



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI V HOSMANI

REVIEW PETITION NO. 90 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. SIDDALINGAIAH,
S/O. CHANDRAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
R/A 2ND STAGE,
GOKULA BADAVANE,
VIVEKANANDA ROAD,
TUMKUR - 572 104.
2. SRI. JAYASIMHA,
S/O. NARASIMHAMURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
R/A SHIVAMUKAMBIKA NAGAR
3RD MAIN CROSS, UPPHARALLI,
TUMKUR - 572 102.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI Y K NARAYANA SHARMA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI VIDYA VIJAYA THIRTHARU,
UTHARADHIKARI,
VYASARAJA MUTT (SOSALE)
BENNEGOVINDAPPA ROAD,
GANDHIBAZAR,
BANGALORE - 560 004.
2. SRI VIDYA SHREESHA THIRTHARU,
MATADHIPATHI,

Digitally signed
by ANUSHA V
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



VYASARAJA MUTT (SOSALE),
BENNEGOVINDAPPA ROAD,
GANDHIBAZAR, BANGALORE-04.

3. SRI ITHAREYA,
S/O BRAHMANYA THIRTHA ACHAR,
AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS,
R/A KRISHNARPANA BEHIND
1ST MAIN ROAD,
NEAR SARDHANA GA
MANJUNATHANAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 090.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI K.SHRIHARI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SRI VENKATESH S. ARABATTI, ADVOCATE FOR R2
R3 - SERVED & UNREPRESENTED)

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER ORDER 47 RULE
1 R/W SEC. 114 OF CPC, PRAYING TO ORDER DATED
19.11.2024. PASSED IN MFA NO. 6998/2018 BY THIS HONBLE
COURT BE REVIEWED AND FURTHER SUITABLE ORDERS BE
PASSED AFTER HEARING THE PETITIONERS IN THIS REVIEW
PETITION AND ALL OTHER PARTIES CONCERNED AND OTHER
SUITABLE ORDERS AS DEEMED FIT BE PASSED UNDER THE
CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY,
ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI V HOSMANI



ORAL ORDER

Challenging judgment dated 19.11.2024 passed by this Court in MFA.no.6998/2018 and connected with MFA.no.1280/2024, this review petition is filed.

2. Sri Y.K. Narayana Sharma, learned counsel for petitioners submitted that petitioners are plaintiffs in O.S.no.231/2018 which was filed before Civil Judge (Jr.Dn.) Mysore. It was submitted that said suit was filed seeking for following reliefs.

- a. Declaring that the Judgment and Decree passed in O.S.no.376/2016 on the file of the Civil Judge (Jr. Division) Mysore, dated 01-07-2017, as null and void;
- b. To declare the ordainment of Sri Prahalladachar as Peetadhipathi of Sri Vyasaraaja Mutt (Sosale) as illegal and unlawful and
- c. To direct the defendants to pay the costs of the suit and grant such other reliefs that this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant under the circumstances, in the interest of justice.

3. It was submitted that in Miscellaneous First Appeals filed against interim orders passed on applications filed under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, ('CPC', for short) in O.S.no.3130/2018 on file of XLI Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru (CCH-42), this court



had passed an order for clubbing of various suits including O.S.no.231/2018 to be tried together.

4. It was submitted that O.S.no.3130/2018 was filed seeking for following reliefs.

- a. Declaring that Plaintiff as the Utharadhikari of Vyasaraja Mutt (Sosale);
- b. For a mandatory injunction restraining the 1st defendant or his followers from appointing the 2nd defendant or any person/s as Shishya, Sanyasi or Utharadhikari;
- c. A permanent injunction restraining the 1st defendant from interfering with the performing of the Pooja of the idols of Sri Vyasaraja Mutt (Sosale) by the plaintiff in any branches of Sri Vyasaraja Mutt (Sosale), including the head office at Bangalore;
- d. Grant any other reliefs that this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant under the circumstances of the case including the costs of this suit, in the interest of justice.

Said reliefs were totally different from prayer sought in O.S.no.231/2018. Hence, there would be no possibility of conflicting judgments.

5. It was firstly submitted, order of clubbing was passed without granting opportunity of hearing to plaintiffs in O.S.no.231/2018 and secondly, on ground that there would be no possibility of conflicting judgments. It was submitted that



relief sought in O.S.no.231/2018 namely for declaration that decree dated 01.07.2017 passed in O.S.no.376/2016 as illegal was sought after plaintiffs had noticed that same was detrimental to interests of Sri Vyasaraja Mutt (Sosale) (for '**Mutt**'). Under such circumstances, impugned judgment directing clubbing of cases including suit filed at Mysore, would not be justified and seeks for review.

6. On other hand, Sri Venkatesh S Arbatti, learned counsel for respondent no.2 opposes petition; Sri K. Shrihari, learned counsel appeared on behalf of respondent no.1. Respondent no.3 is served and unrepresented.

7. Heard learned counsel and perused impugned judgment.

8. At outset, it is seen that impugned judgment is passed after detailed examination of facts and circumstances giving rise to appeals as well as various suits filed with regard to appointment of Peetadhipathi/Utharadhikari of Mutt. It was noted that all suits were filed in a representative capacity and apparently for protecting faith in deity and for welfare of Mutt.



9. Though contentions urged is that prayers sought in O.S.no.231/2018 was different from O.S.no.3130/2018 and this was not brought to notice of Court, it is seen that this Court has taken not only note of prayers sought in various suits but also circumstances in which said suits were filed and their implication on dispute concerning appointment of Peetadhipathi of the Mutt and order passed for clubbing of suits is by assigning specific reasons. No error apparent on face of record is shown to entertain review. Hence, review petition is without merit and is ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(RAVI V HOSMANI)
JUDGE

GRD
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 32