



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO. 18962 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

MRS. SHANTHI T PANDIYA
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
W/O LATE TEJPAL P PANDIYA,
RESIDING AT NO. 10/1/4
KUMARA KRUPA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. S.K.MITHUN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MR BYRAPPA
SINCE DEAD BY LRS

SMT BYRAMMA
SINCE DEAD BY LRS

MRS.SHASHIKALA
D/O LATE BYRAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,

2. MR. CHANDRASHEKAR
S/O LATE BYRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS

3. SMT.SUMA
D/O LATE BYRAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS



4. MR.PURUSHOTHAM
S/O LATE BYRAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,

ALL ARE RESIDING AT
THYAMAGONDLU VILLAGE,
THYAMAGONDLU HOBLI,
THYAMAGONDLU POST,
NELAMANGALA TALUK-562 132
5. SMT. LAKSHMAMMA
SINCE DEAD BY LR'S
MR.NATARAJU
S/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA MAJOR,
6. MR.MANJUNATHA
S/O LATE LAKSHMAMMA
MAJOR,
BOTH ARE RESIDING AT
AGASARAHALLI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
NELAMANGALA TALUK
7. MR. MUNIRAJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
S/O LATE BYRAPPA,
8. MR.G.B.GANGARAJU
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
S/O LATE BYRAPPA
9. MR. SIDDAGANGAIAH
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
S/O LATE BYRAPPA,
10. MR.NANJAPPA
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
S/O LATE BYRAPPA,
11. MR. KRISHNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,



RESPONDENT 7 TO 11 ARE R/AT
GJJAGADAHALLI VILLAGE,
DASANPURA HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK,
BANGALORE DISTRICT-562 123

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.HARSH D JOSHI, ADVOCATE FOR C/R7
SRI.B.H.KEMPEGOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR C/R8
SRI.SRIKANTH B., ADVOCATE FOR R9 TO R11)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO DIRECTING THE LEARNED PRL. CIVIL JUDGE SENIOR DIVISION, NELAMANGALA TO FORTHWITH MAKE AVAILABLE RELEASE AND FURNISH THE SEPARATE ORDERS DATED 09.04.2026 PURPORTEDLY PASSED ON IA NO.15 AND IA NO. 16 IN OS NO. 416/2009.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

It is brought to the notice of this Court by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the trial Court had dismissed I.A Nos.15 and 16 by an order dated 09.04.2026. The order was pronounced in open court, but no separate order was recorded. Since that day, the petitioner has been seeking for a copy of the order. So far, the order has not been provided, and this fact has also been brought to the notice of the trial Court. Considering the same, this Court had directed



the trial Court not to pronounce the judgment and had also called for a report. The report from the concerned Court discloses that, as submitted by the counsel for the petitioner, the order copy was not dispatched and was mixed up with other files, and they could not trace the file. When an order was passed, and the party was not given a reasonable opportunity to question the said order, the court ought not to have posted the matter for judgment.

2. Considering that both the orders are now ready, this Court deems it appropriate to grant two weeks' time to question the orders, and for a period of two weeks, the Court shall not pronounce the judgment. The order copy shall be furnished to the petitioner on the same day. Accordingly, this Court is passing the following:

ORDER

- i. The writ petition is ***disposed of*** giving liberty to the petitioner to assail the orders passed in I.A.Nos.15 and 16.



- ii. The Registry of the trial Court is directed to furnish a copy of the order to the petitioner on the same day.
- iii. The trial court shall not pronounce the judgment for the period of two weeks from the date of receipt of the copy of the order.
- iv. All pending I.As., in the writ petition shall stand closed.

SD/-
(LALITHA KANNEGANTI)
JUDGE