



469 a - 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE

Dated this the 16th day of September 1998

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.N. VALLINAYAGAM

C.P. NO: 121 OF 1998

IN

R.S.A.NO: 443/1990

BETWEEN:

1. Muniswamy Reddy @ Chinnappa,
S/o. Rottala Muniyappa, aged
about 68 years.
2. Ramaiah Reddy, S/o. Rottala
Muniyappa, aged 67 years.
Both r/o. Janatakandahalli
village, Sarjapur Hobli,
Anekal Taluk.

: PETITIONERS

(By Sri.P. Krishnappa, Advocate)

AND:

1. Smt. Hanumakka, w/o. late
Narayana Reddy, aged 74 Yrs.
2. Sri. Munireddy, s/o. late
Narayana Reddy, aged 48 years,
3. Sri. Thimma Reddy, s/o. late
Narayana Reddy, aged 44 years,

(R-1&3 are r/o. Muttakadahalli
village, Anugondanahalli
Hobli, Hoskote Taluk.

R-2 is r/o. Janatakandahalli,
Sarjapura Hobli, Anekal Tq.

: RESPONDENTS

This Civil Review Petition filed under Order-47, Rule-1 C.P.C. by the Petitioners, who are respondents in R.S.A.NO: 443/1990, defendants in O.S.NO:199/1979 for review of the Judgment made by this Court in R.S.A.NO:443/1990, dated. 11-11-1997.

This Civil review Petition having been reserved for Order, coming on for pronouncement of Order, this day, the Court delivered the following:-

ORDER

....2/-

5

TNVJ:
16-9-1998

C.P.NO: 121/1998

O R D E R

The Judgment is passed taking into consideration the equity and more or less with the consent of the parties. It is too late for the respondents/defendants to come and ask for review of such a Judgment. I do not find any error of law or no new points to re-write the Judgment already been delivered. I have adopted the best course with the interest of all the parties concerned and it is therefore not fair for the parties to ask for review.

In the circumstance of the case and consequently, the I.A.1 as well as C.P. is dismissed.

Sd/-
JUDGE

Vge/-