NC: 2026:KHC:24438
WP No. 13439 of 2026

HC-KAR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 13439 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

K.R. SANTHOSH KUMAR,
S/O. RAMACHANDRA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
R/AT. KODATHI VILLAGE, CARMELARAM POST,
VARTHUR HOBLI, BANGALORE EAST TALUK,
BANGALORE-560 035.

…PETITIONER

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

AND:

1. SRI. K. N. SURESH
S/O. NARAYANA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
R/AT NO.550, FIRST FLOOR,
NEAR ANJENAYA SWAMY OLD TEMPLE,
GOVT. SCHOOL ROAD CROSS,
KUDLU VILLAGE,
SARJAPUR HOBLI, ANEKAL TALUK,
BENGALURU-560 068.

2. SRI. NANJUNDAPPA,
S/O. MUNIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 96 YEARS,
RESIDING AT KODATHI VILLAGE,
VARTHUR HOBLI, BANGALORE EAST TALUK,
BANGALORE-560 035.

Digitally signed by DHANALAKSHMI MURTHY
Location: HIGH COURTOF KARNATAKA

3. SRI. LATE NARAYANA REDDY,
S/O. LATE VENKATAPPA,
SINCE DEAD REP. BY LR'S

SMT. RUKMINI,
W/O. LATE NARAYANA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.550,
NEAR OLD ANJANEYA SWAMY TEMPLE,
BOMMANAHALLI CIRCLE,
KUDLU VILLAGE,
BANGALORE-560 035.

4. SRI. K.N. VENKATESH REDDY
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
S/O. SRI. NARAYANA REDDY,
DEFENDANT NO.2 AND 3
RESIDING AT NO.550,
NEAR ANJANEYA SWAMY OLD TEMPLE,
GOVT. SCHOOL ROAD CROSS,
KUDLU VILLAGE, SARJAPURA HOBLI,
ANEKAL TALUK,
BANGALORE - 560 068.

5. SMT. R. GEETHA,
W/O. MUNIREDDY,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
R/AT NO.51/4,
SARAKKI GATE, J.P. NAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 078.

6. SMT. MUNIYAMMA,
W/O. LATE NANJUNDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
R/AT NEAR GRAMA PANCHAYATH OFFICE,
KODATHI VILLAGE, CARMELARAM POST,
VARTHUR HOBLI, BANGALORE EAST TALUK,
BANGALORE - 560 035.

7. N. SHANTHA KUMAR,
S/O. LATE. NANJUNDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
R/AT NEAR GRAMA PANCHAYATH OFFICE,
KODATHI VILLAGE, CARMELARAM POST,
VARTHUR HOBLI, BANGALORE EAST TALUK,
BANGALORE - 560035.

8. SMT. MANJULA,
D/O. LATE. NANJUNDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,
R/AT NEAR GRAMA PANCHAYATH OFFICE,
KODATHI VILLAGE, CARMELARAM POST,
VARTHUR HOBLI, BANGALORE EAST TALUK,
BANGALORE - 560 035.

…RESPONDENTS

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT, QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 28/02/2026, PASSED BY THE HON'BLE COURT OF 1ST ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE (SR. DIV) BENGALURU RURAL DIST, BENGALURU, ON THE APPLICATION FILED UNDER SEC 151 OF CPC, IN O.S. NO. 1182/2010 REJECTING THE APPLICATION OF THE PETITIONER FILED UNDER SEC. 151 OF CPC, SEEKING LEAVE TO FILE THE WRITTEN STATEMENT (AT ANNEXURE- A) AND CONSEQUENTLY ALLOW THE SAID APPLICATION AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

In this writ petition, the petitioner-defendant No.8 has called in question the order dated 28.02.2026 passed by the I Addl. Senior Civil Judge (Senior Division) Bengaluru (for short 'Trial Court') on application filed under Section 151 of CPC, in O.S.No.1182/2010, whereby the said application filed by the petitioner seeking leave to file the written statement has been dismissed.

2. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per their ranking before the Trial Court in Original Suit.

3. The plaintiff has filed a suit in O.S.No.1182/2010 before the Trial Court seeking for relief of injunction in the year 2010. During the pendency of the suit, the petitioner herein purchased the suit schedule item No.1 and thereafter, he filed an application seeking to implead himself as defendant No.8 to the suit. The Trial Court, by order dated 28.06.2023 has allowed the application. Even after impleading, the petitioner has not

filed the written statement. Thereafter, the parties have adduced the evidence and the arguments have been concluded. Then the matter was posted for judgment and later, an application has been filed seeking permission to file written statement. The Trial Court has rejected the application on the ground that the application has been filed when the matter was posted for arguments. Aggrieved by the said impugned order passed by the Trial Court, the present writ petition is filed.

4. Viewed from any angle, there is no error or illegality in the impugned order passed by the Trial Court warranting interference by this Court.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(H.T. NARENDRA PRASAD)
JUDGE

BN
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 48