HC-KAR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF JUNE, 2025

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO

WRIT APPEAL NO. 383 OF 2023 (KLRA)

BETWEEN:

SRI. N. KRISHNASWAMY IYENGAR
SINCE DEAD, BY HIS LRS

1. SRI. K. KESHAVA IYENGAR
S/O LATE SRI. N. KRISHNASWAMY IYENGAR
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS

2. SRI. K. JAYARAMU
S/O LATE N. KRISHNASWAMY IYENGAR
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS

BOTH ARE R/AT. NARAYANAGHATTA VILLAGE
MUTHANALLUR POST, ANEKAL TALUK
BENGALURU DISTRICT-562 106

...APPELLANTS

Digitally signed by CHANNEGOWDA PREMA
Location: High Court of Karnataka

(BY SRI. MITHUN G.A., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BENGALURU

2. LAND TRIBUNAL
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
ANEKAL

THIMMAKKA
SINCE DEAD, REP BY LRS

3. SMT. AMMAYYA
D/O LATE THIMMAKKA
W/O RAMAREDDY
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS
R/AT. NARAYANGHATTA VILLAGE
ANEKAL TALUK
BENGALURU

4. SMT. PAPAMMA
D/O LATE THIMMAKKA
W/O LATE RAMAREDDY
MAJOR
R/AT. NARAYANGHATTA VILLAGE
ANEKAL TALUK
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT

5. SRI. B.S. SHIVARAMA
S/O B.P. SIDDARAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/AT. HOSABOODANUR
HALE BOODANUR POST
MANDYA TALUK AND DISTRICT

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. SHWETA KRISHNAPPA, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SRI. KESHAVARAJU T.T., ADVOCATE FOR C/R5)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, 1961, PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER OF LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE PASSED IN W. P. No.29272/1996 (KLRA), DATED 02.11.2022, HOLDING THAT THE PETITIONERS/APPELLANTS ARE THE ABSOLUTE OWNER OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY, BY ALLOWING THIS MEMORANDUM OF WRIT APPEAL IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
and
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE K.MANMADHA RAO

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN)

When the matter was called out, there is no appearance for the appellants.

2. It is noticed that inspite of granting sufficient opportunities, appellants have not complied with the office objections. On 14.10.2024, finally, a week's time was granted subject to payment of cost of Rs.7,000/. It appears that the appellants are not diligent in prosecuting the appeal. Hence, appeal is ***dismissed*** for non-compliance of office objections.

Sd/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(DR.K.MANMADHA RAO)
JUDGE

PN List No.: 1 Sl No.: 49