NC: 2025:KHC:4581
RFA No. 1922 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 31ST DAY OF JANUARY, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI MULIMANI

REGULAR FIRST APPEAL NO. 1922 OF 2023 (DEC/INJ)

BETWEEN:

SRI.B.CHANDRASHEKAR
S/O LATE BASAVARAJ,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
R/AT NO.22, G.K. LAYOUT,
PARAPPANA AGRAHARA,
SINGASANDRA P.O,
BANGALORE-560 100.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. MAHENDRA GOWDA.C.R., ADVOCATE [ABSENT])

AND:

1. SRI. LOKESH REDDY
   S/O K.SRINIVAS REDDY,
   AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS,
   R/AT SRI.RAJESHWARI NILAYA,
   KAGGADASPURA MAIN ROAD,
   C.V.RAMAN NAGAR,
   BENGALURU-560 093.

2. SRI S.CHADRAPPA
   S/O SONNAPPA,
   AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
   R/AT DINNUR VILLAGE,
   KADUGODI, BIDARAHALLI HOBLI,
   BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
   BANGALORE.

3. SMT G.SUMATHI
   W/O N.GUNASHEKARA
   AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,

Digitally signed by PREMCHANDRA M R
Location: High Court of Karnataka

R/AT NO.3, 1ST CROSS,
CASHIER LAYOUT, TAVAREKERE,
BENGALURU-560 081.

…RESPONDENTS

THIS REGULAR FIRST APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 96 OF THE CPC, 1908.

THIS REGULAR FIRST APPEAL IS LISTED FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS UNDER:

ORAL ORDER

When the case is called, the appellant is not represented. When the case is listed and is called out, the advocate must be present. His absence may affect the case.

As could be seen from the daily order sheet, the appeal was listed before the Registrar (P & H) and sufficient time was granted to comply with the office objections. Again the appeal was listed before the Court and sufficient time was granted to comply with the office objections. Once again the appeal was listed on 09.01.2025, on that day, finally a week's time was granted to comply with the office objections, failing which the office was directed to list the appeal under the caption 'for dismissal of appeal for non-compliance of office objections' on 31.01.2025.

The appeal is listed today under the caption 'for dismissal of appeal for non-compliance of office objections'. Despite granting sufficient time, the appellant has not complied with the office objections. It appears that the appellant is not interested in prosecuting the appeal. In view of peremptory order dated 09.01.2025, the appeal is ***dismissed*** for non-prosecution and also for non-compliance of office objections.

Sd/-
(JYOTI MULIMANI)
JUDGE

MRP
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 9