

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 5<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2026**

**PRESENT**

**THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU**

**WRIT APPEAL NO.70 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)**

**C/W.**

**CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO.1380 of 2024**

**IN WA NO.70/2025:**

**BETWEEN:**

- 1 . STATE OF KARNATAKA  
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY  
REVENUE DEPARTMENT  
M.S. BUILDING  
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI  
BENGALURU-560 001
- 2 . THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT  
DEVANAHALLI TALUK-562 110
- 3 . THE TAHSILDAR  
DEVANAHALLI TALUK  
DEVANAHALLI  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-562 110
- 4 . STATE OF KARNATAKA  
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY  
DEPT. OF HORTICULTURE  
M.S. BUILDING

DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI  
BENGALURU-560 001

...APPELLANTS

(BY SHRI. I. THARANATH POOJARY, AAG ALONG WITH  
SMT. PRAMODHINI KISHAN, AGA)

**AND:**

- 1 . SRI. MUNIYAPPA  
S/O NANJAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS  
R/O. CHIKKASANNE  
KASABA HOBLI  
DEVANAHALLI TALUK  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-562 110
- 2 . SMT. PARVATHAMMA  
W/O MUNIYAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS  
R/O. CHIKKASANNE  
KASABA HOBLI  
DEVANAHALLI TALUK  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-562 110
- 3 . SMT. KAMALAMMA  
D/O LATE VENKATAMMA  
W/O NARASIMACHARI  
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS  
R/AT No.619, 1<sup>ST</sup> MAIN  
2<sup>ND</sup> CROSS, CHAMARAJPET  
BENGALURU-560 018
- 4 . SRI. VISHWANATH A.  
S/O LATE ANJINAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS  
RESIDING AT. 741/4

1<sup>ST</sup> MAIN, 1<sup>ST</sup> CROSS  
M.M. LAYOUT, KAVALBYRASANDRA  
BENGALURU NORTH  
BENGALURU-560 032

- 5 . SMT. NETRAVATHI A.  
D/O LATE ANJINAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS  
RESIDING AT. 741/4  
1<sup>ST</sup> MAIN, 1<sup>ST</sup> CROSS  
M.M. LAYOUT, KAVALBYRASANDRA  
BENGALURU NORTH  
BENGALURU-560 032
- 6 . SRI. N. GOPAL  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF HORTICULTURE  
DEVANAHALLI  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-562 110
- 7 . SRI. GUNAVANTHA  
OFFICE OF HORTICULTURE  
DEVANAHALLI  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT - 562 110

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI. H.N. MANJUNATH PRASAD, ADV., FOR R1 TO R5;  
SHRI. H.T. VASANTH KUMAR, ADV., FOR R6 & R7)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE  
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, 1964, PRAYING TO SET-ASIDE  
THE ORDER DATED 26.03.2024, PASSED BY THE LEARNED  
SINGLE JUDGE IN W.P.No.3776/2024 (KLR-RES) AND ETC.

**IN CCC No.1380/2024:****BETWEEN:**

- 1 . SRI. MUNIYAPPA  
S/O LATE NANJAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS  
R/O. CHIKKASANNE  
KASABA HOBLI  
DEVANAHALLI TALUK  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-562 110
  
- 2 . SMT. PARVATHAMMA  
W/O MUNIYAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS  
R/O. CHIKKASANNE  
KASABA HOBLI  
DEVANAHALLI TALUK  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-562 110
  
- 3 . SMT. KAMALAMMA  
D/O LATE VENKATAMMA  
W/O NARASIMACHARI  
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS  
R/AT No.619, 1<sup>ST</sup> MAIN  
2<sup>ND</sup> CROSS, CHAMARAJPET  
BENGALURU-560 018
  
- 4 . SRI. VISHWANATH A.  
S/O LATE ANJINAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS

R/AT. 741/4, 1<sup>ST</sup> MAIN  
1<sup>ST</sup> CROSS  
M.M. LAYOUT  
KAVALBYRASANDRA  
BENGALURU NORTH  
BENGALURU-560 032

- 5 . SMT. NETRAVATHI A.  
D/O LATE ANJINAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS  
R/AT. 741/4, 1<sup>ST</sup> MAIN  
1<sup>ST</sup> CROSS  
M.M. LAYOUT  
KAVALBYRASANDRA  
BENGALURU NORTH  
BENGALURU-560 032

...COMPLAINANTS

(BY SHRI. H.N. MANJUNATH PRASAD, ADV.)

**AND:**

- 1 . SRI. BALAKRISHNA H.  
THE TAHSILDAR  
DEVANAHALLI TALUK  
DEVANAHALLI  
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT-562 110

...ACCUSED

- 2 . STATE OF KARNATAKA  
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY

REVENUE DEPARTMENT  
M.S. BUILDING  
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI  
BENGALURU-560 001

...PROFORMA RESPONDENT

(BY SHRI. I. THARANATH POOJARY, AAG ALONG WITH  
SMT. PRAMODHINI KISHAN, AGA)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE  
CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, PRAYING TO TAKE ACTION  
AGAINST THE ACCUSED FOR SHOWING WILFUL DISOBEDIENCE  
TO THE ORDER DATED 26.03.2024 PASSED BY THIS COURT IN  
WP No.3776/2024 (KLR-RES).

THIS WRIT APPEAL AND CCC HAVING BEEN HEARD AND  
RESERVED FOR JUDGMENT ON 30.04.2026 AND COMING ON FOR  
PRONOUNCEMENT OF JUDGMENT THIS DAY, **ANU SIVARAMAN  
J.**, PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN  
AND  
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

**CAV JUDGMENT****(PER: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN)**

This Writ Appeal is filed challenging the Order dated 26.03.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in Writ Petition No.3776/2024 (KLR-RES). By the judgment appealed against, the learned Single Judge allowed the writ petition, set aside the impugned endorsements and directed respondent No.3 - Tahasildar to carry out the phodi and durasthi in respect of the properties granted to the writ petitioners as directed by Order dated 10.08.2022 in W.P. No.15649/2022.

The Contempt of Court case is filed alleging wilful disobedience of the same Order.

2. We have heard Shri. I. Tharanath Poojary, learned Additional Advocate General along with Smt. Pramodhini Kishan, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the appellants in the Writ Appeal and for accused and proforma respondent in the Contempt of Court case; Shri. H.N. Manjunath Prasad, learned counsel appearing for respondents No.1 to 5 in the Writ Appeal and

for the complainants in the Contempt of Court case and Shri. H.T. Vasanth Kumar, learned counsel appearing for respondents No.6 and 7.

3. The brief facts are as follows:-

The subject matter of the current appeal pertains to land bearing Sy.No.21 of Poojanahalli Village, Kasaba Hobli, Devanahalli Taluk, Bengaluru Rural District, measuring in all 17 acres, which was granted in favour of seven grantees in the year 1984. The said extent came to be divided amongst the grantees as follows:

- (i) 4 acres to respondent No.1 – Shri N. Muniyappa;
- (ii) 2 acres to respondent No.2 – Smt. Parvathamma;
- (iii) 2 acres to Smt. Venkatamma, mother of respondent No.3;
- (iv) 2 acres to Shri Anjinappa, father of respondents No.4 and 5;
- (v) 3 acres to Shri Munikrishnappa;
- (vi) 2 acres to Smt. Laxmamma; and
- (vii) 2 acres to Shri Achappa.

The Deputy Commissioner, Bengaluru Rural District vide Order dated 20.02.2010 cancelled the grants made in favour

of the grantees of the subject land in Sy.No.21. A portion of this land measuring 11 acres 27 guntas was granted to the Horticulture Department on 18.04.2012.

Aggrieved by Order of cancellation, respondents No.1 to 5 preferred an appeal before the Karnataka Appellate Tribunal (Revenue) Bangalore, which was dismissed by a common Order dated 28.09.2012. Being aggrieved by the order of the Karnataka Appellate Tribunal, respondents No.1 to 5 approached this Court by filing W.Ps.No.43477-43480/2012 (KLR-LG). By Order dated 16.01.2013, the learned Single Judge allowed the said Writ Petitions, setting aside the order of cancellation dated 20.10.2010 and the Order of the Karnataka Appellate Tribunal dated 28.09.2012.

The appellants herein, being aggrieved by the Order of the learned Single Judge dated 16.01.2013, preferred W.A.No.4224/2013 and W.As.No.4289-4291/2013 (KLR-LG) before this Court. By Judgment dated 04.07.2019, the Division Bench dismissed the said Writ Appeals and confirmed the order of the learned Single Judge. Thereafter, the appellants filed a Review Petition No.19/2021 in

W.A.No.4224/2013 and W.As.No.4289-4291/2013 which was dismissed by Order dated 25.02.2022. Appellant No.1 - State then filed a Special Leave Petition before the Apex Court registered as Diary No.(S) 40038/2022 against the judgment dated 04.07.2019 which was also dismissed by Order dated 13.03.2023.

After Orders were passed by the Division Bench of this Court, respondents No.1 to 5 made a representation to the Tahasildar, Devanahalli Taluk on 03.03.2022, requesting that Phodi and Durasthi work be carried out. Thereafter, respondents No.1 to 5 filed W.P.No.15649/2022 before this Court seeking a direction to the Tahasildar, Devanahalli Taluk to consider their representations. By Order dated 10.08.2022, this Court disposed of the said Writ Petition granting liberty to the respondents to file an online application before the Tahasildar, Devanahalli Taluk, who was directed to consider the same and do the needful.

Thereafter, by Order dated 25.05.2023 in W.P.No.15649/2022, this Court directed that Phodi and Durasthi work be carried out forthwith. Pursuant thereto, the

appellants undertook the exercise of Phodi and Durasthi work in respect of the subject land. The appellants contended that though handwritten Pahani, Darkasth Register and Computerized RTC were available, the Saguvali Chit, Official Memorandum, Sketch and Challan were not available. The matter was placed before the Missing File Reconstruction Committee. A checklist was prepared by the Tahasildar, Devanahalli and placed before the Assistant Commissioner, Doddaballapura on 14.07.2023.

Thereafter, the Tahasildar, Devanahalli Taluk issued an Endorsement dated 14.12.2023 bearing No.LNDCR 32/2022-23, LNDCR 36/2022-23, LNDCR 37/2022-23 and LNDCR 38/2022-23, communicating to respondents No.1 to 5 that since the required documents were not available, Phodi and Durasthi could not be carried out and that the file had been placed before the Missing File Reconstruction Committee. Aggrieved by the said Endorsements dated 14.12.2023, respondents No.1 to 5 filed W.P.No.3776/2024 (KLR-LG) before this Court seeking to quash the said Endorsements and further seeking a direction to the appellants to carry out

Phodi work in terms of the Orders dated 25.05.2023 in W.P.No.15649/2022.

The learned Single Judge quashed the Endorsements dated 14.12.2023 and directed the Tahasildar, Devanahalli to comply with the directions issued by this Court in W.P.No.15649/2022 by the impugned Order dated 26.03.2024. Being aggrieved by the same, the appellants have preferred the present Writ Appeal.

4. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the appellants contends that the phodi and durasthi work cannot be carried out as directed by the learned Single Judge because the required extent of land is covered by the orders of the Government in favour of seven grantees is physically not available. An affidavit of the Tahasildar, Devanahalli Taluk, is placed on record on 26.02.2026, wherein it is contended at paragraph No.3, which reads as follows:-

*"3. I state that the Appellants have taken various legal and factual grounds in the Writ Appeal in a report submitted to the legislature House Committee wherein information was sought for with respect to grant of lands to the Horticulture department. A detailed report along*

*with sketch was submitted with respect to land bearing Sy.No.21, Poojanahalli Village, Devanahalli Taluk. The survey records reveals that Sy.No.21 of Poojanahalli Village, Kasaba Hobli, Devanahalli totally measures 38 acres 37 guntas only. However, the RTC shows the extent as 41 acres 32 guntas in column No.3. But 41 acres 32 guntas of land is not available and what is available actually is 38 acres 37 guntas only. Out of the said total 38 acres 37 guntas, 21 acres 10 guntas of land is granted to various persons and separately demarcated as Sy.No.70, Sy.No.71, Sy.No.72, Sy.No.73, Sy.No.74, Sy.No.75, Sy.No.76, Sy.No.77, Sy.No.78, Sy.No.79, Sy.No.80, Sy.No.81. Another extent of 5 acres is granted in favour of Horticulture Department as per Official Memorandum dated: 12.07.1973 issued by the Deputy Commissioner. After excluding these 21 acres 10 guntas and 5 acres, what remains in Sy.No.21 of Poojanahalli village is 12 acres 27 guntas only. Therefore 17 acres of land is not at all available in Sy.No.21 of Poojanahalli village as claimed by the Respondent Nos.1 to 5."*

5. The proceedings of the District-Level Committee Meeting for Reconstruction of Missing Files which was held on 27.04.2026 under the Chairmanship of the Deputy Commissioner of Bengaluru Rural District is placed on record. In the said Minutes of the Meeting, it is recorded as under:-

- A report of the Tahasildar as well as the Assistant Commissioner had been sought for and reports have been placed on record by the said officers.
- It is stated in the report of the Tahasildar on the basis of a spot inspection conducted on 26.12.2023 that the applicants are not in actual possession and enjoyment of the said land. It was further stated that the records pertaining to the land grant are not available.
- It is further stated that a Committee addressed a communication to the Government on 22.03.2024 and that the Government in its letter dated 15.06.2024 directed that action shall be taken in accordance with norms of the District-Level Committee.
- It is stated that as per the norms of the District Level Committee, the following documents are required for conduct of the phodi work:-
  - (i) Grant Order;
  - (ii) Grant Register (Special Register of Grants);
  - (iii) Cultivation Certificate (Saguvali Chit);
  - (iv) Register of issuance of Cultivation Certificate;

- (v) Approved Possession survey sketch;
  - (vi) Records of Payment of Valuation/Podi charges; and
  - (vii) RTC (Pahani) and mutation records.
- It is further stated that the authenticity of the Grant Order dated 26.05.1984 had been referred by the Deputy Commissioner, Bengaluru Rural District vide Letter dated 11.03.2026 to the Forensics Science Laboratory Institution and a Report has been received stating that the document is a fabricated record.
  - It is further stated that the Tahsildar had submitted a report stating as follows:-
    - (i) The File numbers of the Tahasildar Office mentioned in the Special Deputy Commissioner Official Memorandum do not tally or correspond with the available records.
    - (ii) The file number cited as that of the Assistant Commissioner Office is not traceable in the registers/records maintained for the year 1982 to 1983.
    - (iii) It is stated that the land in question is in possession of the Horticulture Department.

Further, it is stated as under:-

*"Further, in the Saguvali Cheeti Issue Register, the Tahsildar's order number is shown as LND.SR.63/77-78. However, upon verification of the relevant Darakhastu Register in the office of the Tahsildar, it has been reported that the said serial number does not pertain to Poojanahalli Village, Survey No.21, and instead relates to Survey No.21 of Hoshalli Village, as informed by the Tahsildar.*

*The applicant has also submitted another copy of the application register bearing the same number. In this regard, a communication has been addressed to verify the authenticity of the said application register as stated by the Tahsildar; however, no report has been received in this regard so far, as informed to the meeting.*

*Further, it is stated that, as per the questioned grant order, no original file relating to issuance of Saguvali Chittis is available. However, the applicant has claimed that Saguvali Cheetis were issued in his/her favour and has produced copies thereof before the Hon'ble Deputy Commissioner in the pending proceedings. The Tahsildar has, therefore, addressed a communication to the Forensic Science Laboratory seeking verification of the authenticity of the said Saguvali Cheetis as well as the handwritten RTCs pertaining to the period from 1989-90 to 1996-97. It is informed to the Committee that, so far, the report in this regard has not been received.*

*From the verification of the records produced as grant documents, the following discrepancies have been observed:*

1. *The entries in the Saguvali Cheeti Register refer to unrelated survey numbers.*
2. *The mutation records pertaining to the year 1984-85 do not support the claim of right/entitlement.*
3. *The RTC entries for the period 1989-1997 appear, on prima facie examination, to have been subsequently inserted/entered at a later stage.*

*Further, as per the order dated 26.03.2024 in W.P.No.3776/2024, notices were issued to all the khatedars recorded in the seven RTCs, and the Tahsildar conducted a spot inspection on 25.03.2026. During the course of the spot inspection, the following were observed:*

1. *Some of the applicants present were unable to identify or physically point out the land which they claim to have been granted and over which they allege possession.*
2. *The applicants stated that they are in joint possession of 10.00 acres of land.*
3. *The villagers present at the spot have stated that none of the applicants are in actual possession or enjoyment of the said land, and that the said land is under the custody and possession of the Horticulture Department.*

*Upon consideration of the above facts and circumstances:*

1. *It is evident that the applicants are not in actual possession and enjoyment of the land claimed to have been granted to them.*
2. *No minimum/basic documentary evidence is available to substantiate the claim that the land has been granted in favour of the applicants.*
3. *The documents produced by the applicants appear, on a prima facie examination to be fabricated/forged, documents."*

6. The learned counsel appearing for the private respondents, on the other hand, contended that the plea that the original grant file is "missing" is untenable and cannot be accepted to deny Phodi and Durasthi, since the existence of the grant records have been verified by the Assistant Commissioner. It is further contended that the question of validity of the grants has attained finality through the judgment of the Division Bench and the dismissal of the Review Petition and Special Leave Petition. It is further contended that despite repeated opportunities, extensions of time and two rounds of contempt proceedings, the Phodi and Durasthi directions have not been complied with. Therefore, the writ appeal is an attempt to only re-agitate concluded issues.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the private respondents placed reliance on the following decisions:-

- ***Satish Chander Sharma & Others v. State of Himachal Pradesh & Others*** reported in **2025 INSC 491**;
- ***Israr Ahmad Khan v. Amarnath Prasad & Others*** by order reported in **2026 INSC 209**;
- ***Joint Collector Ranga Reddy District & Another v. D.Narsing Rao and Others***, reported in **(2015) 3 SCC 695**;  
and
- ***Jalim Singh v. Nand Kishore & Others***, by order dated **17.03.2026 in SLP (C)No.20915/2024**.

8. We have given our anxious consideration to the pleadings and the materials on record, including all the material which is belatedly sought to be placed on record by the appellants almost 42 years after the grant in favour of the party respondent was made. The question which arises for consideration is, whether the directions issued by the learned Single Judge require interference in this intra-Court appeal.

9. The undisputed facts have been narrated in the opening paragraphs of this judgment.

10. The grant on which the writ petitioners based their claim was of the year 1984. An order was passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore Rural District, cancelling the grant on 20.02.2010. The said Order was challenged and was set aside by a learned Single Judge of this Court by Annexure H2 - Judgment dated 16.01.2013. It was specifically held by this Court that, while there is power in the Deputy Commissioner to cancel grants made in appropriate circumstances, the *suo moto* power is to be exercised within a reasonable time. Further, it was categorically found that only an extent of 5 acres of land in Sy.No.21 was granted to the Horticulture Department, but the Department is in possession of 18 acres and 6 guntas of land. It was also found that it was on a report of the Assistant Commissioner that the grant was made and there can be no fraud attributed to the writ petitioners. It was therefore held that mere suspicion cannot be a ground for invalidating the grants after 27 years. The orders of cancellation of grant were therefore set aside. The operative portion of the judgment reads as under:-

*"30. In the result, these petitions are allowed. However, if any fresh material comes to the notice of the authorities indicating that the land-grant is obtained by making false or fraudulent representation, it is open to the respondents to initiate the appropriate proceedings therefor. If such proceedings are initiated, it is also open to the petitioners to take such defences as are permissible in law, including the delay and laches. No order as to costs."*

11. The State preferred Writ Appeal and Special Leave Petition, both were unsuccessful. The cancellation of grant was set aside and Review petitions were also dismissed. However, liberty was granted to the appellants to take appropriate action in accordance with law if there is material to show that the grant claimed by the writ petitioners was fraudulent. Even after the dismissal of the SLP on 13.03.2023, no steps were taken by the appellants or the department to substantiate the contention that the grant of 1984 was fraudulent.

12. However, when the private respondents sought action in pursuance of the judgments, their efforts were attempted to be thwarted raising various grounds. It is clear

that the Horticulture Department, which was granted only 5 acres of land in Sy.No.21 of Poojanahalli, was in possession of 18 acres and 6 guntas of land in the said survey number. This fact was clearly recorded by this Court in the judgment relying on the reports and proceedings on record. It is evident that the said department did not give up the illegal possession of land in excess of 5 acres even in spite of the repeated orders issued by this Court. Therefore, the contention that the writ petitioners are not in possession of the granted land is not the one that can legally be taken by the appellants. Further, the belated contention that the grants are not genuine also is not available to the appellants so late in the day, since the reasons now stated also only amount to a suspicion harboured by the authority and no reliable material is placed on record to support the allegation of fraud. A forensic report is now sought to be placed on record, suggesting that there is discrepancy in the signatures of the Deputy Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner in the Grant Certificates relied on by the private respondents. We find absolutely no reason why this

exercise was not conducted within a reasonable time from the date of issue of the same. We are of the opinion that such an exercise, at this distance of time, would not be legally sustainable.

13. The further contention that the 17 acres of land covered by the 1984 grants is not available is an afterthought which also cannot be urged by the appellants, who had suffered the repeated orders by this Court without raising any such contention. It is pertinent to note that the challenge against the orders of cancellation of grant was raised only by the private respondents herein, who are grantees of 10 acres of property. The earlier judgments of this Court have also been rendered with only them on the party array. Therefore, the contention that the entire extent of 17 acres of land is not available need not deter the appellants, since land in excess of 10 acres is admittedly available with the Horticulture Department over and above the 5 acres legally granted to them. It is therefore clear that the effort of the appellants is only to protect the illegal possession of land by the Horticulture Department.

14. It is clear that as on the date of this Order, there is still no order passed in accordance with law, cancelling the grant made in favour of the private respondents No.1 to 5 or their predecessors-in-interest. The grants of the year 1984 still subsist, though permission had been granted by this Court in the 2013 Judgment and thereafter in several orders passed by this Court to take action in accordance with law. In the said circumstances, it is clear that the attempt made by the appellants is only to see that the illegal possession of the granted lands by the Horticulture Department is protected by any means. This is not a conduct expected of the Government in a democratic State and is an abuse of the law and statutory powers.

15. In the above mentioned circumstances, we are of the opinion that the orders passed by the learned Single Judge require no interference. Accordingly:-

- (i) The appeal is ***dismissed***.
- (ii) The appellants are given three months further time to see that the directions issued by the learned Single Judge are complied with.

- (iii) The Contempt of Court Case is ***closed***.  
Liberty is reserved to the complainants to file afresh in case the directions issued herein are not honoured by the appellants.

Pending interlocutory applications in both the matters shall stand *disposed of*.

**Sd/-  
(ANU SIVARAMAN)  
JUDGE**

**Sd/-  
(TARA VITASTA GANJU)  
JUDGE**

cp\*