



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 14TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M

WRIT PETITION NO. 20044 OF 2026 (GM-DRT)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. DEVI S.,
W/O. P.SHIVA KUMAR,
AGE 52 YEARS,
2. P.SHIVAKUMAR,
S/O. A.V.PARAPARAM
AGE 62 YEARS,

PETITIONERS NO.1 AND 2 ARE
RESIDING AT DOOR NO.20,
M.S.R.NIGAM, FLAT NO.FR1,
4TH FLOOR, 5TH MAIN, 1ST CROSS,
BEML LAYOUT, 3RD STAGE,
GIRIDHAMA LAYOUT,
RAJARAJESWARI NAGAR,
BENGALURU-560098.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. H.VASANTH KUMAR, ADVOCATE - ABSENT)

AND:

1. BANK OF INDIA
KUVEMPUNAGARA BRANCH
UDAYA RAVI ROAD, KUVEMPU NAGAR,
MYSORE CITY-570023.
REPRESENTED BY SENIOR MANAGER.
2. BANK OF INDIA
LOAN RECOVERY AND PUBLIC ACTION
NO.11, BANK OF INDIA BUILDING,



K.G.ROAD, BENGALURU-560009.
REPRESENTED BY SENIOR MANAGER.

3. SUNIL B. DEVAGIRIMATH,
S/O. BASAVARAJ,
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.57/14, 2ND FLOOR,
MADHAVANAGAR,
NEAR JAIN TEMPLE,
RACE COURSE ROAD,
BENGALURU-560001.

ALSO RESIDING AT NO.19,
SAMRUDDI NILAYA,
GNANAMANDIR SCHOOL ROAD,
N.G.E.F. EMPLOYEES LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, MALLATHAHALLI,
6TH CROSS, BENGALURU-560057.

AND ALSO AT PROPRIETOR OF
SRI BASAVA BHAGIRATHI ENTERPRISES,
NO.68/168, 1ST FLOOR, 6TH MAIN,
10TH CROSS, GNANA JYOTHI NAGAR,
BENGALURU-560056.

4. SRI. MOHAMMED ASHFAQ,
S/O. BURHAN KHAN,
AGE ABOUT 52 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.1339,
ISLAMPUR MOHALLA, DAIRA
CHANNAPATNA,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT-562160.

5. AZEEZ BANU,
W/O. BURHAN KHAN,
AGE 80 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.696,
ABIDPUR MOHALLA DAIRA
CHANNAPATNA, RAMANAGARA -562169.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B.S.JEEVAN KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, SEEKING CERTAIN RELIEFS.

THIS WRIT PETITION IS LISTED FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS UNDER:

ORAL ORDER

Though matter called twice, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioners, either personally or through video conferencing.

Sri.B.S.Jeevan Kumar., counsel for caveator/respondent No.2 appeared in person.

As already noted above, though matter called twice, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioners, either personally or through video conferencing. It appears the petitioners are not interested in prosecuting the petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***dismissed for non-prosecution.***

**Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE**

SS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 8