HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:64399
WP No. 35303 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010776392026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

WRIT PETITION NO. 35303 OF 2026 (GM-CPC)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI MOHAMMED MOUZAM AZEEZ
   S/O LATE SRI. ABDUL AZEEZ MEMON,
   AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
   R/AT 6, 1ST MAIN ROAD, JAYAMAHAL,
   BANGALORE - 560046.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M.D. RAGHUNATH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI ARVIND REDDY
   S/O SRI. VENKATESH REDDY,
   AGED ABOUT 45 YRS,
   R/AT NO.12, 3RD CROSS, D'COSTA LAYOUT,
   FRAZER TOWN POST,
   BANGALORE - 560 005.

...RESPONDENT

(VIDE ORDER DATED 19/11/2026 NOTICE TO RESPONDENT IS DISPENSED WITH)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO I. ALLOW THE WRIT PETITION ON COSTS AND II. ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Digitally signed by VIJAYA P
Location: High Court of Karnataka

QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 29/10/2026 PASSED BY LXXIII ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS JUDGE MAYO HALL AT BANGALORE, IN O.S. 25946/2023, AT ANNEXURE E AT I.A.NO.3 AND ETC,.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. V. ARAVIND

ORAL ORDER

The limited grievance raised in the present writ petition is that the Trial Court has not passed orders on the requisition made by the 10th ACJM, despite having heard the arguments.

2. A perusal of the order dated 01.10.2026 indicates that arguments were concluded on I.A.No.3 as well as on the requisition made by the 10th ACJM. However, by the impugned order dated 29.10.2026, the Trial Court considered only I.A.No.3, impounded the document in question and referred it to the competent authority for determination of the stamp duty and penalty payable.

3. Considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the material on record.

4. In view of the limited grievance raised in the present petition, issuance of notice to the respondent is unnecessary and is accordingly dispensed with.

5. The Trial Court, by order dated 01.10.2026, recorded that arguments had been heard on I.A.No.3 as well as on the requisition made by the 10th ACJM and posted the matter for orders. However, thereafter, the Trial Court pronounced orders only on I.A.No.3 and did not pass any orders in respect of the requisition made by the 10th ACJM.

6. In the absence of any reasons for not passing orders on the said requisition, this Court is inclined to direct the Trial Court to pass appropriate orders on the requisition made by the 10th ACJM, as recorded in the order dated 01.10.2026, within an outer limit of four weeks from today.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***disposed of***.

Sd/-
(K. V. ARAVIND)
JUDGE

DDU/List No.: 2 Sl No.: 16