



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 14TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO. 20961 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

SMT. R SHARADHA
AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS
W/O LATE R KUMAR
R/AT NO.24, FCI LAYOUT,
DEEPANJALI NAGAR, MYSORE ROAD,
BANGALORE-560026.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SIDDHARTH SUMAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI C. PRAKASH PAUL
S/O LATE T.CHINNASWAMY REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.42, TCR RESIDENCY
ERANAPALYA, ARABIC COLLEGE POST
BENGALURU-560045.

...RESPONDENT

Digitally signed
by SUVARNA T
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR SUCH OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT OR ORDERS OR DIRECTIONS, QUASHING ORDER DATED 05.06.2026 PASSED BY THE HON'BLE I ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE, BENGALURU (CCH-2) IN O.S NO. 3823/2026 I.E. ANNEXURE-A AS ARBITRARY, ILLEGAL AND UNJUST, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY AND ETC.

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



CORAM: HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner is before this Court, questioning an order dated 05.06.2026 passed in I.A.No.1 in O.S.No.3823/2026 by the I Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge, Bengaluru, whereby the trial Court has granted an ex parte temporary injunction restraining the defendant or anybody acting on her behalf from interfering with the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property, till the next date of hearing and suit summons were issued and the matter was directed to be listed on 22.07.2026.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has filed a caveat and without even issuing notice to the petitioner, the trial Court had passed the order. It is submitted that the plaintiff is unconnected with the suit-scheduled properties. Under the guise of the interim order that has been granted, the plaintiff is going to the police, and the police, under the guise of the said order, are trying to interfere with the petitioner's possession. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued on the merits of the matter and



submits that this is a case where the court has to interfere with the order impugned.

3. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, perused the material on record, the court has granted a temporary injunction. It is contended that the petitioner has filed a caveat. The impugned order was passed without notice to the petitioner. As far as the submission regarding the merits of the matter is concerned, this Court is not inclined to go into the merits. If this Court interferes with the order, notice has to be issued to the respondent, and it will unnecessarily protract the litigation. The matter is coming up before the trial Court on 22.07.2026. Hence, this Court deems it appropriate to direct the trial Court to deal with the objections filed by the petitioner and, particularly giving a finding regarding the caveat petition filed by the petitioner and, without notice to the petitioner, why the Court has passed an order.

4. In that view of the matter, this Court is passing the following:



ORDER

- i. The writ petition is ***disposed of*** directing the trial Court to consider the objections filed by the petitioner and pass orders by 22.07.2026.
- ii. If, by any chance, the trial Court is unable to conclude it on 22.07.2026, by 23.07.2026 the trial Court shall pass appropriate orders.
- iii. This Court is not issuing notice to the respondent as no adverse orders are passed.
- iv. All pending I.As., in the writ petition shall stand closed.

SD/-
(LALITHA KANNEGANTI)
JUDGE