IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA,

DHARWAD BENCH

DATED THIS THE 31ST DAY OF JULY, 2024

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI MULIMANI

REGULAR FIRST APPEAL NO. 100182 OF 2015 (PAR)

BETWEEN:

DR. BASAPPA S/O SHIDDALINGAPPA TELI,
AGE: 50 YEARS, OCC: MEDICAL PRACTIONER
AND AGRICULTURE, R/O: ALAGAWADI,
TQ: RAIBAG, DIST: BELAGAVI.

…APPELLANT

(BY SRI. ABHISHEK PATIL AND
SRI. M.R.SHINDE., ADVOCATE [ABSENT])

AND:

1. SMT. KAMALAWWA W/O HONNAPPA SATTIGERI,
AGE: 38 YEARS, OCC: HOUSEMAKER,
R/O: KESARAGOPPA, TQ: MUDHOL,
DIST: BAGALAKOT.

2. SMT. PARAWWA W/O DUNDAPPA GOKAK,
AGE: 40 YEARS, OCC: HOUSEMAKER,
R/O: SULTHANAPUR, TQ: RAIBAG,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

Digitally signed by
PREMCHANDRA M R
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

3. SMT. BOURAWWA W/O SHIRISHAL BAGI,
AGE: 42 YEARS, OCC: HOUSEMAKER,
R/O: HALINGALI, TQ: JAMKHANDI,
DIST: BAGALAKOT.

4. SMT. MAHADEVI W/O ALLAPPA GANIGER,
AGE: 48 YEARS, OCC: HOUSEMAKER,
R/O: GURLAPUR, TQ: GOKAK, DIST: BELAGAVI.

5. SHRI. RAMESH S/O SHIDDALINGAPPA TELI,
AGE: 44 YEARS, OCC: AGRICULTURE,

R/O: ALAGAWADI, TQ: RAIBAG,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

6. DR. SHRISHAIL S/O SHIDDALINGAPPA TELI,
AGE: 46 YEARS, OCC: MEDICAL PRACTIONER
AND AGRICULTURE, R/O: TELI ORTHOPAEDIC
CENTER AND MATERNITY HOME,
NEAR A.G.DESAI CIRCLE, (MURGOD PLOT),
JAMAKHANDI, TQ: JAMAKHANDI,
DIST: BAGALAKOT.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. J.S.SHETTY., ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R3;
R4-HELD SUFFICIENT; R5-SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED;
SRI. SHRIKANTH.D.BABALADI., ADVOCATE FOR R6;
SRI. CHETAN NAIK AND
SRI. N.M.PATIL., ADVOCATES FOR R6)

THIS REGULAR FIRST APPEAL FILED UNDER SECTION 96 OF CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, 1908.

THIS REGULAR FIRST APPEAL IS LISTED FOR FINAL HEARING, THIS DAY, THE ORDER IS MADE AS UNDER:

ORAL ORDER

When the matter is called there is no representation on behalf of appellant, either personally or through video conferencing.

Sri.J.S.Shetty., learned counsel for respondents 1 to 3 has appeared in person.

As could be seen from the appeal papers, the appeal is filed in the year 2015. Now we are in the month of July

2024. The appeal is pending for almost nine years. As already noted above, there is no representation on behalf of appellant, either personally or through video conferencing. It appears that the appellant is not interested in prosecuting the appeal. Hence, the Regular First Appeal is ***dismissed*** for non-prosecution.

Sd/-
(JYOTI MULIMANI)
JUDGE

MRP
List No.: 3 Sl No.: 20