HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:62162
CRP No. 975 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010751572026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

CIVIL REVISION PETITION NO. 975 OF 2026 (IO)

BETWEEN:

MANJULA
W/O.GOVINDARAJU
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
RESIDING AT UKKADA VILLAGE,
KARAMANGALA, MAGADI TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT-562 201

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VENKATA REDDY G.K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. GIRIYAMMA
   W/O.LATE M.S.ANJANAPPA,
   AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS

2. SRI. MANJUNATHA M.A.
   S/O.LATE M.S.ANJANAPPA,
   AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,

3. SMT. KALAVATHI
   W/O.LATE M.S.ANJANAPPA,
   AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,

4. SRI. SANJEEVRAJU M.A.
   S/O.LATE M.S.ANJANAPPA,
   AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,

5. SRI. NAGAHANUMAIAH
   W/O.LATE M.S.ANJANAPPA,
   AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,

Digitally signed by SUVARNA T
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

ALL RE RESIDING AT
MOTAGONDANAHALLI VILLAGE
MAGADI TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT-562 127

…RESPONDENTS

THIS CRP FILED U/S. 115 OF CPC PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 13.10.2026, PASSED ON IA IN OS NO. 568/2025 ON THE FILE OF THE IV ADDITIONAL SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE, BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT, BENGALURU, DISMISSING THE IA FILED U/O 7 RULE 11(a) OF CPC FOR REJECTION OF PLAINT.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

Aggrieved by the order dated 13.10.2026 passed in I.A. filed under Order 7 Rule 11(a) of the CPC in O.S.No.568/2025 by the IV Additional Senior Civil Judge, Bangalore Rural District, Bangalore, the petitioner/defendant is before this Court.

2. The respondents herein, who are the plaintiffs, have filed O.S.No.568/2025 seeking declaration that the plaintiffs are the absolute owners of the suit schedule property and consequently declare that the plaintiffs are entitled to receive the award amount passed in LAC proceedings. In the said suit,

the defendant has filed an application under Order 7 Rule 11(a) of the CPC seeking rejection of the plaint. It is the specific case of the defendant that the plaintiffs have created a GPA in the name of one B.T.Subod and the GPA holder, and the plaintiffs have executed the Sale Deed dated 04.11.2020 in favour of the purchaser and received a sum of Rs.25 lakhs from the purchaser. The suit was filed on 01.03.2025, and the plaintiffs are not entitled for declaration, as they have already executed a Sale Deed illegally in favour of the purchaser, and the said Sale Deed is produced by the defendant along with the application. It is the case of the defendant that the plaintiff, without any cause of action, has filed the suit and has suppressed material facts, and on this ground the plaint has to be rejected. The trial Court, by the impugned order, has dismissed the application.

3. While dismissing the application, the trial Court observed that, according to the defendant, there is no cause of action for the plaintiff to file the present suit. They have created documents and falsely claiming the suit schedule property belongs to the defendant. Whereas the specific case of

the plaintiffs is that the suit schedule property was granted in favour of one Lingaiah and confirmed in the name of his wife Hanumakka, and the revenue records were mutated in her name. It is observed that, from the plaint averments, it is clear that the plaintiffs and defendant have set up separate titles over the suit schedule property, which they have established by producing cogent evidence. The trial Court concluded that the plaint cannot be rejected and dismissed the application.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the suit is filed without a cause of action and without filing the documents. Once the property has been sold, there is no cause of action to file the present suit. It is submitted that the trial Court has failed to appreciate these aspects, and the impugned order needs to be set aside and the plaint has to be rejected.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, perused the entire material on record. When an application is filed under Order 7 Rule 11 of the CPC, the Court has to look at the averments of the plaint and the documents filed along with the plaint. It is the admitted case of the defendant that the

plaintiffs has not stated in his plaint about the Sale Deed or about selling the property, and, according to him, he has purchased the said document. In the light of settled law, the Court cannot look into the documents filed by the defendant. The trial Court rightly considered all these aspects and dismissed the application, and this Court finds no reason to interfere. Hence, this Court is passing the following order:

ORDER

i. Accordingly, the Civil Revision Petition is ***dismissed***.

ii. All I.As. in this petition shall stand closed.

SD/-
(LALITHA KANNEGANTI)
JUDGE

MEG
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 10