

KAUK510004662025



Presented on : 26-03-2025  
Registered on : 26-03-2025  
Decided on : 16-10-2025

**IN THE COURT OF CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC, HALIYAL**  
**AT: HALIYAL, UTTARA KANNADA**

**Dated this 16<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2025**

**PRESENT**

**Smt. Geeta.** B.A.LL.B (Hon's) LL.M.,  
Civil Judge and JMFC,Haliyal

**ORIGINAL SUIT NO.42/2025**

**BETWEEN:**

1. Lalu S/o Shankar Lamani,  
Age: 52 years, Occ : Agriculture,  
R/o : Venkatapur Thanda,  
Tq: Haliyal, Dist: Uttar Kannada

**.....Plaintiff**

**(By Shri. A.C.C., Advocate)**

**AND:**

1. Chandrashekar S/o Rudrappa Mathad,  
Age 65 years, Occ: Agriculture,  
R/o : Gurla Hosur Oni Savadatti,  
Dist: Belagavi.

**.....Defendant**

**(By Sri. B.N.R/Sri. D.K.J, Advocates)**

**I.A.No.II****Applicant/Pliff : Lalu S/o Shankar Lamani****-Vs.-****Opponent/Deft : Chandrashekar S/o Rudrappa  
Mathad****ORDERS ON I.A.No.II**

The plaintiff filed I.A.No.II under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of C.P.C praying to grant temporary injunction restraining the defendant, his henchmen, or any person acting on his behalf from obstructing peaceful possession and enjoyment of suit property till disposal of the suit.

2. In the affidavit the plaintiff stated that, the suit property is part and parcel of R.S No.20B/68 measuring 4 acres situated at Venkatapur Village, out of which 2 acre 20 guntas, said property belongs to State Government. The ancestors of plaintiff have started to cultivate said land since 65 to 70 years, since 30 years plaintiff alone is cultivating 2 acre 20 guntas. The suit property is abutting to R.S.No.142, which belongs to plaintiff family. In the year 2023, the plaintiff came to know that, one Vachappa S/o Tekappa Lamani and others have filed W.P No.85634-647/2013 and obtained order from the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka against the plaintiff and others on

10.12.2014. Thereafter, the plaintiff and others preferred Appeal No.100536/2022, after hearing the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka passed order on 08.08.2023 holding that order passed in W.P No.85634-647/2013 is not binding on plaintiff and others and reserved liberty to plaintiff and others to take recourse if required. Thereafter, the plaintiff continued his possession over the suit property and also filed many applications before the concerned authority to grant said land in his favour and same are pending for consideration.

3. Such being the case, the defendant colluding with revenue officials had surveyed the suit property and other properties and created some documents including maps. As per created documents and maps, property bearing Survey No.20B/68 situated at Ajamanal Village is converted into Block No.141 of Venktapura Village as per survey order No.10030124243895, dated 31.07.2024. In the said survey, it is mentioned that, the plaintiff has encroached the property measuring 2 acres 20 guntas in Survey No.141 i.e., present suit property. In reality, the plaintiffs never encroached any property but, the plaintiff and his ancestors cultivating the suit property since longtime till this date without any obstructions. The suit property is not at all concerned to defendant

but, he colluding with revenue officials has created maps and entered his name in the record of rights of R.S No.141 illegally. On the basis of illegal entry, the defendant is trying to dispossess the plaintiff from the suit property. Hence, the plaintiff filed several applications before the Tahasildar, Deputy Commissioner, Police officials and also other Departments regarding illegal acts of defendant and his henchmen. All the while, the defendant gave threat of dispossession from suit property and also trying to destroy standing crops grown in the suit property. Therefore, the plaintiff requested defendant not to do such illegal activities stating that, the plaintiff is having every right to cultivate and protect his possession. The plaintiff and his ancestors are cultivating the suit property and elders of the locality are also advised defendant not to do illegal activities but, the defendant not heed the request of elders. On the contrary, gave threat to the plaintiff stating that, he already managed revenue officials and officials of other department. Hence, the plaintiff filed this suit along with this application. The plaintiff contended that, he has prima-faice case, balance of convenience lies in his favour and he has every chance of success in the case. With these contentions, he prayed to allow the application.

4. After issuance of suit summons, the defendant appeared through his counsel and filed written statement along with memo to consider written statement as objections to I.A No.II. In the written statement, the defendant denied the description of the suit property and stated that, suit being one for bare injunction, in the absence of correct description, suit is not maintainable. The defendant contended that, suit property is 2 acres 20 gunthas out of R.S No.141 measuring 4 acres but, the plaintiff failed to state on which side or direction of R.S No.141, he is claiming right or interest in respect of 2 acres 20 gunthas. Further, the plaintiff has not given boundaries of 2 acres 20 gunthas. The defendant contended that, after the death of ancestor of the plaintiff i.e., Shanker Lamani is also granted 4 acres of land out of Block No.20B and from M.R.No.T9/2023-24 it appears that after his death his brothers succeeded the same. The other LRs are not made as parties to this suit, therefore, the suit is not maintainable. The defendant had not filed writ petitions and not a party to said writ petition. He admitted that, Vachappa Tekappa Lamani and others had filed Writ Petition and obtained orders on 10.12.2014 but, not against the plaintiff but, against State of Karnataka, Deputy Commissioner, Karwar and Tahasildar, Haliyal. Further, the plaintiff and others

preferred Writ Appeal No.100536/2022 and same was disposed on 08.08.2023 observing that, they are not parties to Writ Petition and same is not binding on them. It is further observed that, said order does not cause prejudice or affect their alleged right, title or interest in any way and reserved liberty to take recourse to law. Further, the order passed in Writ Petition No.85634-85647/2013, dated 10.12.2014 was not set aside and they were not restrained from carrying out the survey work. Therefore, it is clear that, the claim of plaintiff is contingent, simply by making application to grant the land will not invest him with any right to initiate any legal proceedings that too against the third party i.e., the defendant without perfecting his rights against the Government. As per the Order of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the survey work is conducted, the defendant being ordinary person, he colluding with revenue officials and creating documents and maps etc., are false.

**5.** The defendant contended that, the Government is the original owner of Block No.20B, in order to show that, from whom and how plaintiff derives right or interest in the suit land has not been stated. The Government is necessary party and it ought to have made as party after complying formalities under Section 80 of C.P.C. The suit property

is granted to defendant by Government on 02.06.1979, since then he was in actual possession and enjoyment of the same. The plaintiff has not title to the suit property and he is not concerned to the same. The suit property is earlier Government land subsequently granted to defendant, the plaintiff with malafide intention is attempting to grab the same by falsely contending that, he is cultivating the suit land since 65 to 70 years. There is no evidence to show that, the plaintiff is cultivating the suit land since 65 to 70 years and he is in possession. Admittedly, the suit property is Government land and the plaintiff is claiming right and interest over the suit land unless Government and survey authorities are made as parties. The suit for bare injunction cannot be adjudicated. Further, suit filed by the plaintiff without seeking the relief of declaration against the Government is not maintainable. The plaintiff has not disclosed how he derived right, interest and title over the suit property.

**6.** It is contended by the defendant that, originally Block No.20/B of Ajamanal Village was vast land totally measuring 574 acres, same belonged to Government and lying fallow. In order to bring the same under cultivation, the Government decided to grant the same to poor, fit and landless persons and invited applications. Accordingly, granted the same to

142 landless persons under its Order No.LGL-SR-1646. The defendant had also applied for grant of land and 4 acres of land was granted to him. After survey, as per order of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, same is numbered as R.S No.141. As per grant, the name of defendant is entered as M.E No.369. Since the date of grant, defendant is in possession of said land. As per nature of land and since it is vast, some of the grantees were not in possession of the actual extent granted to them and some of them were in possession less extent. Therefore, many of the grantees made several representations to D.C and Survey authorities to measure, demarcate and fix Hubbust but, the concerned authorities did not take any action. Therefore, some of the grantees including defendant have filed W.P No.85634 to 85647/2013 for issuing necessary directions to concerned authorities. The said petition was disposed on 10.12.2014 and issued direction to the concerned authorities to review applications filed by each grantees in the year 1999 or earlier seeking Hubbust of lands and to compare the same with original grant order and ensure that, each of the grantee is put in possession of the extent of land granted to him. It is further observed that, while conducting said exercise none of the grantee shall be entitled to seek retention of excess land in their

cultivation on the ground that, they have sunk well or made out any improvement or construction or any development activities in the said extent.

7. It is further contended that, the ancestors of the plaintiff are also granted 4 acres of land by the Government, after the death of original grantee, the plaintiff and his brothers succeeded the same. It is simply contended that, they are cultivating the said land since 65 to 70 years and may the representation to the concerned authorities for grant of the same. In the year 1979 itself, defendant is granted 4 acres i.e., suit land after 8 years, the plaintiff and 55 others challenged the order of the Hon'ble Court in Writ Appeal No.100534/2022 on the ground that, they are cultivating lands claimed by the defendant and others. On 8.8.2023, said appeal came to be disposed off holding that, the plaintiff and others are not parties to said order and said order is not binding upon them reserving liberty to take recourse to law. The W.P No.85634 to 85647/2013 were filed against State of Karnataka, the Deputy Commissioner, Karwar and Tahasildar, Haliyal and order dated 10.12.2014 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P No.85634 to 85647/2013 were not specifically set aside. Therefore, the concerned authorities had preceded with survey work as per direction in W.P

No.85634 to 85647/2013. The plaintiff has no title to suit property or in possession. The land is already granted to defendant, therefore, the suit is not maintainable.

8. It is further contended that, as per the observations in Writ Petition, the Deputy Commissioner and Survey authorities took steps for measurement, demark the boundaries of each grantees and put them in actual possession as per original grant order. After demarcation and fixing boundaries of 4 acres, same is handed over to defendant together with encroached area and possession certificate is also issued to defendant on 29.09.2024. The defendant is in possession of the suit land but, in less extent. Such being the case, the plaintiff in order to lay false claim over the defendant's land by colluding with revenue officials got created false documents and maps etc. Therefore, suit is liable to be dismissed.

9. It is contended that, as per the plaint averments, suit property belongs to Government, the plaintiff has not disclosed how he derived right, title, interest over the suit property, on what basis and he is claiming adverse possession over the suit property has not been stated. Therefore, until he claims the relief of declaration over the suit property, suit for bare

injunction is not maintainable. With these contentions, the defendant prayed to dismiss the application.

10. Heard both counsel and perused the records.

11. Now the points that arise for consideration are as under;

***1. Whether the plaintiff has made out prima facie case to grant of temporary injunction?***

***2. Whether the plaintiff proves balance of convenience lies more in his favor?***

***3. Whether the plaintiff proves irreparable loss will be caused more to him, if temporary injunction is not granted?***

***4. What order?***

12. Answers on above points are as follows;

**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**

**13. POINT NO.1 TO 3:-** In order to avoid the repetition of facts and for the sake of convenience these points are taken together for discussion.

**14.** It is the case of the plaintiff that, he is in possession and enjoyment of suit property i.e., R.S/Block No.141 measuring 2 acres 20 gunthas out of 4 acres situated at Venktapura Village. Initially, said property is part and parcel of R.S No.20B/68 and now it is renumbered as R.S No.141. The plaintiff's ancestors were in possession of suit property since 65 to 70 years and plaintiff is in possession and cultivation of suit property since 30 years. The suit property is situated just abutting to the property of plaintiff i.e., R.S No.142, the defendant colluding with revenue officials has got surveyed suit property and created some documents and maps, thereby, threatening plaintiff of dispossession and trying to destroy the crops standing in the suit property. The defendant denied the contentions of the plaintiff and also specifically denied the description of suit property and stated that, suit property was granted to him by the Government on 02.06.1979, since then he is in possession and enjoyment of suit property. As per grant order, the name of defendant is entered as per M.E No.369 and

his name was entered jointly in record of rights. As per MR No.T10/2012-13, dated 25.02.2013, a sub-division was effected and the defendant is in actual possession and enjoyment of suit property. Some of the grantees are not in possession of the land granted to them and some of them are in less extent, therefore, they approached the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka by filing Writ Petition No.85634 to 85647/2013. Thereafter, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka directed the Deputy Commissioner and survey authorities to take steps for measurement, demark the boundaries of each grantees and put them in actual possession as per the grant order. After survey and demarcation grantees were put in possession and a new R.S number is given to Block No.20B/52 as R.S No.141 and handed over the possession of the granted land including encroached area to defendant. In order to lay false claim over the defendant's land. The plaintiff filed this suit, therefore, the suit and the application filed by the plaintiff are not maintainable.

**15.** In order to prove his contentions, the plaintiff produced RTC extract with respect to R.S No.20B/68 for the year 2012-13, in which land measuring 4 acres shown as Government pada land, RTC extract with respect to R.S No.141/\*/\* for the year 2024-25, in which 4 acres stands in the name of

defendant and the mode of acquisition shown as MR No.T10/2012-13 dated 25.02.2013. He also produced Notice issued by Surveyor on 06.01.2024 and also Jawab and Hudbust map in which, it is shown as Block No.141 is encroached by the adjoining land owners of land bearing Survey Nos.140 and 142. He also produced the copy of Order of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka passed in W.P No.85634 to 85647/2013 and Writ Appeal No.100536 of 2012. He also produced direction issued by the D.C, Karwar to the Tahasildar, Haliyal on 24.11.2021 and 30.09.2024 to verify the applications given for grant of land and also to take necessary action regarding the same. He also produced receipt issued by the Revenue Inspector on 29.01.2019 stating that, application received regarding legalization of Survey No.20/B68 measuring 4 acres cultivated by the plaintiff. He also produced application given by him and payment receipt dated 29.01.2019 requesting to grant land to him. He also produced Notice issued by the Revenue Inspector on 10.01.1992 to the plaintiff fixing the date for enquiry regarding rant of suit property to him. He also produced an objection given by him to Surveyor on 29.07.2024 and the application given by him along with others to Tahasildar, Haliyal informing him about the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka passed in W.P No.85634 to 85647

of 2013 and also produced letter issued by the D.C, Karwar to the Tahasildar directing him to conduct enquiry regarding possession of plaintiff over the suit property and grant of said land to plaintiff. The plaintiff also produced letter given by him to the Tahasildar on 04.09.2017 requesting to grant Block No.20/B/68 measuring 4 acres to him and register his name in the revenue records. The plaintiff produced an affidavit filed by him on 14.06.2010 stating that, he is in possession and cultivation of suit property i.e., Block No.20B/68 measuring 4 acres is Government pada land and he is cultivating the same by encroaching it. The plaintiff also produced Notice issued on 10.04.2012 under Section 80(1) of C.P.C., requesting the Government to grant said land to the plaintiff. The plaintiff also produced copy of an application given by him for grant of suit property.

**16.** Further, plaintiff produced Notice dated 10.01.1999 issued by the Revenue Inspector, Sambrani to appear for an enquiry regarding legalization of encroached land. He also produced objections given by him to Surveyor, Haliyal stating his objections regarding survey of R.S No.141. He produced a requisition given by him and others to the Tahasildar, Haliyal stating that, Order passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in Writ Appeal No.100536/2022 is

not binding upon them in spite of the order of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka that order passed in W.P No.85634 to 85647/2013 is not binding on the plaintiff and others, the Tahasildar is trying to dispossess the plaintiff and directing them to vacate the suit land. He produced a letter issued by the D.C, Karwar directing Tahasildar, Haliyal to take action regarding the application given by the plaintiff for grant of suit property. He produced several requisitions given by him to the Tahasildar for grant of suit property to him and also direction issued by the D.C, Karwar to the Tahasildar, Haliyal directing him to take necessary actions regarding the grant of said land. The plaintiff produced self declaration by him stating that, Block No.20B/68 measuring 4 acres is Government Pada land and his ancestors were cultivating the said land since 1973. He also produced notice issued by him through his counsel to Tahasildar, Haliyal stating that, he is in possession of suit land i.e., Block No.20B/68 measuring 4 acres since 1976 and the Tahasildar, Haliyal unauthorizedly without due process of law is trying to evict him from said land, if the act of Tahasildar, Haliyal is continued, he will take appropriate action against him.

**17.** In order to prove his contentions, the defendant produced M.R.No.T10/2012-13, in which

Block No.20\*/B/68 measuring 4 acres is shown as Government land and the name of defendant shown as possessor of said land. He also produced M.R No.T9/2023-24, in which Block No.141/\*/\* measuring 4 acres was granted to defendant. The defendant also produced M.E No.121 dated 29.07.1969, as per this document, Block No.20B shown as Government pada land. He produced Form No.V given by him to Tahasildar, Haliyal stating that, Block No.20B Plot No.52 measuring 4 acres is in his possession and he is in occupation of the same. He also produced Form No.VII i.e., Certificate of Grant Saguvali Chit and condition of grant. He produced certified copy of M.E No.369, as per this document, land bearing Block No.20B/52 of Ajamanal Village was granted to defendant. He produced RTC extract with respect to Block No.20B Plot No.52 for the year 1984-85 to 2000 in which, the defendant shown as owner and possessor of land measuring 4 acres. He produced RTC extract with respect to Block No.20B/52 for the year 2012-13 in which 4 acres stands in the name of defendant. The defendant also produced encumbrance Certificate with respect to suit property in which, it is stated that, there is no transaction with respect to suit land from 01.04.2004 to 25.09.2018. He produced P.T Sheet and Tax paid Receipts.

18. On perusal of entire records, it is true that, suit land i.e., Block No.141/\*/\* measuring 4 acres was granted to defendant on 2.6.1979 and his name continued in the revenue records and to that effect M.E No.369 dated 08.07.1979 was effected. RTC extract with respect to said land also stands in the name of defendant and he is paying tax to the Government. However, on perusal of documents produced by the plaintiff, it appears that, though the suit property was granted to defendant in the year 1979, but, the plaintiff and his ancestors encroached said land and they are in possession. Based on his possession over suit property, the plaintiff applied for grant of said land to Tahasildar, Haliyal and also D.C, Karwar. Several time, the D.C, Karwar directed the Tahasildar to take necessary action regarding application filed by the plaintiff for grant of suit property to him. Though the Writ Petition No.85634 to 85647/2013 has been filed against State of Karnataka, Deputy Commissioner, Karwar and Tahasildar, Haliyal alleging that, the Government had called for applications from the landless agricultural coolies in the year 1977 and they have filed applications, based on which, an extent of 4 acres was granted to each of the applicants in R.S No.20 and R.S No.5 of Ajamanal Village. Though the grant was made in the year 1977 but, the respondent no.2 and 3 i.e.,

D.C, Karwar and Tahasildar, Haliyal did not take proper steps for identifying the extent of land granted to each grantees by conducting Hudbust of said land and they sought Hudbust of lands granted to each grantees. In view of said Writ Petition, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka directed the respondent no.2 i.e., Deputy Commissioner, Karwar to review the applications filed by each grantees in the year 1999 and earlier seeking Hudbust of land and same shall be compared to original grant order and shall ensure that, each of the grantee is put in possession of the extent of land granted by the Government under original grant order. But, the plaintiff has not been made as party to said Writ Petition. Therefore, though the plaintiff and others have preferred Writ Appeal No.100536 of 2022, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, Dharwad Bench observed that, the order passed in Writ Petition No.85634 to 85647 of 2013 is not binding on the appellants i.e., present plaintiff and others reserving the liberty to take recourse to such remedies as available under the law.

**19.** Therefore, it is proved that, though the suit property was granted to defendant in the year 1979 but, he was not in possession of suit land. Therefore, he filed an application for survey of R.S No.141/\*/\* on 06.01.2024, based on which, R.S No.141 was surveyed

on 31.07.2024 by Surveyor, ADLR Office, Haliyal and submitted report stating that, R.S No.141 is encroached by the land owners of Block No.140 and 142. The plaintiff being owner of Block No.142 has encroached Block No.141. Therefore, prima-facie it is proved that, the plaintiff is in possession of suit land by way of encroachment.

**20.** Though the suit land is granted to defendant in the year 1979 but, at present it appears that, plaintiff is in possession of the same. Therefore, possession of plaintiff is to be protected till he is vacated from the suit land through due process of law. Further, there are no documents to show that, Tahasildar, Haliyal or D.C, Karwar or Surveyor has taken possession from plaintiff and handed over to defendant. Under these circumstances, it is proper to protect the possession of the plaintiff over the suit property. Moreover, plaintiff is claiming relief of temporary injunction with respect to property bearing R.S.20B/68, now renumbered as R.S No. 141 and defendant is granted with R.S.No.20B/52, it appears that both properties are different. To clarify the same, full-fledged trial is required, therefore, till then possession of plaintiff has to be protected.

21. In ***Smt. A.Y. Satyavati vs. Sri. Danushree and another, MFA No.4702/2025 dated 22.07.2025***, the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka held that, it is well settled principle that, possession, even if not rooted in absolute title, is nonetheless a right in itself. Possession lawfully obtained must be protected against unlawful interference. Even a person in possession without title is entitled to protect his possession against the whole world except the rightful owner. In the case on hand, it prima-facie appears that, the plaintiff is in possession of suit land. Though the suit land is granted to defendant, but from the records, it appears that, he is not in possession of the suit property. Under these circumstances, the possession of plaintiff is to be protected until he vacated through due process of law.

22. In ***Dalpat Kumar vs Prahlad Singh (1992) 1 SCC 719***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that, it is settled law that, the grant of injunction is a discretionary relief, the exercise thereof is subject to the Court satisfying that, (1) there is serious disputed question to be tried in the suit and that the act, on the facts before the Court, there is probability of his being entitled to the relief asked for by the plaintiff/defendant. (2) The Courts interference is necessary to protect the party from the species of

injury. In other words, irreparable injury or damage would enure before the legal right would be establish at trial. (3) That the comparative hardship or mischief or inconvenience which is likely to occur from withholding the injunction will be greater than that would be likely to arise from granting it.

**23.** In the case on hand, the plaintiff prima-facie proved his possession over the suit property and the defendant is contending that, suit land is granted to him and he is in possession of the same since the date of grant. Therefore, there is a question to be tried at trial. Further, admittedly, the suit property is an agricultural land and plaintiff sought the relief of permanent injunction alleging that, he is in possession of the suit property and defendant is trying to dispossess him and destroy the crops standing in the suit property. From the records, it appears that, the plaintiff is in possession of the suit property, at this stage, if temporary injunction is not granted and if defendant interferes with the plaintiff's possession and destroy crops standing in the suit land, certainly the comparative hardship will be more to plaintiff. Moreover, the plaintiff sought for the relief of injunction simplicitor, from the records, it appears that, the plaintiff is in possession of the suit property, therefore, the balance of convenience liens in favour of the

plaintiff. Therefore, at this stage, the plaintiff has made out prima-facie grounds to grant temporary injunction.

**24.** Further, the defendant contended that, description of suit property and boundaries shown in the plaint are not correct. It is well settled principle of law that, while considering application for grant of temporary injunction, the Court has to consider prima-facie case to go for trial and at this stage, it cannot conduct mini trial. Therefore, at this stage, the plaintiff is entitled for grant of temporary injunction.

**25.** Under these circumstances, at this stage, the plaintiff has made out prima-facie case. From the documents, the balance of convenience lies in favour of the plaintiff, if temporary injunction is not granted, the defendant may dispossess plaintiff from the suit property without due process of law. Therefore, till conclusion of the suit, possession of the suit has to be protected. Hence, the plaintiff has made out grounds to allow the application. Hence, **I answer Point No.1 to 3 in the Affirmative.**

**26. POINT NO.4:-** In view of the discussion on Points No.1 to 3 and for the reasons stated therein, I proceed to pass the following;

**ORDER**

**I.A.No.II filed by the plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 of C.P.C., is hereby allowed.**

**The defendant, his henchmen or any person acting on his behalf are hereby restrained from obstructing peaceful possession and enjoyment of suit property by the plaintiff till disposal of the suit.**

**No order as to costs.**

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by her, then corrected, signed and pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the **16<sup>th</sup> day October, 2025**)

Sd/-  
**(GEETA)**  
Civil Judge and JMFC.,  
Haliyal