



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 5TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO.6832 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

1. VISHAL RAJ BHANSALI,
S/O SRI JASWANTHRAJ BHANSALI,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
M/S. PYRAMID SYSTEMS,
NO.18, GROUND FLOOR,
11TH CROSS, CUBBONPET,
BENGALURU-560 002.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SRIPAL J. SANGHVI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. BISHNU KUMAR AGARWAL,
NO.18, 1ST FLOOR,
1ST CROSS, CUBBONPET,
BENGALURU-560 018.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. SANTHOSH KUMAR G., ADVOCATE FOR C/R)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 03.01.2026 PASSED ON IA NO.11, FILED UNDER ORDER XI RULE 1(10) CPC R/W SECTION 151 OF THE CPC IN O.S.NO.1674/2024 AT ANNEXURE-A, ON THE FILE OF THE CITY CIVIL JUDGE (COMML.) AT BENGALURU CCH-90 BY ALLOWING THE ABOVE WRIT PETITION IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

Digitally signed
by DEVIKA M
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

This writ petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the order dated 03.01.2026 passed by the LXXXIX Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru in Com.O.S.No.1674/2024 on I.A.No.11 filed under Order XI Rule 1(10) of CPC read with Section 151, whereby the application filed by the petitioner/defendant for production of additional documents has been rejected.

2. Brief facts of the case is that the respondent/plaintiff filed a suit in O.S.No.3426/2020 for ejectment. After appearance, the petitioner/defendant filed the written statement and took a contention that the regular suit filed before the Civil Court is not maintainable. Thereafter, the suit has been transferred to Commercial Court and it has been numbered as Com.O.S.No.1674/2024. Thereafter, the petitioner/defendant filed an application for amendment of the written statement. The same came to be dismissed on the ground that in the written statement it is clearly admitted that



advance amount on lease paid is Rs.7,50,000/-. In respect of payment of advance amount is concerned, it is specifically admitted in the written statement that deposit is sum of Rs.7,50,000/-. To that extent, the amendment petition has been dismissed. That has been called in question before this Court.

3. Thereafter, the petitioner/defendant filed the present application for production of the documents to establish that he had paid advance of Rs.15,00,000/- to the previous owners. That application has been dismissed on the ground that the application filed for amendment itself has been dismissed, since there is already an admission in the written statement that advance amount paid is only Rs.7,50,000/- and the petitioner/defendant cannot be permitted to produce the documents contrary to the admission made in the written statement.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/defendant submitted that the receipts which the petitioner wants to produce along with the application may be used only for the purpose to prove that he has paid the



advance amount of Rs.7,50,000/- and not Rs.15,00,000/-. The rent receipts may be permitted to be produced as additional documents.

5. Therefore, the rent receipts are permitted to be produced as additional documents. It is made clear that the receipt, which is produced to show that the petitioner has paid advance of Rs.15,00,000/- has to be confined only to advance amount of Rs.7,50,000/-. The petitioner's claim for Rs.15,00,000/- cannot be allowed. To that effect, the application filed by the petitioner is required to be allowed.

5. Accordingly, the following order is passed:

ORDER

- (i) The writ petition is allowed in part.
- (ii) The order dated 03.01.2026 passed by the LXXXIX Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru in Com.O.S.No.1674/2024 on I.A.No.11, is set aside.
- (iii) I.A.No.11 filed by the petitioner under Order XI Rule 1(10) of CPC is allowed, subject to the condition that the advance paid receipts produced along with the application can be



made use of to prove to that extent of Rs.7,50,000/- as admitted in the written statement.

- (iv) Additionally the Trial Court is directed to dispose of the suit as expeditiously as possible.

Sd/-
(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE

MD
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 29