

**IN THE COURT OF CIVIL JUDGE & J.M.F.C.**  
**AT BANAHATTI**

**:PRESENT:**

**Miss. Shushma T.C.**  
**B.Com., LL.B.,**

Civil Judge & J.M.F.C., Banahatti.

**Dated this, the 05<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2022.**

**O.S No.35/2020**

1. Shabana W/o Irshad Aptagiri,  
Age: 42 years, Occ.: Housewife,  
R/at Terdal, Tq: Rabakavi-Banahatti.

**.... Plaintiff**

(Represented by Sri. A.S.G., Advocate)

**-Vs-**

1. The Town Municipal Council, Terdal,  
Represented by Chief officer, Terdal,  
Tq: Rabakavi-Banahatti.

**.... Defendant**

(Represented by Sri. V.D.P., Advocate)

**: PARTIES IN I.A No. II :**

1. Shabana W/o Irshad Aptagiri

**... Applicant/plaintiff**

**-Vs-**

1. The Town Municipal Council, Terdal  
Represented by Chief officer

**.... Opponent/defendant**

**: ORDERS ON I.A No. II :**

The plaintiff has filed this application U/o 39 Rule 1 and 2 of CPC seeking an order of temporary injunction against defendant restraining him from causing obstruction for her peaceful possession, enjoyment and vahiwat of the suit property bearing TMC No.2785 situated at Terdal till disposal of this suit.

2. In support of this application, plaintiff has sworn to an affidavit stating that, she has filed this suit for declaration and consequential relief of permanent injunction against defendant. It is submitted that, she is the actual owner in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property since time immemorial. Originally, the suit property belonged to the family of one Shankar S/o Yamanappa Gadiwaddar, who sold the same to the husband of this plaintiff. By virtue of the said sale, he was in peaceful possession and enjoyment over the suit property along with his wife and children. Thereafter, he transferred the suit property to the name of his wife- the plaintiff via registered gift deed dated 15.09.2015 and since then she

is the owner in possession of the suit property without any disturbances and paying taxes regularly. But, the defendant caused obstruction to her possession by asking her to vacate the same within two days without any right, title or interest and are trying to dispossess her from the suit property with intention to cause wrongful loss. Hence, she has filed this suit and this application seeking to restrain the illegal acts of defendant. If the application is not allowed, she would be put into greater hardship which cannot be compensated in any terms, whereas, on the other side, no harm would be caused. Further it is submitted that, she has got a prima facie case and balance of convenience lies in her favour. On these grounds prayed to allow the application.

3. On the other hand, defendant has filed written statement and filed a memo to treat the contents of written statement as the objections to this application and contended that, plaintiff is not the actual owner in possession and enjoyment of the suit property and has got entered her name in the property extracts without producing legal documents. Merely based on the said

property extracts she cannot become owner of the suit property and further she needs to adduce evidence to prove her ownership over the suit property. She has filed this suit against defendant only to grab the property by creating illegal documents and has not made out prima facie case for the grant of temporary injunction. On these grounds, prayed to dismiss the application with compensatory costs.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials placed on record.
5. On the basis of rival contentions urged by the parties, the points that would arise for my consideration are as follows:
  1. Whether the plaintiff has made out a prima facie case?
  2. In whose favour balance of convenience lies?
  3. Who will be put to irreparable loss or injury, if an order of temporary injunction is rejected?
  4. What order ?

6. My answers to the above said points are as under:

Point No.1 : In the **Affirmative**.

Point No.2 : In favour of plaintiff.

Point No.3 : Answered accordingly.

Point No.4 : As per final order,  
for the following:

**: R E A S O N S :**

7. **Point No.1:** Plaintiff has filed this suit against defendant for the relief of declaration and consequential relief of permanent injunction. It is the definite case of plaintiff that, she is the owner in actual possession and enjoyment of the suit property bearing TMC No.2785 situated at Terdal. Originally, the suit property belonged to the family of one Shankar S/o Yamanappa Gadiwaddar who sold the same to her husband and he along with his wife and children was in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the same. Thereafter, he executed a Registered Gift Deed dated: 15.09.2015 in favour of his wife who is none other than this plaintiff and since then, she is the actual owner in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property without any disturbances till the filing of this suit. They are paying taxes regularly to the

municipality and have got electricity and water supply to the said suit property. But on 09.01.2020, the defendant tried to dispossess her from the suit property and asked her to vacate the same within two days without having any right, title or interest over the suit property and is trying to cause obstruction to her peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit property. It is submitted that, she has got prima facie case and balance of convenience lies in her favour and if an order of temporary injunction is not granted, she will be put to greater hardship and hence prayed to allow the application.

8. On the other hand, defendant has contended that, plaintiff is not the owner in possession and enjoyment of the suit property and got entered her name in the property extracts without producing valid documents and merely based on the alleged property extracts, she cannot claim ownership over the suit property and has filed this suit only to grab the property of defendant and hence prayed to reject the application as she has not made out prima facie case for the grant of temporary injunction.

9. In support of this application, plaintiff has produced property extracts wherein, her name is mentioned in the column meant for entering the name of owner and registered gift deed dated 15.09.2015 executed by her husband in her favour wherein, the subject matter of the said document is the suit property, the copy of resolution passed by municipality, the property tax paid receipts, electricity charges paid receipt, photograph, unregistered sale deed, copy of license issued by municipality for construction of suit property.
10. It is a settled law that, while considering an application under Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 of CPC, court has to look into prima facie case and not to examine the case on merits that, whether the plaintiff is likely to succeed in the case or not. Plaintiff has to make out prima facie case for the grant of discretionary relief of temporary injunction. It is a settled position of law that, one who seeks equity, must show equity to others and should come with clean hands to have a discretionary relief of the Court, such as an order of temporary injunction. It is also a settled law that, a party is not entitled to an order of injunction as a matter of course. Grant of injunction is within the discretion of the court and such discretion is to be

exercised in favour of the plaintiff only if it is proved to the satisfaction of the court that, unless the defendant is restrained by an order of injunction, irreparable loss or damage will be caused to the plaintiff during the pendency of the suit. The court further has to satisfy that, non-interference by the court would result in irreparable injury to the party seeking relief.

11. In the light of the above principles, when we look into the present case on hand, based on the rival contentions urged by both the parties and after careful consideration of the pleadings of the parties, it is observed that, there is a serious dispute by defendant regarding the ownership of the plaintiff over suit property. The suit is filed by her against defendant for the relief of declaration and consequential relief of injunction. However, the question relating to title is a mixed question of law and facts which be adjudicated after full-fledged trial. Based on the available materials, without going into the merits of the case, it is necessary to protect the alleged rights of plaintiff over the suit property until conclusion of trial otherwise the very purpose of filing this suit and application will be defeated. The question whether,

she is the owner to the suit property or not requires to be decided after the evidence which will take time. At this juncture, protection of rights over the property and protecting the nature of suit property is required to be safeguarded and hence, without going into the merits of the case, it is safe to hold that, plaintiff has made out prima facie case for the grant of temporary injunction. Accordingly, I answer point no.1 in the **Affirmative**.

12. **Point No.2:** The plaintiff has made out prima facie case for the grant of temporary injunction and looking into the available materials on record produced by plaintiff, it would be just and proper to hold that, balance of convenience lies in favour of plaintiff. If an order of temporary injunction is not granted, it would definitely prejudice the rights of the parties over the suit property who is paying taxes to the municipality and alleges to be in possession over the suit property. Hence, this point is answered accordingly.

13. **Point No.3:** By considering the facts and circumstances of the case and based on my discussion on above points, I hold that, plaintiff has made out prima facie case and has

convinced this Court that, balance of convenience lies in her favour and moreover, has shown that, a Judicial intervention is necessary to protect her alleged right over the suit property, failing which, she will be put into greater hardship, which cannot be compensated in any terms. Hence, this point is answered accordingly.

14. **Point No.4** : In view of my discussions on point No.1 to 3, I proceed to pass the following:

**: O R D E R :**

I.A No. II filed by plaintiff U/o 39 Rule 1 and 2 of CPC is hereby allowed.

The defendant is hereby restrained from causing obstruction for the plaintiff's peaceful possession, enjoyment and vahiwat over the suit property bearing TMC No.2785 situated at Terdal till further orders.

No order as to costs.

*(Dictated to the stenographer, typed by her, transcript corrected and then signed and pronounced by me in the open court on this, the 05<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2022)*

**Sd/-**  
**(Shushma T.C.)**  
**Civil Judge & J.M.F.C., Banahatti.**