



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

**DATED THIS THE 28<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2025**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA**

**MISCELLANEOUS SECOND APPEAL NO. 45 OF 2018 (RO)**

**BETWEEN:**

1. SRI. B. R. NARASIMHA REDDY,  
S/O. LATE RAMAIAH,  
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,  
R/AT BYRAPALLI VILLAGE,  
KASABA HOBLI,  
SRINIVASAPURA TALUK,  
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 135.
2. SRI. B. K. GOPALA REDDY  
S/O LATE KADIRI REDDY,  
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,  
R/AT BYRAPALLI VILLAGE,  
KASABA HOBLI,  
SRINIVASAPURA TALUK,  
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 135.

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. K.N. CHANDRASHEKAR REDDY, ADVOCATE (ABSENT))

**AND:**

1. SMT. CHIKKAVENKATAMMA  
W/O LATE SRINIVASA REDDY,  
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
2. SRI. B. S. NARASIMHAREDDY,  
S/O LATE SRINIVASA REDDY,  
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,





3. SRI B. S. VENKATASHIVA REDDY  
W/O LATE SRINIVASA REDDY,  
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,

SL. NO. 1 TO 3 ARE RESIDING AT  
BYRAPALLI VILLAGE, KASABA HOBLI,  
SRINIVASAPURA TALUK,  
KOLAR DISTRICT-563 135.

4. SMT. SAROJAMMA,  
D/O LATE SRINIVASA REDDY,  
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,

5. SMT. LAKSHMIDEVI,  
D/O LATE SRINIVASA REDDY,  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,

SL.NO. 4 AND 5 ARE RESIDENT OF MANIGANAHALLI  
VILLAGE & POST, RONUR HOBLI,  
SRINIVASAPURA TALUK-563 135.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V. VINOD REDDY, ADVOCATE FOR R4 AND R5)

THIS MSA FILED UNDER ORDER XLIII RULE 1(u) OF CPC.,  
AGAINST THE JUDGMENT AND DECREE DATED 24.02.2018  
PASSED IN RA.NO.184/2014 ON THE FILE OF THE PRINCIPAL  
SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND CJM., KOLAR, ALLOWING THE  
APPEAL AND SETTING ASIDE THE JUDGMENT AND DECREE  
DATED 26.09.2014 PASSED IN OS.NO.49/2006 ON THE FILE  
OF THE PRINCIPAL CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC., SRINIVASPUR  
AND REMANDING BACK THE MATTER TO THE TRIAL COURT TO  
DISPOSE OFF THE SUIT AFRESH IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY,  
JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA



**ORAL JUDGMENT**

No representation on appellants' side on call.

The appeal was filed in the year 2018. Though the matter was repeatedly adjourned, granting time to the appellants to comply the office objections, the appellants did not choose to comply the office objections. This Court does not find any ground whatsoever to adjourn the matter further. Therefore, the appeal stands dismissed for non-compliance of office objections.

**Sd/-  
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)  
JUDGE**

DS  
CT:TSM  
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 12