellate Court have not challenged the said relief on the ground that the said relief was not granted by way of decree. In this connection, an endorsement was also made by the appellants and the appeal was valued with regard to the reliefs mentioned in the decree. It appears that the Registry of the Principal Sub-Court has admitted the said endorsement and numbered the appeal. As stated supra, a decree shall agree with the judgment

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

and if the decree is not in agreement with the judgment, the First Appellate Court should have directed the appellants/defendants to seek for an amendment in consonance with the judgment. Without directing the appellants/defendants to rectify the decree, the First Appellate Court has erroneously accepted the method adopted by the appellants/defendants.

29. The First Appellate Court, in its judgment, has commented that either the plaintiffs or the defendants have taken steps to amend the decree. However, it has lost sight of the legal position that, the Court need not wait for an application to be filed in this regard, the First Appellate Court being an Appellate Court can very well amend the decree by invoking the power under Section 152 of CPC as the appeal is nothing but a continuation of the suit.

30. Or else, it can very well direct the trial Court to amend the decree and to submit. However, since the First Appellate Court found that the respondents are not entitled to declaratory relief, it has come to the conclusion that the respondents are not entitled to the consequential permanent injunctions also. Therefore, the fact remains that the relief which was granted by the trial Court with regard to the permanent injunction restraining the respondents herein from taking the water to the lands unconnected to the survey numbers referred to in Ex.B1 partition deed shall remain unchallenged.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

31. Therefore, from the above, it is clear that the court fee was paid on erroneous belief that one of the injunction was not granted by the Trial Court as the decree does not indicate the same. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the court fee was paid only with regard to the reliefs challenged. Hence, it is proper. Accordingly, the said issue is answered.

32. In the result, the present Second Appeal is allowed. The judgment and decree dated 26.06.2008 passed in A.S.No.77 of 2004 on the file of the Sub Court, Namakkal reversing the decree and judgment dated 21.06.2004 passed in O.S.No.62 of 2000 by the District Munsif Court, Namakkal District is set aside. The suit in O.S.No.62 of 2000 is decreed as prayed for. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

26-11-2026

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

srm

To

1.The Sub Court,
Namakkal.

2.The District Munsif Court
Namakkal District.

3.The Section Officer,
V.R. Section,
Madras High Court.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

S.KARTHIKEYAN J.

SRM

Judgment made in
S.A.No.931 of 2010

26-11-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis