

ROBUST HOTELS LIMITED

CIN: L55101TN2007PLC062085

Registered Office: No. 365, Anna Salai, Teynampet, Chennai – 600 018.

☎ 044 6100 1256 ✉ info_rhl@sarafhotels.com 🌐 www.robusthotels.in

18th July 2025

To

BSE Limited
Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers,
Dalal Street, Mumbai- 400001

National Stock Exchange of India Ltd.
Exchange Plaza, C-1, Block G,
Bandra Kurla Complex,
Bandra (E), Mumbai-400 051

Type of Security: Equity shares
Scrip Code : 543901

Type of Security: Equity shares
NSE Symbol : RHL

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject : Disclosure under Regulation 30 of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015. ("Listing Regulations")

Pursuant to Regulation 30 of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 (SEBI Listing Regulations) and in accordance with the requirements of sub-para 20 (c) of Para A of Part A & sub-para 8 of Para B of Part A of Schedule III of SEBI Listing Regulations.

We hereby inform you that the Company filed a suit in Madras High Court claiming reimbursement of expenses from M/s. Ramani Hotels Limited (defendant).

In this regard, judgement was pronounced on 15th July 2025 by the Hon'ble Principal judge, Principal commercial court, Chennai, directing the defendant to pay a sum of Rs.34,20,581/- along with applicable taxes with further interest at the rate of nine (9%) percent per annum from the date of plaint till the date of realization. The same was uploaded in the e-court services portal on 17.07.2025.

The copy of the order is enclosed herewith.

Kindly take the above on record.

With regards,

FOR ROBUST HOTELS LIMITED

**YASOTHA
BENAZIR**

Digitally signed by
YASOTHA BENAZIR
Date: 2025.07.18 18:12:23
+05'30'



Yasotha Benazir N

Company Secretary & Compliance Officer

**IN THE PRINCIPAL COMMERCIAL COURT AT EGMORE,
CHENNAI**

**Present : Tmt. Deepthi Arivunithi, M.L.,
Principal Judge**

Tuesday the 15th Day of July 2025.

C.O.S. No.684 / 2022

**O.S.No.2063/2019
(On the file of VII Additional
City Civil Court, Chennai)**

**C.S. No.895 /2017
(On the file of Hon'ble High Court, Madras)**

(C.N.R. NO.TNCH1B –001425-2022)

M/s.Robust Hotels Limited,
Represented by its Vice President and
Company Secretary
T.N.Thanikachalam,
No.365, Anna Salai,
Teynampet,
Chennai – 600 018

Plaintiff

Versus

Ramani Hotels Limited,
365, Anna Salai,
Teynampet,
Chennai – 600 018.

Defendant

This suit was originally filed before the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in C.S. No.895 of 2017. For want of pecuniary jurisdiction, this suit was transferred to City Civil Court, Chennai and allotted to VII Additional City Civil Court, Chennai. It was re-numbered as O.S.No.2063/2019. Based on

commercial nature of the dispute, this suit was transferred to the Commercial Court, Egmore, Chennai and a new COS No.684/2022 has been assigned.

This suit came before me for final hearing on 16.06.2025 in the presence of M/s.K. Harishankar, T.K. Bhaskar, Srinath Sridevan Learned counsel for the plaintiff and M/s. C.Jagadish N.C. Ashok Kumar, S.Uma Maheswari, K.P. Suresh Kumar, S.R.Varun Karthik counsel for the Defendant and upon hearing the submissions of the learned counsel for the plaintiff and defendant and upon perusing the plaint, written statement, written arguments and other documents and having stood over for consideration till this day, this court delivered the following:

JUDGMENT

Plaint filed under Order IV Rule 1 Original Side Rules read with Order VII Rule 1 CPC for recovery of a sum of Rs.34,20,581/- along with applicable taxes and interest at the rate of 18% per annum from 29.05.2013 till the date of realisation and for costs.

Brief averments in the Plaint:

2. The plaintiff is engaged in the business of construction, operation and maintenance of hotels and restaurants. The plaintiff and defendant are the co-owners of the property situated at No.365, Anna Salai, Teynampet, Chennai – 600 018. The property was purchased under the provisions of SARFAESI Act by virtue of Deed of Transfer dated 05.07.2007. The defendant purchased another portion in terms of the Sale Certificate dated 14.03.2008. For the mutual benefit of the plaintiff and defendant as co-owners, several payments were made by the plaintiff to third party vendors during the construction phase of the building. Time to time running account was maintained by the plaintiff regarding the amounts payable by the defendant towards the share of their expenses. On 25.06.2011, the defendant paid a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- into the account of the

plaintiff towards expenses incurred. The plaintiff made payments periodically to various third parties including utility agencies and Debit notes were issued to the defendant from time to time. By letter dated 31.07.2012, debit note for Rs.37,75,107/- was issued for the expenses incurred until 31.07.2012. Another debit note dated 29.05.2013 for a sum of Rs.6,45,474/- was issued for the expenses incurred until 31.03.2012. After adjusting the payments made by the defendant, there is balance Rs.34,20,581/- that is due and payable. Inspite of several reminders, the defendant did not make the payments. Vide letter dated 29.05.2013, the defendant demanded further payments and the same is referred in the letter of the defendant dated 17.01.2015, wherein it was assured that the outstanding amount would be repaid in a phased manner. Since no payments were forthcoming, the plaintiff issued a legal notice dated 15.06.2015. However there was no reply from the defendant. Hence the suit.

Brief averments in the Written statement filed by the Defendant:

3. The defendant filed the written Statement denying the allegations and averments made in the plaint except those that are specifically admitted. The suit is barred by limitation. The suit ought to have been filed on or before 28.05.2016. However the said suit is filed only on 30.11.2017 and therefore has to be dismissed that the suit is barred by limitation. Though the plaintiff and defendant are co-owners, they are fighting suit in C.S.No.758 of 2009 for establishing their rights over the areas and for demarcation of the hotel complex and the shopping complex. Therefore the allegation that payments were made by the plaintiff on behalf of the defendant is baseless. The debit notes are self serving documents and the defendant is not liable to pay any amount under the said debit notes. A sum of Rs.10,00,000/- was paid by the defendant towards property tax assessment for the shopping complex which was originally in the joint names. Hence, the claim of the plaintiff that the amount was towards the

expenses incurred is completely false. The existence of the debit notes are denied and there is no mutuality or agreement between the parties. There is no contract between the plaintiff and the defendant for incurring any expenses in common. The defendant is not bound to make any payments as claimed by the plaintiff. The defendant had separate sewerage connection and has been separately assessed to property tax. The defendant has not signed any acknowledgment of liability or debit notes as claimed. The plaintiff has not established any arrangement between the parties to incur expenditures commonly. The defendant never approached the plaintiff to maintain their shopping complex and the common space. The letter dated 17.01.2015 is signed by one T. Suresh, who was not authorized signatory of the defendant. The letter is without any basis and not binding on the defendant, The legal notice was rightly ignored by the defendant and there is no cause of action to the present suit. The defendant as by letter dated 22.09.2016 specifically warned the plaintiff not to make false claim. Hence the suit be dismissed.

4 Upon hearing both sides and having perused the pleadings on record, this Court framed the following issues for consideration.

1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to get a sum of Rs.34,20,581/- along with applicable taxes and along with interest at the rate of 18% per annum from 29.05.2013 till the date of realisation?

2 .Whether this suit is barred by limitation?

3. To what other relief the plaintiff is entitled for ?

5. Based on the above pleadings and issues, the case was taken up for trial. On behalf of PW1 was examined and Ex.A1 to A12 were marked. On behalf of the defendants DW1 was examined and Ex. B1 to B3 were marked. Heard both sides and perused the written arguments and other materials on record

Issue No. 2:

6. Since the said issue relates to the question of limitation, it is taken up for discussion at the first instance. The brief set of facts necessary for the purpose of this case is as follows. The plaintiff is engaged in the business of construction, operation and maintenance of hotels and restaurants. The plaintiff and the defendant are the co-owners of the property situated at No. 365, Anna Salai, Teynampet, Chennai 600018. The plaintiff purchased the property under the provisions of SARFAESI Act by virtue of a deed of transfer dated 05.07.2007. The defendant also purchased another portion of the property in terms of the Sale certificate dated 14.03.2008. Since the construction was to be made for the mutual benefit of both parties, during the construction phase, the plaintiff made several payments to third party vendors in consultation with the defendant and from time to time a running account was maintained by the defendant towards their share of expenses. On 25.06.2011, the defendant paid a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- towards the expenses incurred by the plaintiff on behalf of the defendant as on that date. The plaintiff made payments periodically to various third parties including to utility agencies and debit notes were issued to the defendant from time to time claiming their share of expenses. On 31.07.2012, the plaintiff issued a debit note for Rs.37,75,107/- with annexures showing various expenses incurred till July 2012 and another debit note was issued on 29.05.2013 for a sum of Rs.6,45,474/- along with annexures showing expenses incurred upto 31.03.2012. After deducting the sum of Rs.10,00,000/-, the balance due as on 29.05.2013 was Rs.34,20,581/-. Despite periodic reminders sent by the plaintiff, the defendant has not made payments leading to the filing of this suit.

7. On the contrary, the defendant would contend that there is a dispute regarding the demarcating of the land and therefore, a suit was filed in C.S. No.

758 of 2009 which is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Madras. It is contended that the plaintiff and the defendant never agreed to share the expenses and the plaintiff has not incurred any expenses on behalf of the defendant. The plaintiff has no cause of action to file the present suit and the plaintiff cannot raise any claim against the defendant merely based on the debit notes. It is the case of the defendant that no acknowledgement of liability was executed by the defendant or any of their authorised representative. The last demand for payment was made by the plaintiff on 25.09.2013. While so, the plaintiff ought to have filed the present suit on or before 24.09.2016. However, the suit was filed only on 13.11.2017. Hence, it is contended that the suit is barred by limitation.

8. With regard to contention relating to the limitation, it is contended by the learned counsel for the plaintiff that the last demand for payment was made by them for payment is on 25.09.2013. While so, on 17.01.2015, one Mr. T. Suresh representing himself as a General Manager has written a letter to the defendant wherein he states that the payments would be released in a phased manner. A perusal of the said letter would show that the said letter amounts to an acknowledgment of liability in terms of Section 18 of the Limitation Act, 1963. Hence, the limitation period has to be reckoned from the said date. While so, the present suit is filed on 13.11.2017 which is very much within the limitation.

9. The learned counsel for the defendant would point out that Mr. T. Suresh was not employed as a General Manager and that he was not issued with any authority to sign letters or issue communication on behalf of the defendant. In this regard, the learned counsel for the plaintiff would state that the plaintiff is protected by the doctrine of indoor management which is an exception to the doctrine of constructive notice. Reliance is placed on the decision reported in (2010) 11 SCC 374; 2024 SCC online Del 8037; 2024 SCC online NCLAT 482; and 2009-1-LW-209. It is contended that as far as the plaintiff is concerned, they

are a third party vis-a-vis the defendant company. Therefore, when Mr. T. Suresh held out as the General Manager of the defendant company the plaintiff had no reason to suspect the same. Hence, since the plaintiff is a third party dealing with the company, it cannot be aware of the constitution or arrangement of the company. As per the doctrine of indoor management, any outsider dealing or contracting with a company is entitled to presume that the internal requirements prescribed in the Memorandum and Articles of Association have been properly observed. It is the specific case of the plaintiff that the said Mr. T. Suresh not only communicated with the plaintiff but also attended the meeting held between the parties. In these circumstances, the plaintiff is entitled to presume that Mr. T. Suresh was duly authorised by the defendant and the plaintiff has to be protected by the doctrine of indoor management.

10. With regard to the contention raised, it is relevant to note that the plaintiff admittedly had contact with one Mr. Balakrishnan. The said fact is affirmed by DW1 at the time of cross examination. It is the case of the defendant that after Mr. Balakrishnan, DW1 was authorised by the defendant herein. DW1 has in his evidence admitted that Mr. T. Suresh was working in the defendant company. Though DW1 has stated that the said person was not the general manager, it was admitted that the said person was working as a Manager. It is also relevant to note that Ex. A6 letter dated 17.01.2015 was issued by Mr. T. Suresh. In the said letter, the said Mr. T. Suresh described himself as GM-Mall. It is not the case of the defendant that the said letter was not signed by the said Mr. T. Suresh or issued by the said person. Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the plaintiff that they are protected by the doctrine of indoor management is well founded and merits consideration.

11. A perusal of Ex. A6 letter dated 17.01.2015 would show the defendant has specifically stated that they would make all the payments due to the plaintiff

on accounts of expenditure for construction and maintenance as per their letter dated 29.05.2013 in a phased manner. The learned counsel for the defendant has placed reliance on the decision reported in 2005 (1) LW 612 to contend that a letter cannot be considered as acknowledgement of liability. However, as per the facts of the said case, the letter therein was sent demanding payment and in that context, it was held that the letter would not amount to acknowledgment of liability. The learned counsel for the plaintiff would rely upon the decisions reported in (2004) 12 SCC 360; AIR 1961 SC 1236 and (1971) 1 SCC 67 to contend that whether the communication is an acknowledgment of liability or not is to be ascertained based on the statements found in the said letter/communication. In view of the contention, this court finds it necessary to go into the contents of Ex. A6. The contents of the letter would show that there is a specific admission with regard to the outstanding amount as referred in Ex. A5 letter and also specific statement that the amounts will be released in a phased manner by the defendant and the said document is also signed by a person holding out himself as a General Manager of the defendant company. Therefore the contents of the letter would show that it amounts to an acknowledgment in writing as per Section 18 of the Limitation Act, 1963. Hence, a fresh period of limitation would commence from 17.01.2015. The contentions with reference to Section 25(3) of the Indian Contract Act, 1872 as advanced by the learned counsel for the defendant cannot be applicable in the present suit, since the acknowledgement of liability is within the limitation period. Hence, the said contention is not discussed herein. The main suit is filed by the plaintiff on 13.11.2017, which is well within the limitation period and therefore, this court finds that the suit is filed in time. As such, the issue is answered.

Issue No. 1:

12. The suit has been filed by the plaintiff claiming a sum of Rs. 34,20,581/- from the defendant. According to the plaintiff, the said amounts were spent by the plaintiff towards the expenses of the defendant and there was an understanding between the parties that the defendant would reimburse the amounts spent by the plaintiff. In order to prove their claim, the plaintiff has marked the following documents. The authorisation letter is marked as Ex. A1. The deed of transfer executed in favour of the plaintiff is marked as Ex. A2. The sale deed of the defendant is marked as Ex. A3. The debit notes issued by the plaintiff to the defendant are marked as Ex. A4 and Ex. A5. The letter of the defendant acknowledging the liability is marked as Ex. A6. The subsequent debit notes issued by the plaintiff is marked as Ex. A7 and Ex. A9. The legal notice sent by the plaintiff is marked as Ex. A8. The letter sent by the defendant to the plaintiff is marked as Ex. A10. The bank statement of the plaintiff is marked as Ex. A11 and the completion certificate issued by CMDA is marked as Ex. A12.. The defendant has produced and marked the board resolution issued in favour of DW1 as Ex. B1. Ex. B2 is the invoice in favour of defendant. Ex. B3 are the letter copies.

13. The fact that the plaintiff and the defendant purchased portions of the same property is not in dispute, the respective sale deeds are filed and marked as Ex. A2 and Ex. A3. According to the plaintiff, common expenditures were incurred by the parties and borne by the plaintiff as per the understanding between them. The defendant agreed to reimburse the expenses incurred by the plaintiff on their behalf. According to the plaintiff, as per the understanding between the parties, the plaintiff incurred expenditure under various heads as detailed in the annexures to the letters in Ex. A4 and Ex. A5. The said expenses were communicated to the defendant. It is also pointed out that the said letters

along with annexures were received by the staff concerned and their signature is also found in the said letter. It is further pointed out that DW1 has in his evidence admitted that the signature was that of one Mr. Balakrishnan and himself. Thus, the plaintiff has informed the defendant not only about the expenses incurred by them but also about the dues payable by the defendant to them. It is pointed out that there was no objection or reply given by the defendant at any point in time during the relevant period denying or objecting to the amounts mentioned in the debit notes. It is further pointed out that by letter dated 17.01.2015, the defendant in fact acknowledged the liability and also agreed to release the amount in a phased manner. Thus, it is contended that though there is no contract or agreement between the parties in strict sense, an agreement/understanding was developed between the parties during the course of communication. Since the defendant admitted the liability, there is no necessity for further proof of the expenditure incurred by the plaintiff. It is also pointed out that it is only based on this understanding between the parties, three amounts were released by the defendant as reflected in Ex. A4. From the email attached to the letter, it is apparent that the defendant has issued two demand drafts on 29.03.2011 for Rs.4,67,500/- and Rs.39,325/- and also paid a sum of Rs.10,00,000/-. It is pointed out that DW1 has also admitted the payment of the said amounts. Hence, it is contended that the plaintiff is entitled to the said amount as prayed for.

14. The learned counsel for the defendant would contend that the plaintiff cannot base their claim on debit notes. It is pointed out that there is no material produced by the plaintiff to show that any expenditure was incurred by them under the heads shown in the statement of accounts. The statement of accounts is only a self serving document and therefore, no claim can be granted on the said basis. The plaintiff has failed to produce any receipt showing actual payments made to third parties. Further, there is agreement or contract between

the parties to show that the defendant asked the plaintiff to undertake any work on their behalf. It is admitted that a suit in C.S. No. 758 of 2009 was filed and pending with regard to demarcation of the suit property and the parties were at logger heads. While so, the claim of the plaintiff that the parties agreed for the plaintiff to undertake works on their behalf is totally unbelievable. It is pointed out that the defendant has during the course of cross examination produced the receipts showing expenses incurred for maintenance of common area for the year 2014. The present suit has been deliberately filed only for two debit notes. As far as two other debit notes are concerned, the plaintiff cleverly avoided to claim the amounts since the falsity of their claims would come to light in view of the documents furnished by the defendant. Hence, it is contended that the plaintiff has failed to prove his claim and that the suit has to be dismissed. Both side counsels have relied upon precedents to support their contentions which shall be referred at the appropriate stages in the discussion.

15. The learned counsel for the defendant has relied upon the decision in 2005 (1) CTC 409 to contend that burden of proof is only upon the plaintiff to prove his case and they cannot succeed by picking holes in the case of the defendant. The same is a settled position of law and it is for the plaintiff to prove their case. In view of the decision cited and the position of law, this court has to now decide whether the plaintiff has proved his case by way of preponderance of probabilities. In the present suit, the receipt and the existence of the debit note is denied in the written statement. The debit notes are produced as Ex. A4 and Ex. A5 in the present suit. The said documents are letters with enclosures claiming the amounts that are said to be due from the defendant. It is relevant to note that the receipt of the said document is acknowledged by the defendant herein. It is also relevant to note that DW1 has in the cross examination identified the signatures and the receipt of the said debit notes. Hence, the plaintiff has shown

that the debit notes were issued by them and also delivered to the defendant along with the annexures.

16. The next aspect that has to be proved by the plaintiff is with regard to their entitlement to the said amounts. In this regard, it is admitted by both parties that there is a dispute between the parties regarding the demarcation of the land and therefore C.S. No 758 of 2009 is filed and pending. It is vehemently contended by the learned counsel for the defendant that the said suit is being pursued by both parties vigorously. It is further contended that when there are pending proceedings before the court of law in which the parties are fighting for their rights, it is unbelievable that the parties agreed to incur common expenses on behalf of the other. In this regard, this court finds it relevant to take note of the evidence of DW1. The said witness DW1 has in his cross examination stated that one Mr. Balakrishnan was appointed by the defendant for the purpose of communicating to the plaintiff and thereafter he was appointed for the purpose of communicating to the Defendant. It is admitted by DW1 that the plaintiff took efforts to obtain the completion certificate for the building and it was agreed that the certificate was issued in joint names. It is also admitted that the plaintiff took efforts to obtain the separate property tax for both parties. From the admissions made by DW1 it is apparent that there was ongoing dialogue between the parties with regard to the building in question. Further, it is admitted by DW1 that they were subject to separate assessment only in the second half of 2011-2012, which is also after the suit in C.S. No. 758 of 2009 was filed.

17. Therefore, from the admissions made by DW1 at the time of cross examination it is apparent that there was communication between the plaintiff and the defendant even after the suit was filed with regard to the demarcation of the suit property. It is also apposite to note that unless there is any need to communicate with the plaintiff, the defendant need not have appointed specific

person to communicate with the plaintiff herein. Therefore, the very fact that DW1 has admitted that there was a liasoning person appointed to communicate with the plaintiff would show that there were ongoing discussions between the parties. It is to be noted that the witness DW1 has selectively admitted the role of one Mr. Balakrishnan and himself. However, the involvement of one Mr. T. Suresh is denied.

18. The said denial is relevant because it is the same Mr. T. Suresh who has signed the letter dated 17.01.2015 on behalf of the defendant admitting the outstanding due as per the letter dated 25.09.2013 marked as Ex. A5 and also stated that the amounts would be released in a phased manner. It is relevant to note that DW1 has admitted the fact that Mr. T. Suresh was a Manager of the defendant. However, it is denied that he was the general manager as found in Ex. A6. It is not the case of the defendant that the said document was fabricated or created by the plaintiff or by the said Mr. T. Suresh. The only defence taken is that he was not authorised to address any letter on behalf of the defendant and that the said letter would not bind the defendant. The fact that the letter was written in the letter head of the defendant company is to be noted. Further, the fact that the said person held out to be the General Manager, Mall has also to be noted. This court has already found that the plaintiff is entitled to the protection by invoking doctrine of indoor management. Therefore, it is seen that the denial is only evasive and cannot be taken into consideration.

19. From Ex. A6, it is apparent that the defendant has categorically admitted the discussion between the parties and also admitted that the amount that remains due and outstanding as per the letter dated 25.09.2013. Hence, in view of the categorical admission in writing, this court finds that the plaintiff has proved that the amounts claimed by them remains outstanding from the defendant as claimed by them under Ex. A4 and Ex. A5. In view of admission,

as per Section 58 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, no further proof is required to be produced by the plaintiff. The learned counsel for the defendant would rely upon the decision reported in 2005 (5) SCC 100 to contend that mere non-denial cannot be taken as admission. The decision quoted was decided on different factual settings. In the present case, there is acknowledgment of liability that is being relied upon with other admissions made by the witness during the cross examination. Hence, the said decision cannot be applied to the facts of the present case.

20. Since there is an admission regarding the outstanding payable, the contentions of the learned counsel for the defendant regarding the claim based on debit notes and whether the suit is maintainable on debit notes needs no further consideration and therefore is not discussed herein.

21. In this regard, it is also to be noted that as rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the plaintiff herein that even in the legal notice in Ex. A8 sent by the plaintiff there is a specific reference to the acknowledgement of liability by the defendant. Though the receipt of the legal notice is admitted by the defendant, as per the averments in the written statement, it is stated that they rightly ignored the legal notice as the claim was untenable. Even in the written statement, the defendant has not state that the letter in Ex. A6 was fabricated or created. Hence, the contentions of the defendant denying the contents of Ex. A6 or denying the authority of the signatory is to be considered only as an afterthought to deny the liability.

For the foregoing reasons, this court finds that the plaintiff has, by way of preponderance of probabilities, shown that they are entitled to the suit claim amount as prayed for. Considering the nature of the transaction, the interest is limited to 9% per annum from the date of plaint till the date of realization. As such, this issue is answered.

Issue No. 3:

22, Since the plaintiff has succeeded in their claim, they are entitled to the costs of the suit. The plaintiff is not entitled to any other relief under the present suit. Thus, this issue is answered.

In result, this suit is decreed as prayed for and the defendant is directed to pay a sum of 34,20,581/- along with applicable taxes with further interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of plaint till the date of realization. Time for payment is fixed as two months from the date of receipt of this judgment/decreed.

Partly typed by me and partly dictated to the steno typist, transcribed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court this the 15th day of July 2025.

DEEPTHI
ARIVUNITHI
Digitally signed
by DEEPTHI
ARIVUNITHI
Date: 2026.07.15
20:31:22 +0530

**Principal Judge,
Principal Commercial Court,
Egmore, Chennai – 8.**

Witness marked on the side of the plaintiff:

1. Mr. T.N. Thanikachalam (P.W.1)

Exhibits marked on the side of the plaintiff:

Sl.No.	Date	Exhibits	Description
01.	14.01.2018	A1	Board Resolution (Original)
02.	02.07.2007	P2	Deed of Transfer (Copy)
03	14.03.2008	A3	Sale Certificate (Copy)
04.	31.07.2012	A4	Letter issued by Plaintiff to Defendant (Copy)

05.	29.05.2013	A5	Letter issued by Plaintiff to Defendant (Copy)
06.	17.01.2015	A6	Letter issued by Plaintiff to Defendant (Original)
07.	12.06.2015	A7	Letter issued by Plaintiff to Defendant (Copy)
08.	15.06.2015	A8	Legal notice issued on behalf of plaintiff to defendant (Copy)
09	31.08.2016	A9	Debit note raised by the plaintiff in favour of defendant (copy)
10	22.09.2016	A10	Letter issued by defendant to plaintiff (Original)
11		P11	Bank Statement (Copy)
12	25.08.2011	A12	Completion Certificate issued by CMDA (Copy).

Defendants side witness:

1. Mr.B.Ravikumar D.W.1

Exhibits marked on the side of the Defendants:

Sl.No.	Date	Exhibits	Description
01.	25.03.2024	B1	Board Resolution (Copy)
02	17.11.2022	B2	Invoice (Original)
03		B3	Letters (Copy)

DEEPTHI
ARIVUNITHI

Digitally signed
by DEEPTHI
ARIVUNITHI
Date: 2026.07.15
20:31:31 +0530

**Principal Judge,
Principal Commercial Court,
Egmore, Chennai – 8.**

Draft/Fair/Judgment

C.O.S.No.684/ 2022

Dt: 15.07.2025.

Principal Commercial Court,
Egmore,
Chennai - 8