

KARN220003432023



IN THE COURT OF THE ADDL. CIVIL JUDGE
CHANNAPATNA.

Present: Smt. Usharani B.N.,
B.A., LL.B., L.L.M.,
Addl. Civil Judge and JMFC.,
Channapatna.

Dated this the 5th day of July, 2023

O.S.No.35/2023

Plaintiff/s: 1. Sri. Srinivasa

(By Sri.M.M., Adv.)

V/s.

Defendant/s : Sri. Hanumantha

and Others

(By Sri R.V.K., Adv.)

I.A.NO.I

Applicant: : Smt. Srinivasa

V/S

Respondents : Sri. M. Hanumantha

KARN220003432023



U/O XXXIX RULE 1 AND 2 R/w Sec.151 OF CPC

1. The plaintiff has filed this application seeking temporary injunction against the defendants, followers or hire laborers from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property till disposal of this suit.

SCHEDULE

The property situated at Manalavarapete Village, Kasaba Hobli, Channapatna Taluk, Ramanagara District bearing KNo.25/542/6 and E-Katha No.152900103000501305. Measuring east to west 40 North to south 30 feet and K No 25/542/7, E Katha No 15290010300801269 measuring East to west 40 feet north to south 30 feet, both the property situated side by side hence common boundary as follows:

KARN220003432023



East By : The remaining property of
vendor now house of
Venkatesh,

West By : 20 feet road,

North by : Vacant sute of Srinivasaiah

South By : 14 feet Vacant space left for
common usage.

2. In support of the application the plaintiff has filed affidavit stating that, he has filed this suit for the relief of the permanent injunction against the defendants, he is fully conversant with the facts of the case, due to avoid the repetition of facts the plaint may read the part and parcel of this affidavit. Further submitted that he is the absolute owner of the suit schedule property being purchased from 3rd defendant through registered sale deed dated 13.03.1998, the E-Katha has been made out in his name he is paying the Kandayam

KARN220003432023



to the concerned authority. The defendants are nothing to do with the suit schedule property and the vendor 3rd defendant in the suit have lost all manner of right and title when he sold the suit property in favour of Mookammal in the year 1998. Earlier the suit property was part of land bearing Sy.No.542 of Mangalavarapete. The defendant Nos 1, 2 along with their brothers and mother channamma partitioned Sy. No. 542 in the year 1991 through panchayath parikhath. In the partition defendant 1 & 3 and other brothers got 0-07 guntas each. On the basis of partition, the defendants No.1 and 3 and their brother applied for conversion of Sy. No 542 into residential purpose. The District Commissioner Bengaluru rural district converted the land Sy. No 542 through an order No. B.D.ALN (CHA) 15/1993-94 into residential purpose. On the basis of said conversion order the defendant No.3 got into Thittamaranahalli Grama Panchayath and

KARN220003432023



assigned K.No.25/542/6 and 25/542/7, and E-katha also have been made out. He has filed application for being made E-khatha in CMC Channapatna. Though the DC have passed orders converting the Sy.No.542 into residential purpose defendant No.3 had lost all manner of right and title over the suit schedule property, the DC Bangalore rural district has sent the records of conversion order to the Tahsildar Channapatna to effect necessary changes with respect to revenue records of Sy.No.542, but the Tahsildar till today has not made any changes in the RTC of Sy.No.542. According to the rules and regulations of land revenue act 1963 it is bounded duty of concerned Tahsildar to effect the necessary changes in the revenue records as well as the survey sketch, but the Tahsildar has not followed the orders of the DC Bangalore rural district, Still the RTC depicts 00-19 guntas in the name of Channamma who is the mother of defendant No.1

KARN220003432023



to 3. After the conversion of Sy.No.542 defendant No.1 to 3 as well as Channamma has sold remaining measurement of land in Sy. No. 542 to various person and have not retained a piece of land in Sy. No.542. But the defendant taking undue advantage of still mentioning the name of Channamma in RTC of revenue records are continuously obstructing the peace full possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit property. The plaintiff applied of change of katha in CMC Channapatna but the defendants have filed objections and halted the katha proceedings of the plaintiff. The defendants also with dire consequences being made hectic attempt to disposes the plaintiff from the suit schedule property, the defendants have attempted to change of katha in the revenue documents to alienate the suit property hurriedly. Prior to filing of the suit about 7 days back he lodged complaint before the jurisdictional police but instead of

KARN220003432023



talking necessary action against the defendants for their high handedness have issued NCR. On the other hand, the defendants without any untoward incident from his side have lodged complaint against the complaint as well the other adjacent property owners under the atrocity act. With the apprehension of being illegal arrest he has approached this court against the onslaught of the defendants. He has established prima facie case, the balance of convenience lies in his favour and he is entitled for the TI as prayed in the IA. If this court please to grant TI there is no hardship caused to opposite side on the other hand he will be put irreparable loss and injury. Hence, prays to allow the application.

3. The defendants have filed written statement to the suit and filed memo and prays to treat the written statement as objection to IA.NoI and contended that, the plaintiff has not approached with clean hand and he suppressed

KARN220003432023



the true and material facts from the preview of this court, on that score itself the suit of the plaintiff is liable to be dismissed. The plaintiff is not entitled for any of the relief as against these defendants in respect of the suit schedule property. The boundaries in respect of the suit schedule property as furnished by the plaintiff is incorrect. There was one Venkatadasaiah. Now Venkatadasaiah is no more. One deceased Channamma is the wife of said Venkatadasaiah. Said Venkatadasaiah had six issues by name Hanumanthaiah the first defendant herein, Vishaka the 2nd defendant herein, Venkatesha the 3rd defendant herein, Venkatappa, Madduramma @ Mahalakshmi and Sathyanarayana. Among them Venkatappa is no more. So far as Sathyanarayana is concerned he found missing about 15 years back. The land bearing Sy.No.542 of Mangalawarapet was originally Chikkayalagaiah. Venkatadasaiah, the father of

KARN220003432023



the defendants 1 to 3 was tenant under Chikkayalagaiah in Sy.No.542, measuring 1 acre 24 guntas situated at Mangalawarapet. After induction of tenancy Act, said Venkatadasaiah made an application in prescribed form before the land grant committee, Channapatna seeking for grant of occupancy right in respect of said 01 acre 24 guntas of land his favour. The above representation has been registered as LRF No.13/79-80. Based on the said representation made by Venkatadasaish, after confirming the possession of Venkatadasaiah over said 01 acre 24 guntas, the land grant committee has granted the said land in favour of Venkatadasaiah, as per the document produced herewith by considering the said Venkatadasaiah as occupant of said 01 acre 24 guntas tenancy right has been granted in favour of said Venkatadasaiah in the said proceedings on 20.08.1986.

KARN220003432023



4. Subsequently pursuant to the above occupancy right granted in favour of Venkatadasaiah, the mutation has been accepted into the name of Venkatadasaiah, khatha has been made out into the name of Venkatadasaiah and he has been shown as khatedar and in possession and enjoyment of the said 01 acre 24 guntas of land till his death. During the life time of Venkatadasaiah he has purchased another extent 15 guntas of adjacent land in the same survey number from one Chikkayalagaiah S/o Doddaputtaiah in the same survey No. by virtue of the registered sale deed dated 15.07.1970. Thus, Venkatadasaiah became absolute owner of 01 acre 39 guntas of land in Sy. No.542 of Mangalawarapet. Subsequently after the death Venkatadasaiah his wife Channamma along with her children including defendants 1 to 3 sold that 15 guntas of land (purchased by Venkataadasaiah from Chikkayalagaiah) by virtue of a registered

KARN220003432023



sale deed dated 23.06.1990 in favour of V.B. Srikantaiah and retained 1 acre 24 guntas of land with them.

5. After the death of Venkatadasaiah his sons Hanumanthaiah the 1st defendant, Venkatappa, Venkatesha the 3rd defendant herein and Sathyanarayana have partitioned 07 guntas each out of total extent of 01 acre 24 guntas. Subsequently all the above shares have converted their 07 guntas each from agriculture purpose to non-agriculture purpose. Thereafter, sold the converted portion of 28 guntas. In the remaining retained land of 36 guntas again the four sons of Venkatadasaiah have partitioned 04 guntas each equally and subsequently the above four sharers have sold their portions of 04 guntas each and retained 20 guntas with them. These defendants after the death of Venkatadasaiah have made representation before the Tahsildar seeking for

KARN220003432023



khata of that 20 guntas in Sy.No.542 but the Tahsildar instead of making the khata has issued an endorsement bearing No. RRT/CR/802/ 2020-2021 on 10.01.2022 on the ground that, already mutation has been accepted and asked these defendants to prefer appeal before the competent forum. Subsequently one Madduramma @ Mahalakshmi who is the daughter of Venkatadasaiah preferred an appeal before the Assistant Commissioner, Ramanagara Sub-Division, Ramanagara in RA.No.240/2021-2022, which came to be allowed by directing the Tahsildar Channapatna, to make enquiry in the above matter U/sec.129 of KLR Act 1964 and to make the khata by taking into consideration of all the records and the possession over the land in question. Subsequently pursuant to the order passed by the Assistant Commissioner in RA.No.240/2021-2002, the Tahsildar Channapatna took the matter as RRT(DIS 273/2021-2022 and after the due survey

KARN220003432023



through the Taluka Surveyor confirmed that, these defendants and the daughter of Venkatadasaiah by name Madduramma and Mahalakshmi, the Tahsildar passed the order on 28.02.2022 to make the khata of 19 guntas of land in the name of Channamma W/o late Venkatadasaiah, and Pursuant to the said order the mutation has been accepted by the Tahasildar vide MR No.T75/2021-2022 and khata has been made out into the name of Channamma W/o Venkatadasaiah and Channamma is shown as khatedar and the person in possession over the said 19 guntas of land. The above facts are established by the survey and recent mutation. At this juncture of time the plaintiff without disclosing the above true facts from the purview of this court has come up with this false and frivolous suit by making reckless allegations against these defendants who are the lawful owners and in possession and enjoyment over 19 guntas of land in Sy.No.542 of Mangalawarapet,

KARN220003432023



Channapatna Taluk to get wrongful gain and to defeat and deprive the right of these defendants over the said 19 guntas of land in Sy.No/542. Viewed from any angle, the suit of the plaintiff is not maintainable either in law or on facts and the same is liable to be dismissed. The plaintiff is not entitled for any of the relief in the instant matter as against these defendants, in respect of 19 guntas of land in Sy.No.542 of Mangalawarapet Village. No such suit schedule property is in existing in that 19 guntas of land in Sy. No. 542. Even though the plaintiff without proper identification of his alleged suit schedule property by furnishing the wrong boundaries as come up with the present false suit to get wrongful gain. Hence prays to dismiss the application.

6. Heard and perused the materials on record.

KARN220003432023



7. Defendants counsel filed written arguments along with decision of Hon'ble *Alahabad High court. (full bench), 1972 SCC online All 244 : 1972 All LJ 1037 (FB) : AIR 1973 All 116 (FB), Ganesh V/s Sri. Ram lala ji Maharaj Birajman Mandir and others.*

8. The following points arise for my determination;

1. Whether the plaintiffs have made out a prima-facie case in his favour?
2. Whether the balance of convenience lies in favour of the plaintiffs?
3. Whether the irreparable loss or injury will be caused to the plaintiffs if temporary injunction is not granted?
4. What order?

KARN220003432023



9. My findings on the above points are as under;

Point No.1 : In the Affirmative,

Point No.2 : In the Affirmative,

Point No.3 : In the Affirmative,

Point No.4 : As per final order,

for the following;

REASONS

10. **Points 1 to 3** :- These points taken together for the sake of convenience and avoid repetition.

11. As postulated by the provision under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of CPC, it is not required to go into the merits of the case while entertaining the application but the Court has to examine as to whether (i) the plaintiff has a prima facie case to go for trial (ii) the protection is necessary from that species of injuries known as

KARN220003432023



irreparable before his legal right can be established; and (iii) that the mischief of inconvenience likely to arise from withholding injunction will be greater than what is likely to arise from granting it.

12. It is settled principle of law that injunction or interim orders are issued not on grace or on default of any person. Interim orders are granted on the basis of the case made out prima facie in the pleadings and that in the interest of justice such interim order is necessary in order to prevent abuse of process of law to prevent wastage or to maintain the situation as on the date or from recurrence of certain incident which were existing as on the date of presenting such application out of which the proceeding is arising.

13. Prima facie case means bona fide dispute requiring determination without pre-judging the

KARN220003432023



case. In order to find out whether there exists any prima facie case in favour of a party or not, it would be enough if it could be established that there was a seriously arguable question and it is not necessary that the point be proved to the hilt at that stage.

14. The plaintiff has produced Sale Deed dated.13.03.1998, Encumbrance Certificate, E-Katha, Demand register extract, Xerox copy of Tax paid receipt, Notification of transfer of property from Thittamaranahalli panchayath to CMC Channapatna, Police cknowledgment, Conversion order dated 30.11.1993 in No.93-94, RTC.

15. The defendants have not produced documents.

16. In support of the submission made by the learned counsel for the plaintiff, he has relied upon the sale deed and e-katha to substantiate

KARN220003432023



his case. The boundaries of the suit schedule property are not correct and the plaintiff has not approached this court with clean hands.

17. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the respective parties and have gone through the documents produced in support of their contentions. It is the case of the plaintiff that, he has purchased the suit schedule property from defendant No.3 for valuable consideration. On the other hand, it is bone contention of the defendants that, there is no such property exists in the 19 guntas of land belongs to the defendants and the plaintiff without mentioning proper identity of the property filed the false suit.

18. It is pertinent to note that the plaintiff has produced the registered sale deed, the defendants

KARN220003432023



have not disputed the said sale deed of the plaintiff for the suit schedule property. It is apparent from record which has been furnished by the plaintiff. The main grounds on which the defendants have sought for rejection of the application is that, 01 acre 24 guntas of land granted in the name of the defendants' father Venkatadasaiah, further during the life time, he has purchased another extent 15 guntas of adjacent land in the same survey number from one Chikkayalagaiah S/o Doddaputtaiah in the same survey No. by virtue of the registered sale deed dated 15.07.1970. Thus, Venkatadasaiah became absolute owner of 01 acre 39 guntas of land in Sy.No. 542 of Mangalawarapet. Subsequently after the death their father, their mother Channamma along with her children including defendants 1 to 3 sold that 15 guntas of land in favour of V.B. Srikantaiah and retained 1 acre 24 guntas of land with them. Subsequently

KARN220003432023



all the above shares have converted their 07 guntas each from agriculture purpose to non-agriculture purpose. Thereafter, sold the converted portion of 28 guntas. In the remaining retained land of 36 guntas again the four sons of Venkatadasaiah have partitioned 04 guntas each equally and subsequently the above four sharers have sold their portions of 04 guntas each and retained 20 guntas with them. Pursuant to the Tahasildar order, the mutation has been accepted by the vide MR No. T75/2021-2022 and khata has been made out into the name of Channamma W/o Venkatadasaiah and Channamma is shown as khatedar and the person in possession over the said 19 guntas of land excluding 01 gunta of karab. On the other hand, the plaintiff has also made an allegation against the defendants that they being made hectic attempts to dispossess the plaintiff from the suit schedule property and attempted to change katha to alienate the suit

KARN220003432023



schedule property. It, prima facie appears that the suit of the plaintiff is not vexatious.

19. It is noteworthy to state that, the plaintiff has purchased the suit schedule property from defendant No.3 through registered sale deed. If at all an injunction has not been granted as against the defendants, the plaintiff would be put to irreparable hardship and inconvenience which cannot be compensated in terms of money. The fact as to whether the suit schedule property exist in 19 guntas or not or the boundaries mentioned is incorrect to be adjudicated upon during the course of trial. It is also to be adjudged upon to ascertain as to whether 1 acre 24 guntas was granted in the name of defendants' father and in total, he had 1 acre, 39 guntas of land. Hence, prima facie has been made out by the plaintiff to grant an equitable relief. Accordingly, **point No.1 is answered in the Affirmative.**

KARN220003432023



20. Point No. 2 & 3 :- These points are taken up together for common discussion as they are interlinked to each other and also in order to avoid repetition of the facts so also for the sake of convenience and brevity.

21. The second test applicable to assess whether the relief could be granted or not is to ascertain whether the balance of convenience lies in favour of the applicant or lien in favour of the opponent. Since the relief of an interim injunction is all the same an equitable relief, the Court shall also consider whether the comparative mischief or inconvenience which is likely to ensue from withholding the injunction will be greater than that which is likely to arise from granting it, which means that the balance of convenience is in favour of the plaintiff seeking the relief. Thirdly, the test which requires to be applied is whether the

KARN220003432023



applicant suffers irreparable loss or injury if no relief is granted or the opponent as the case may be.

22. On perusal of the pleadings and the documents relied upon by the respective parties, if at all the injunction has not been granted as against defendants, the plaintiff would be put to irreparable loss and hardship which cannot be compensated in terms of money. Viewed from any angle, the plaintiff would be put to comparative hardship and inconvenience if at all the injunction is refused.

23. It is to be noted that, it is settled law that the Court cannot conduct mini trial venturing upon to decide the case on merits while entertaining the interim application. Thus, the contentions raised by the defendants with regard to non-existence of suit schedule property within 19 guntas and other

KARN220003432023



defence could be adjudged during the course of trial. Under the facts and circumstances of the case, it is just and necessary to grant injunction restraining the defendants from causing any interference to the peaceful possession of the plaintiff. **Accordingly, the point No. 2 and 3 are also answered in the Affirmative.**

24. It is needless to state that the observations made herein is only with respect to the adjudication of the present application filed U/O XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of CPC., and the same shall not be construed as an expression on merits of this case.

25. *The learned counsel for defendants has relied upon the decision of Hon'ble Alahabad High court. (full bench), 1972 SCC online **All 244 : 1972 All LJ 1037 (FB) : AIR 1973 All 116 (FB), Ganesh V/s Sri. Ram lala ji Maharaj Birajman Mandir and others.***

KARN220003432023



“It will thus be seen that what the law requires is that the description of the property in suit given in that plaint must be sufficient to identify the property. If independently of the, boundaries the property can be sufficiently identified, then any error or misdescription in the boundaries cannot affect either the suit or the decree passed in the suit. In the instant case, is already mentioned, no dispute at any time was raised that the suit property and the property in respect of which the decree was passed is not identifiable on the spot or it is a property different from the property which was purchased by the plaintiff from panna Lal and for the delivery of which the suit was filed.”

I have gone through the above decision of Allahabad High court, (full bench) with great respect not applicable to the facts and circumstances of present case on hand.

KARN220003432023



26. Point No. 4 : In view of the aforesaid discussion and findings on Point Nos.1 to 3, I proceed to pass the following-

ORDER

I.A. No. I filed by the plaintiffs under Order 39 R.1 & 2 r/w.Sec.151 of CPC is allowed.

The defendants, followers or hire laborers are hereby temporarily restrained from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property till disposal of the suit by way of granting temporary injunction.

(Dictated to the Typist copyist on online computer order corrected and signed by me, then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the **5th day of July - 2023**).

Addl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Channapatna

KARN220003432023



KARN220003432023

**ORDER****Order pronounced in the open court****(vide separate order)**

I.A. No. I filed by the plaintiffs under Order 39 R.1 & 2 r/w.Sec.151 of CPC is allowed.

The defendants, followers or hire laborers are hereby temporarily restrained from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the plaintiff over the suit schedule property till disposal of the suit by way of granting temporary injunction.

For comply of Sec.89 of CPC.

Call on 02.08.2023.

Addl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Channapatna.

KARN220003432023

