

**AMENDED FAIR COPY**

IN THE COURT OF THE HON'BLE II ADDL DISTRICT JUDGE;  
RANGA REDDY DISTRICT:  
AT L.B.NAGAR

OS.NO 206 OF 2014

Between :

G.Pushpamma, W/o Srisailam  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Housewife,  
R/o Kanapur Village, RajendraNagar  
Mandal, Rangareddy District.

...Plaintiff

AND

1. Satyamma, W/o Anjaiah  
aged about 72 Years, Occ: House hold,  
R/o Narsaguda Village, Maheshwaram Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
2. K.Sunetha, W/o Satyanarayana  
aged about 45 Years, Occ: House hold,  
R/o Narsingi Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
3. K.Pochamma, W/o Venkataiah  
aged about 42 Years, Occ: House hold,  
R/o Narsingi Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
4. Anjaneyulu., S/o Gopaiah  
aged about 52 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
5. Bakka Bhagyamma W/o Bishamaiah  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
6. Laxminarayana., S/o Gopaiah  
aged about 48 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
7. Sakamma, W/o Anjaiah  
aged about 46 Years, Occ: House hold,  
R/o Kalvakole Village, Maheshwaram Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
8. P.Gandamma, W/o Pochamalla  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: House hold,  
R/o Idhresham Village, Patanchru Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
9. A Balraj, S/o Pentaiah  
aged about 60 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District

10. Balamma, W/o Rajesh  
aged about 58 Years, Occ: House wife,  
R/o Moosapet, Hyderabad
11. Mallamma, W/o Narsimha  
aged about 55 Years, Occ: Housewife,  
R/o Kukatpally, Hyderabad
12. Yashoda A W/o Jagan,  
aged about 38 Years, Occ: Housewife,  
Kokapet Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
13. Srisailam, S/o Pentaiah  
aged about 40 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
Kokapet Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
14. A.Narayana, S/o Pochaiah,  
aged about 52 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
15. Ch Anjamma, W/o Venkataiah  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Narsingi Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
16. Sarada, W/o Mallesh  
aged about 42 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Jankamampet Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
17. A.Mallesh, S/o Pochaiah,  
aged about 38 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
18. Kyathamamma, W/o Krishna  
aged about 35 Years, Occ: Housewife,  
R/o Kothwalguda Village, Shamshabad Mandla, Rangareddy District,
19. A.Shanker, S/o Narsimha  
aged about 25 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
20. C.Manga, W/o Kumar,  
aged about 24 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Narsingi Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District.
21. A.Durgesh, S/o Narsimha,  
aged about 22 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
22. A.Anjaiah, S/o Pochaiah,  
aged about 55 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNgar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District





- 23 M.Venkatamma, W/o Chandraiah,  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Nagireddy guda Village, Moinabad mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 24 A.Parvathamma, W/o Eshwariah,  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: House wife,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
- 25 A.Nagesh, S/o Pochaiah,  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
Rangareddy District
- 26 K.Yadamma, W/o Sriramulu,  
aged about 52 Years, Occ: Housewife,  
R/o Narsingi Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 27 Krishna, S/o Sailoo,  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 28 Ailamma, W/o Balraju,  
aged about 48 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Narsaguda Village, Maheshwaram Mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 29 A.Kumar, S/o Sailo  
aged about 46 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 30 A.Ravi, S/o Sailo  
aged about 44 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 31 A.Narsimha, S/o Sailo  
aged about 42 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 32 Jangamma, W/o Ramulu  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Gaganpahaed Village, RajendraNagar Mandal,  
RangaReddy District.
- 33 A.Srinivas, S/o Venkatiah  
aged about 48 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 34 Gandamma, W/o Siddulu  
aged about 46 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Narkoda Village, Shamshabad Mandal, RangaReddy District.
- 35 A. Ramu, S/o Sailo  
aged about 42 Years, Occ: Agricultur,  
R/o Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar  
Mandal, Rangareddy Distgrict



36. K.Dashrath, S/o K.Venkatiah  
aged about 75 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o KoKapet Village, Rajendranga  
Mandal, Rangareddy District.
37. P.Anjaiah, S/o P.Rajamallu  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Agricultural,  
R/o Kodicharala Village, Kothur Mandal,  
MahaboobNagar District
38. GAR Constructions Pvt Ltd  
Rep its Director i.e G.Amarender Reddy,  
S/o Late Sudhakar Reddy,  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Buisness,  
R/o Plot No 1305, Road No 65, Jubille Hills, Hyderabad-33
39. Humera Fathima, W/o Md Bharuddin,  
aged about 40 Years, Occ: house wife,  
R/o H.No 16-2-740/C,/9, Asmanghat,  
Malakpet, Hyderabad,
40. Sudha Rathnamala, W/o Krishnaprasad  
aged about 58 Years, Occ: house wife,  
R/o H.No 10-76, Royal Nagar Extention,  
TUDA Layout, Tirupathi, Chituru District.
41. G.Ranadhir Ramreddy, S/o R.AmarenderReddy  
aged about 29 Years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Plot No 1305, Road No 65, Jubille Hills, Hyderabad-33
42. A.Rangareddy, S/o Late Venkatreddy  
aged about 75 Years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Plot No 50, Sukamani Bilding,  
Anand Agencies, S.P.Raoad, Secbad.
43. L.Samba Shiva Rao, S/o L.V.V Prasad,  
aged about 50 Years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Plot No 839- G. Road No 42, Jubille Hills, Hyderabad-33
44. G.Rajesh, S/o Gopalkrishna  
aged about 45 Years, Occ: Business,  
C/o G.RamakirshnaRAo, R/o Plot No 352, VivekaNada Nagar,  
Kukatpally, Hyderabad-33
45. GAR Property Holdings Pvt Ltd.,  
Rep by its Director, i.e N.Srinivas, S/o N.Satyanarayana  
aged about 55 Years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Flat No 410, Mount Santoshi Apartments,  
Mayurui Marg, Begumpet, Hyderabad
46. Smt Swatha, W/o KrishnamaRaju  
aged about 33 Years, Occ: House wife  
R/o H.No 2-159//9, Prapurna Encluve, Jeedimental,  
Medchak raod, Rangareddy District.
47. Gotham, S/o B.L.N Raju  
aged about 28 Years, Occ: Business  
R/o H.No 402, CRSS Estate, Hitck City,  
Madapur, Hyderabad.





- 48 B.Sathyavathi, W/o Late Ravivarama,  
aged about 62 Years, Occ: Housewife  
R/o Flat No 102, Subhagya Residence;  
64-A, Vengalrao Nagar, Hyderabad.
- 49 M/s Maskhan Eng Pvt Ltd.,  
Rep by it SrinivasRao  
R/o Flat No 410, Mount Santoshi Apartments,  
Mayurui Marg, Begumpet, Hyderabad.
- 50 Smt Ramadevi W/o M.SrinivasRao  
R/o Flat No 410, Mount Santoshi Apartments,  
Mayurui Marg, Begumpet, Hyderabad
- 51, M/s Babukhan Heights, a Registered Partnership firm  
Rep by Its. Mangaing Parter Mr Mansoor Babu Khan,  
S/o Ghiasuddin Babu Kham, aged about 40 years,  
Occ Business, R/o 100, Road No 7, Banjara hills, Hyderabad.

Amended as per  
order In IA.No of  
2016 dated 16/6/17

....Defendants

**CLAIM : SUIT FOR PARTITION AND SEPERATE POSSESSION**  
**PLAINT FILED UNDER SECTION 26 ORDER VII RULE 1 OF C.P.C.**

**I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PLAINTIFFS**

The description of the Plaintiffs and address for the purpose service of all processes, notices etc., is the same as above mentioned in the cause title and that of his counsel M/s N.Harigopal, Advocate, # Flat No101, Ist Floor, Satya Durga Heaven, OPP: Gandhi Law College, L.B.Nagar, Hyderabad. Ph 9959322088.

**II. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEFENDANTS**

The description of the defendants and addresses for the purpose of service of all processes, notices etc., is the same as above mentioned in the cause title.

**III. THE ABOVE NAMED PLAINTIFFS MOST HUMBLY BEGS TO SUBMITS AS UNDER :**

1) That the Plaintiff and Defendant No.1 to 35 are legal heirs of late Nagaiah who is father of the Defendant No1 and Grandfather of the Plaintiff and defendants No 2 to 35, the late Nagaiah is died leaving behind the

Plaintiff and defendant No 1 to 35. The Plaintiff and Defendant are joint owners and possessors of the agricultural land in Sy.No. 107, Admeasuring Ac 14-23Gts, **and land in Sy.NO 106 Admeasuring Ac 10-34gnts**, situated at Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. Which is more clearly delineated in the schedule of property hereunder and herein after termed as Suit Schedule property.

Amended as Per orders in IA.No 146 of 2017  
dated 6/2/2018

2) The suit schedule property was originally lying in the name of the late A.Nagaiah, who is the grandfather of Plaintiff and defendants No 2 to 35. The suit schedule properties are ancestral properties of the Plaintiff and defendants. That the Plaintiff and defendants are born Hindus and governed by the Hindu Law.

3) The Plaintiff submitted that the suit schedule properties is ancestral properties and no partition was affected. That the Plaintiff made several demand to the defendants No 1 to 35, but the defendants No 1 to 35 not respond for the partition of the suit schedule properties. The Plaintiff submits that the properties which are more clearly described suit schedule property were the ancestral properties and the Plaintiff are entitled for partition of the same with the defendants No 1 to 35 herein. On 20-12-2013 the Plaintiff herein had requested the defendants No 1 to 35 to partition their share of properties so as take the assets for his convenience. The defendants No 1 to 35 were evading the demand of the Plaintiff on one or the other pretext with an intention knock away the share of the Plaintiff though they are qualified.

4) The Plaintiff submits that the Plaintiffs and defendants No 1 to 35 are joint owners and coparceners in respect of the suit schedule property. The Plaintiff and defendants No 1 to 35 are enjoying the suit schedule property jointly without any partition with metes and bounds. As such the Plaintiff are entitled for partition over the suit schedule property for which the Plaintiff many times requested the defendants herein for partition.

5) The Plaintiff submits that the Plaintiffs and defendants No 1 to 35 are jointly cultivated the suit schedule property and get the yield from the suit schedule property for few years and later stopped the cultivation due to water scarcity no major crops were raised after death of late A.Nagaiah. The defendants name were mentioned in the revenue records as possessor. That the Plaintiff filed the pahanies to prove the same.



6) The Plaintiff submits that the suit schedule property is not partitioned so far and no partition had been affected with metes and bounds in between the Plaintiff and defendants as such they are liable for the partition. That the defendants 1 to 35 with a view to deprive the legitimate right of the Plaintiff in the suit schedule property. In the above circumstances, the Plaintiff felt that it is not desirable to keep the property in joint for any more time, and thus on 22-12-2013 the Plaintiffs herein had demanded the defendants for partition of the suit schedule property to the extent of his share and separate possession of the same.

7) The Plaintiff submits that the Plaintiff approached the Su-Registration office on enquiry the Plaintiff came to know that the Legal heirs of the A.Nagaiah and another have created the alleged sale deed in favour of the Gajula Veeraiah, S/o Late Gopaiah and Shamim Uddin Ansari and the Defendant No 1 to 35 herein in collusion with each other have executed the alleged Reg Sale deed bearing Vide D.No 5369 of 1984 dated 31<sup>st</sup> Aug 1984 and Reg sale deed bearing Vide D.No 5370 of 1984 dated 31<sup>st</sup> day of Aug 1984 and Alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 1164 of 1991 of 1991 dated 14<sup>th</sup> Feb 1991, and Alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 15923/90 dated 5<sup>th</sup> Dec 1990, Alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 5492/05 dated 25<sup>th</sup> Day May 2005, and alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 5938/01 dated 12<sup>th</sup> Day Nov 2001. Under the guise of the alleged Sale deed the Lr's of the Gajula Veeraiah were executed alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing Doc.No 5626 of 2003, Under the guise of the alleged Sale deed the Lr's of the Shamim Uddin Ansari were executed alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing Doc.No 726/2004, dated 28<sup>th</sup> Jan 2004, and alleged Regd Sale deed Doc.No 5172 of 2005 dated 18<sup>th</sup> Day May 2005, Alleged Regd. Sale deed Doc.No 1573/2005, 18<sup>th</sup> day May 2005, Alleged Sale deed Doc.No 5174/05, dated 18<sup>th</sup> May 2005, Alleged Sale deed Doc.No 1617/2011, dated 10<sup>th</sup> June 2011, Alleged Sale deed Doc.No 203/05, dated 12<sup>th</sup> Day Jan 2005, Alleged Sale deed Doc.No 2056/05, dated 24<sup>th</sup> Day Dec 2004, and alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 3581 of 2005 dated 21<sup>st</sup> day of April 2005. But without the notice and knowledge behind the back of the Plaintiff, the defendant No 1 to 35 have created the alleged registered deeds, only with a view to deprive the legitimate right of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property to alienate the same through alleged registered deeds in favour of the defendant no 36 to 50 herein by suppressing the fact of entitlement of share of the plaintiff over the petition schedule property. As such alleged register sale deeds are sham and nominal and not valid in the eye of law and not binding against me towards their share. And further



under the guise of the alleged reg documents the defendant No 36 to 50 in collusion with defendant No 1 to 35 are trying to alienate and trying to change the nature of the suit schedule property with a view of deprive the legitimate right of the Plaintiff over the suit schedule property. As such the defendant No 36 to 50 are also made as parties in the above suit as they are the proper and necessary parties it is submitted that the father of the plaintiff were executed the sale deed in favour of the anybody is illegal and inoperative in the eye of law, as such the alleged transaction in between the defendant are not valid documents. As such there is no need for the Plaintiff to seek the remedy of cancellation of alleged sale deeds.

8) The Plaintiff submits that after knowing the intention of the defendant No 1 to 35, on 20-12-2013 the Plaintiffs approached them and demanded for partition of the suit schedule property. As such it is just and necessary to divided the suit schedule property into equal shares with metes and bounds and to allot one such share to the Plaintiff herein and the Plaintiff is no other alternative remedy except approaching this Hon'ble court by way of filing the present suit for partition and separate possession with metes and bounds.

9) That the Plaintiff submit that the Plaintiff and defendants are in the joint possession of the suit schedule properties and the Plaintiff is entitled to claim separate possession of her share with metes and bounds. The Plaintiff is entitled for share in the suit schedule property. It is pertinent to submit that the parties herein have got joint interest and deemed to be in joint possession over the suit schedule property though the records reveals the name of the late Nagaiah alone. The above facts evidences that the parties hereto are in joint possession and enjoyment over the suit schedule property.

10) The Plaintiff had not filed any suit or suits or any proceedings before any court or other authorities with regard to the suit schedule property and no other matters are pending between these parties for the above said relief. In the above circumstances the Plaintiff is entitled to sue and the defendants are liable to be sued. That the plaintiff have triad their level best to compromise the matter between the defendant No 36 to 50 but the defendant No 36 to 50 not come forward to settled the issue amicable as such it is just and necessary made as the defendants in the above case.



11) The Plaintiff submit that the cause of action arose for the present suit on 20.12.2013 when the Plaintiffs had made continuous, persistent demands and lastly on 22-12-2013 when the Plaintiff had orally demanded for partition and the same is refused by defendants and the same is still subsisting. Thus the present suit for partition and separate possession is well in limitation. But the defendants have not responded for the same.

12) The Plaintiff submit that the suit schedule property is situated at Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District which come with in the periphery of the Ranga Reddy District and thus the Hon'ble court has got territorial and pecuniary jurisdiction to entertain the suit.

13) The Plaintiff submit that the claim of the suit is for partition and separate possession of the suit schedule property and the said property is valued at Rs 21,86,25,000/- and the share of the Plaintiffs being 1/36 share out of the suit schedule property which comes to Rs. 60,72,916/- and 3/4 of the same comes to Rs 45,54,687/- and the properties being in joint possession, it is valued under section 34 (2) of A.P.C.F. and S.V. Act for which a fixed court fees of Rs. 200/- is paid herewith and same is sufficient.

Since the property is undivided Hindu Joint Family property. Consequently the declaration of documents as null and void is ancillary to pray relief as such no court fee required.

It is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble court may be pleased to pass

#### JUDGEMENT AND DECREE of :

a) Preliminary decree to an extent of 1/36 share to the Plaintiff and an extent of 1/6 share to the Defendant No 1 and an extent of 1/36 share to the Defendant No 2 and an extent of 1/42 share to the Defendant No 3 to 8 and an extent of 1/36 share to the Defendant No 9 to 13, and an extent of 1/60 share to the Defendant No 14 to 18, and an extent of 1/180 share to the Defendant No 19 to 21, and an extent of 1/60 share to the Defendant No 22 to 25, and an extent of 1/36 share to the Defendant No 26 to 31, and an extent of 1/24 share to the Defendant No 32 to 35 in the suit schedule property be allotted.

b) Final decree be passed in compliance to the preliminary decree by appointing the advocate commissioner to divide the suit schedule property with metes and bounds and also to deliver the physical possession in favour of the Plaintiff.

c) To declare the sale deed executed by the Defendant No 1 to 35 in favour of the Gajula Veeraiah, S/o Late Gopaiah and Shamim Uddin Ansari and the Defendant No 1 to 35 herein in collusion with each other have cared the alleged Reg Sale deed bearing Vide D.No 5369 of 1984 dated 31<sup>st</sup> Aug 1984 and Reg sale deed bearing Vide D.No 5370 of 1984 dated 31<sup>st</sup> day of Aug 1984 and Alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 1164 of 1991 of 1991 dated 14<sup>th</sup> Feb 1991, and Alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 15923/90 dated 5<sup>th</sup> Dec 1990, Alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 5492/05 dated 25<sup>th</sup> Day May 2005, and alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 5938/01 dated 12<sup>th</sup> Day Nov 2001. Under the guise of the alleged Sale deed the Lr's of the Gajula Vecraiah were executed alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing Doc.No 5626 of 2003, Under the guise of the alleged Sale deed the Lr's of the Shamim Uddin Ansari were executed alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing Doc.No 726/2004, dated 28<sup>th</sup> Jan 2004, and alleged Regd Sale deed Doc.No 5172 of 2005 dated 18<sup>th</sup> Day May 2005, Alleged Regd. Sale deed Doc.No 1573/2005, 18<sup>th</sup> day May 2005, Alleged Sale deed Doc.No 5174/05, dated 18<sup>th</sup> May 2005, Alleged Sale deed Doc.No 1617/2011, dated 10<sup>th</sup> June 2011, Alleged Sale deed Doc.No 203/05, dated 12<sup>th</sup> Day Jan 2005, Alleged Sale deed Doc.No 2056/05, dated 24<sup>th</sup> Day Dec 2004, and alleged Regd. Sale deed bearing vide D.No 3581 of 2005 dated 21<sup>st</sup> day of April 2005 are null and void and he alleged GPA and sale deed are not banding on the plaintiff.

d) Award costs of these proceedings and

e) Pass such other and further order or orders as are deemed fit and proper in the circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice.

Place : L.B.Nagar  
Date : 20-02-2018

Counsel for Plaintiff

Plaintiff



VERIFICATION

I, the, above named Plaintiffs, do hereby declare that the contents stated above in the plaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, hence verified.

Place : L.B.Nagar  
Date : 20-02-2018

Plaintiff

SUIT SCHEDULE PROPERTY-A

All that the agricultural land admeasuring Sy.No. 107/ admeasuring Ac. 14-23 gts, situated at Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District and bounded on:

North : Sheevar Puppalguda  
South : Bulkapur Nala  
East : Sheevar of Puppapl guda  
West : K.K.Pentiaiah and Veeraiah

SUIT SCHEDULE PROPERTY-B

All that the agricultural land admeasuring Sy.No 106 Admeasuring Ac 10-34 gunts, situated at Kokapet Village, RajendraNagar Mandal, RangaReddy District and bounded on:


North : Road Amended as per  
South : Sy.No 104 orders in IA NO 141 of 2016  
East : Balkapur Nala Road dated 6/2/2018  
West : Koakpet Cheruvu S.Y.No 90

VERIFICATION

I, the above named Plaintiff, do hereby declare that the contents stated above in the suit schedule property are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, hence verified.

Place : L.B.Nagar  
Date : 20-02-2018

Plaintiff

  
Counsel for the Plaintiff

LIST OF DOCUMENTS


S.No.	DATE	PARTIES TO THE DOCUMENT	DESCRIPTION OF THE DOCUMENT
1.	-----	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Khasra Pahani for the year 1954-55
2.	-----	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Pahani Patrica for the year 1971-72
3.	-----	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Pahani Patrica for the year 1973-74




4.	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Pahani Patrica for the year 1974-75
5.	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Pahani Patrica for the year 1985-86
6.	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Pahani Patrica for the year 1996-97
	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Pahani Patrica for the year 2009-10
8.	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Pahani Patrica for the year 20012-13
9	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
10	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
11	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
12	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
13	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
14	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
15	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
16	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
17	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
18	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
19	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
20	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
21	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
22	Plaintiffs & Defendants	C.C of Sale deed
23.	Plaintiffs & Defendants	E.C
24	Plaintiffs & Defendants	Valuation Certificate



Place : L.B.Nagar  
Date : 20-02-2018

  
Counsel for the Plaintiff

Plaintiff

READY BY:   
COMPARED BY:  
CERTIFIED TRUE PHOTO COPY

  
Copying Superintendent





S.R. No. 1028/18  
20-02-18

**AMENDED FAIR COPY**

THE COURT OF THE HON'BLE  
II ADDL DISTRICT JUDGE;  
RANGA REDDY DISTRICT  
At L.B.NAGAR

O.S. NO. 206 OF 2014

Between :

Pushpamma

...Plaintiff

AND

Smt Sayamma and others

...Defendants

CLAIM : SUIT FOR PARTITION AND  
SEPARATE POSSESSION

PLAINT FILED UNDER SECTION 26  
ORDER VII RULE 1 OF C.P.C.



*Perind copy  
counsel for defendant  
N. Prasad  
20/2/18*

<b>COURT OF THE DISTRICT &amp; SESSIONS JUDGE</b>	
RANGA REDDY DISTRICT	
CA No.	16018 of 18 20
Application Filed on:	28/6/18
Charges Called on:	6/7/18
Charges Deposited on:	7/7/18
Receipt No.	6037/18 Rs. 150/-
Copy made ready on:	7/7/18
Copy delivered on:	7/7/18
 Superintendent Copying Section Ranga Reddy District.	

FILED ON: 20-02-2018  
FILED BY: COUNSEL FOR  
Plaintiff

M/s. HARI GOPAL NEELA  
Advocates, AP2163/95  
# H.No 11-14-294/1,  
IInd Floor, Sudha Neliam  
SiriNagar, Near Bhagyanagar  
Function Hall, L.B.Nagar,  
Hyderabad. Ph 9959322088