



CNR: KAHC010519002026

NC: 2026:KHC:41921
WP No. 23592 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO. 23592 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

SMT USHADEVI K
W/O SRI SATISH KUMAR A M
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
RA/T NO. 309, 6TH MAIN
2ND CROSS, COFFEE BOARD LAYOUT
HEBBAL KEMPAPURA
BENGALURU - 560 024

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MAHESH C.M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI B H MANJUNATH
S/O LATE HIMAKARAN K.S.
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
RA/TNO. 108/15 N,
5TH MAIN GANGANAGAR
BENGALURU - 560 032
2. SRI SATHISH KUMAR A M
S/O RAJANNA
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
R/AT NO. 309, 6TH MAIN
2ND CROSS, COFFEE BOARD LAYOUT
HEBBAL KEMPAPURA
BENGALURU - 560 024

...RESPONDENTS

Digitally
signed by
SUVARNA T
Location:
HIGH-COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



**NC: 2026:KHC:41921
WP No. 23592 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010519002026

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 15/07/2026 PASSED BY THE LEARNED 1ST ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE (CCH-2), BENGALURU, IN O.S. NO.6246/2022 ON I.A. NO.9 VIDE ANNEXURE-A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

Aggrieved by the order passed in O.S.No.6246/2022 dated 15.07.2026 by the I Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru, the petitioner is before this Court

2. The petitioner, who is the tenant, is before this Court, and respondent No.1 has filed the suit. In the said suit, the parties have entered into a compromise. As per the compromise, the petitioner is required to deliver possession of the property by 14.08.2026. It is the case of the petitioner that his daughter's marriage is scheduled to be held on 30.10.2026. Hence, he is seeking an extension of time to vacate the



CNR: KAHC010519002026

scheduled premises. Accordingly, he has filed an application under Section 151 of the CPC before the trial Court. By the impugned order, the trial Court has dismissed the application.

3. While dismissing the application, the Trial Court has observed that, after contesting the suit for four years, the defendants, under a compromise petition, agreed to vacate the scheduled premises. The compromise was entered into before the Lok Adalat. The Trial Court has no jurisdiction to review the decision of the Lok Adalat. Hence, both parties are bound by and directed to abide by the terms of the compromise.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that he has not made any independent request. He submits that, as the daughter's marriage is fixed, he may be granted reasonable time to deliver possession of the house. He further submits that the trial Court has failed to consider this.

5. This is an award passed by the Lok Adalat. If there is any violation of the award, the only remedy available is to seek its execution, and the Court cannot interfere with the



**NC: 2026:KHC:41921
WP No. 23592 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010519002026

award, modify, alter, or extend the terms and conditions of the said compromise decree.

6. If that is the same, the litigation will have no end. In the considered opinion of this Court, the Trial Court has rightly dismissed the application, and there is no ground to interfere with the impugned order. In view of the above discussions, this Court is passing the following:

ORDER

- i. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***dismissed.***
- ii. Pending IAs, if any, shall stand closed.

**Sd/-
(LALITHA KANNEGANTI)
JUDGE**

SMC
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 16