

Heard the learned counsel appearing for impleading applicants by name Smt. Kempamma, Smt. Gopamma, Smt. Nagarathnamma and Smt. Shwetha.

It is the say of the impleading applicants that the SLAO authority had acquired land measuring half guntas (8 anas) in Sy.No.111/1 of Singahalli Village, Jala Hobli. That the said land as on the date of acquisition is not at all an agricultural land. Despite of the said nature, the revenue entries have been continued. Taking undue advantage of the said revenue entries, the first claimant Venkateshappa basing on alleged WILL said to have been executed in respect of land acquired made a claim before the SLAO state authority. That in fact, Venkateshappa does not have any right, possession in respect of the acquired extent nor does he enjoyed the same. That the impleading applicants are the interested persons and are entitle for the compensation awarded and therefore

that the impleading application be allowed.

Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for Venkateshappa the claimant hereinabove is fair enough to admit that the land acquired is half gunta bearing Sy. No.111/1 of Singahalli Village. He does also admit that the claimant Venkateshappa prefers his claim basing on the WILL referred to by the impleading applicants. But he further says that the claimant Venkateshappa had preferred suit in OS No.404/1993 as against the impleading applicants and others seeking the relief of declaration declaring the Venkateshapp as the owner of property by virtue of the said WILL and for the consequential relief of injunction. He further says that the suit being decreed on 16.10.2017, the impleading applicants and others have not challenged the said decree.

By way of reply, it is submitted on behalf of impleading applicants that the suit referred to by the claimant Venkateshappa was filed for the relief

of bare injunction.

The above said rival submissions of claimant and the impleading applicants enable this court to conclude that an opportunity be given to the impleading applicants to put forth their say in the course of enquiry without seeking any adjournments. Hence, the following:

ORDER

That for the aforementioned reasons, the IA dated 12.02.2025 filed under Order I Rule 10(2) of CPC is hereby allowed by permitting the impleading applicants to be on record as respondent No.2 to 6.

Post the matter for amendment of cause title, filing of amended version and filing of claim statement by the respondent No.2 to 6 by 16.12.2025.

I ADJ, BRD.