

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O.S. No. 108/2022

Plaintiff : Smt. Doddellara Honamma
Vs.
Defendants: Smt. Kamma & Another

ISSUES

- 1) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, the Defendants have agreed to sell the Suit Schedule Property for Total Sale Consideration of Rs. 5,50,000/- and by receiving Advance Amount of Rs.5,00,000/- from the Plaintiff she has Executed the Sale Agreement dated 21.05.2016?**
- 2) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, the Defendants have agreed to Execute the Sale Deed by receiving Balance Sale Consideration as and when the Plaintiff is ready?**
- 3) Whether the Plaintiff's proves that, she is all along ready and willing to perform her part of the Contract?**
- 4) Whether the Defendant No. 1 proves that, the Plaintiff has created the Sale Agreement and the Defendant No. 1 has already sold the Suit Schedule Property in favor of the Defendant No. 2 and Plaintiff is aware of the Ownership and Possession of the Defendant No. 2?**

- 5) Whether the Defendant No. 2 proves that, on 06.01.2017 he has purchased the Suit Schedule Property from the Defendant No. 1 for Rs. 4 Lakhs and by obtaining Change Mutation he is in Possession?
- 6) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief?
- 7) What Order or Decree?

Date: 22.11.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O.S. No. 33/2024

Plaintiff : Smt. Triveni
Vs.
Defendants: Sri. Gowdra Devappa & Another

ISSUES

- 8) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, herself and the Defendants are Members of the Hindu Joint Family and she is having 1/3rd Share in the Suit Schedule Properties?**
- 9) Whether the Defendants No. 1 and 2 prove that, the Plaintiff's father Late Sri. Ravindra Gowda had already obtained his Share in the Suit Schedule Properties by Executing Sale Deed of the Sy. No. 474/B measuring 4.18 Acres and he had received the Sale Consideration Amount for Medical Expenses?**
- 10) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief?**
- 11) What Order or Decree?**

Date: 22.11.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 50/2020

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

- 1) Whether the Defendant No. 34 proves that, he was the Adopted Son of Late Sri. Veerappa and Late Smt. Kamamma and Late Sri. Veerappa had Executed a Registered Will in respect of the 'D' Schedule Property on 17.06.1998 and by virtue of the said Will, the Defendant No. 34 is the absolute Owner of the said Property?**
- 2) Whether Plaintiffs prove that, except the Plaintiffs, there are No other Legal heirs for Late Sri. Veerappa and Late Smt.Kamamma?**

Date: 15.11.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O.S. No. 68/2023

Plaintiff : H. T. Hulugappa
Vs.
Defendant: T. Bheemavva.

ISSUES

- 12) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, the testator Smt. T. Huligemma had acquired the Suit Schedule Property under a Court Decree and she had Executed the Registered Will dated 25.02.2017 in favor of the Plaintiff and thereby, the Plaintiff become the absolute Owner in Possession of the Suit Schedule Property?**
- 13) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, without having any manner of Right, Title or Interest, the Defendant is interfering with his Possession?**
- 14) Whether the Defendant proves that, under a Registered Gift Deed dated 16.09.2010, he become the Owner of the Suit Schedule Property?**
- 15)**
Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?
- 16) What order or Decree?**

Date: 25.10.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

MVC No. 646/2023

Petitioners : Smt. Nagaveni & Others.

Vs.

Respondents: Sri. Siddappa & Another.

I S S U E S

- 1) Whether the Petitioners prove that, the deceased Hammigi Virupakshappa was died in a Road Traffic Accident on 13.01.2023?**
- 2) Whether the Petitioners further prove that, they are Dependants of the deceased and they are entitled for Compensation Amount of Rs. 59,00,000/-?**
- 3) Whether the Respondent No. 1 proves that, the accident was occurred due to own negligence of the deceased and he was not having any valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident to drive the Motor Cycle bearing Reg. No. KA 17 Y 7624 and hence the Respondent No. 1 is not liable for Compensation?**
- 4) Whether the Respondent No.2 proves that, though, the Tractor bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TA 5325 and Trailer bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TA 5326 was Insured with Respondent No. 2, the Owner of the said Vehicle used non Insured Tractor bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TC 0109 and Additional Trailer without taking permission from the RTO and the said Vehicle was driven by a Driver not having valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident and therefore, the Respondent No.2 is not liable for Compensation?**

- 5) **Whether the Petitioners are entitled for Compensation? If so, from whom and how much Compensation they are entitled for?**
- 6) **What Order or Award?**

Date: 13.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. /20

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

- 2) Whether the Defendant No. 2 proves that, for the reason of Legal and Family necessity, the Defendants No. 1, 2 and 8 have sold the Item No. 11 in favor of Defendant No. 10, Item No. 6 in favor of Defendant No. 11 and Item No. 3 and 4 in favor of Defendant No.12 and the said Sale Deeds are also binding on the Plaintiff?**

Date: 27.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 13/2019

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

- 1) Whether the Defendant No. 2 proves that, for the reason of Legal and Family necessity, the Defendants No. 1, 2 and 8 have sold the Item No. 11 in favor of Defendant No. 10, Item No. 6 in favor of Defendant No. 11 and Item No. 3 and 4 in favor of Defendant No.12 and the said Sale Deeds are also binding on the Plaintiff?**

Date: 27.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 13/2019

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

2)

Date: 27.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. /2022

Plaintiff : Smt. Kotramma @ Soubhagyamma.
Vs.
Defendant: Smt. N. M. Kotramma & Others.

ISSUES

- 1) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, herself and Defendants No. 1 to 12 are Members of Hindu undivided Joint Family and she is having 1/6th Share in the Ancestral Suit Schedule Properties?
- 2) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, without seeking any relief of Declaration and Setting aside of the Sale Deed of the Defendant No. 13, she can maintain the Suit?
- 3) Whether the Defendant No. 2 proves that, in the Year 1995 Partition was effected in the Joint Family and Shares were allotted as contended in Paragraph No. 7(d) of the Written Statement and in view of said Partition took place before 09.09.2005, the Suit is not Maintainable?
- 4) Whether Defendant No. 2 further proves that, by suppressing Decree in OS No.122/2014 dated 15.04.2015, the Plaintiff once again filed Second Suit for Partition?
- 5) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?
- 6) What order or Decree?

Date: 20.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 52/2022

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

- 2) Whether the LR's of the Defendant No. 1 prove that, the Item No. 5 bearing Sy.No.369 measuring 3.99 Acres is the self Acquired Property of Meenyanaiik and his sons have already effected Partition of the same and already in Exclusive Possession?**

Date: 20.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 47/2022

Plaintiff : Smt. Kotramma @ Soubhagyamma.
Vs.
Defendant: Smt. N. M. Kotramma & Others.

ISSUES

- 17) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, herself and Defendants No. 1 to 12 are Members of Hindu undivided Joint Family and she is having 1/6th Share in the Ancestral Suit Schedule Properties?
- 18) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, without seeking any relief of Declaration and Setting aside of the Sale Deed of the Defendant No. 13, she can maintain the Suit?
- 19) Whether the Defendant No. 2 proves that, in the Year 1995 Partition was effected in the Joint Family and Shares were allotted as contended in Paragraph No. 7(d) of the Written Statement and in view of said Partition took place before 09.09.2005, the Suit is not Maintainable?
- 20)

Whether Defendant No. 2 further proves that, by suppressing Decree in OS No.122/2014 dated 15.04.2015, the Plaintiff once again filed Second Suit for Partition?
- 21)

Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?
- 22) What order or Decree?

Date: 20.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HOOVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 17/2023

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

- 1) Whether the Defendant No. 6 proves that, she is also entitled for 1/3rd Share in the Suit Schedule Properties?**

Date: 20.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Hoovinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

MVC No. 646/2023

Petitioners : Smt. Nagaveni & Others.
Vs.
Respondents: Sri. Siddappa & Another.

I S S U E S

- 7) Whether the Petitioners prove that, the deceased Hammigi Virupakshappa was died in a Road Traffic Accident on 13.01.2023?**
- 8) Whether the Petitioners further prove that, they are Dependants of the deceased and they are entitled for Compensation Amount of Rs. 59,00,000/-?**
- 9) Whether the Respondent No. 1 proves that, the accident was occurred due to own negligence of the deceased and he was not having any valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident to drive the Motor Cycle bearing Reg. No. KA 17 Y 7624 and hence the Respondent No. 1 is not liable for Compensation?**
- 10) Whether the Respondent No.2 proves that, though, the Tractor bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TA 5325 and Trailer bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TA 5326 was Insured with Respondent No. 2, the Owner of the said Vehicle used non Insured Tractor bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TC 0109 and Additional Trailer without taking permission from the RTO and the said Vehicle was driven by a Driver not having valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident and therefore, the Respondent No.2 is not liable for Compensation?**

11) Whether the Petitioners are entitled for Compensation? If so, from whom and how much Compensation they are entitled for?

12) What Order or Award?

Date: 13.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

MVC No. 646/2023

Petitioners : Smt. Nagaveni & Others.

Vs.

Respondents: Sri. Siddappa & Another.

I S S U E S

- 13) Whether the Petitioners prove that, the deceased Hammigi Virupakshappa was died in a Road Traffic Accident on 13.01.2023?**
- 14) Whether the Petitioners further prove that, they are Dependants of the deceased and they are entitled for Compensation Amount of Rs. 59,00,000/-?**
- 15) Whether the Respondent No. 1 proves that, the accident was occurred due to own negligence of the deceased and he was not having any valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident to drive the Motor Cycle bearing Reg. No. KA 17 Y 7624 and hence the Respondent No. 1 is not liable for Compensation?**
- 16) Whether the Respondent No.2 proves that, though, the Tractor bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TA 5325 and Trailer bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TA 5326 was Insured with Respondent No. 2, the Owner of the said Vehicle used non Insured Tractor bearing Reg. No. KA 23 TC 0109 and Additional Trailer without taking permission from the RTO and the said Vehicle was driven by a Driver not having valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident and therefore, the Respondent No.2 is not liable for Compensation?**

17) Whether the Petitioners are entitled for Compensation? If so, from whom and how much Compensation they are entitled for?

18) What Order or Award?

Date: 13.09.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 127/2022

Plaintiffs : Smt. Mahalakshmi & Others.
Vs.
Defendants: Smt. Sharada & Others.

I S S U E S

- 23) Whether the Plaintiffs prove that, themselves and Defendants are the Members of Hindu Joint Family and the Plaintiffs are having 1/4th Share in the Suit Schedule Properties?**
- 24) Whether the Defendant No. 1 proves that, the Items No. 4 and 5 of the Suit Schedule Property are her Self Acquired Properties in which the Plaintiffs are not having any Rights and the Defendant No. 1 is entitled for Declaration of Ownership over the Items No. 4 and 5 by way of Counter claim?**
- 25) Whether the Plaintiffs are entitled the relief as sought for?**
- 26) What order or decree?**

Date: 24.08.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

MVC No. 647/2023

Petitioners : Smt. Rathnamma & Others.

Vs.

Respondents: Sri. Praveen G. Hulimane & Another.

I S S U E S

- 27) Whether the Petitioners prove that, the deceased Rangaswamy @ Ranganath was died in a Motor Vehicle Accident on 03.10.2022?**
- 28) Whether the Petitioners further prove that, they are Dependants of the deceased and they are entitled for Compensation Amount of Rs. 67,50,000/-?**
- 29) Whether the Respondent No. 2 proves that, the accident was occurred due to own negligence of the deceased and he was not having any valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident and hence the Respondent No. 2 is not liable?**
- 30) Whether the Petitioners are entitled for Compensation? If so, from whom and how much Compensation they are entitled for?**
- 31) What Order or Award?**

Date: 17.08.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 34/2022

Plaintiff : Sri. Alavandi Shankrappa
Vs.
Defendants: Sri. Alavandi Kotreshappa & Others.

I S S U E S

- 32) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, he is a Member of the Joint Family and he is having 1/4th Share in the Suit Schedule Properties?**
- 33) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, in spite of Execution of Registered GPA dated 10.07.2017 by the Defendants No. 1, 3 and 4 in favor of Defendants No. 9 and 10, he can seek Declaration of non binding of the said Registered GPA after expiry of more than 4 Years from the said GPA?**
- 34) Whether the Suit for Partition in spite of Compromise Decree in OS No. 80/2018 dated 09.12.2020 is hit by Order 23 Rule 3-A of CPC?**
- 35) Whether the Defendant No. 11 proves that, he is a bonafide purchaser for Value of the Item No. 3 and his interest is protected?**
- 36) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?**
- 37) What order or decree?**

Date: 09.08.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

MVC No. 647/2023

Petitioners : Smt. Rathnamma & Others.
Vs.
Respondents: Sri. Praveen G. Hulimane & Another.

I S S U E S

- 38) Whether the Petitioners prove that, the deceased Rangaswamy @ Ranganath was died in a Motor Vehicle Accident on 03.10.2022?**
- 39) Whether the Petitioners further prove that, they are Dependants of the deceased and they are entitled for Compensation Amount of Rs. 67,50,000/-?**
- 40) Whether the Respondent No. 2 proves that, the accident was occurred due to own negligence of the deceased and he was not having any valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident and hence the Respondent No. 2 is not liable?**
- 41) Whether the Petitioners are entitled for Compensation? If so, from whom and how much Compensation they are entitled for?**
- 42) What Order or Award?**

Date: 17.08.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

MVC No. 647/2023

**Petitioners : Smt. Rathnamma & Others.
Vs.
Respondents: Sri. Praveen G. Hulimane & Another.**

I S S U E S

- 43) Whether the Petitioners prove that, the deceased Rangaswamy @ Ranganath was died in a Motor Vehicle Accident on 03.10.2022?**
- 44) Whether the Petitioners further prove that, they are Dependants of the deceased and they are entitled for Compensation Amount of Rs. 67,50,000/-?**
- 45) Whether the Respondent No. 2 proves that, the accident was occurred due to own negligence of the deceased and he was not having any valid and effective DL at the time of the Accident and hence the Respondent No. 2 is not liable?**
- 46) Whether the Petitioners are entitled for Compensation? If so, from whom and how much Compensation they are entitled for?**
- 47) What Order or Award?**

Date: 17.08.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 34/2022

Plaintiff : Sri. Alavandi Shankrappa
Vs.
Defendants: Sri. Alavandi Kotreshappa & Others.

I S S U E S

- 48) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, he is a Member of the Joint Family and he is having 1/4th Share in the Suit Schedule Properties?**
- 49) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, in spite of Execution of Registered GPA dated 10.07.2017 by the Defendants No. 1, 3 and 4 in favor of Defendants No. 9 and 10, he can seek Declaration of non binding of the said Registered GPA after expiry of more than 4 Years from the said GPA?**
- 50) Whether the Suit for Partition in spite of Compromise Decree in OS No. 80/2018 dated 09.12.2020 is hit by Order 23 Rule 3-A of CPC?**
- 51) Whether the Defendant No. 11 proves that, he is a bonafide purchaser for Value of the Item No. 3 and his interest is protected?**
- 52) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?**
- 53) What order or decree?**

Date: 09.08.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 71/2023

Plaintiff : Smt. D.K.M. Shakuntala
Vs.
Defendants: Sri. P.M. Shivalingmurthy & Others.

I S S U E S

- 54) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, as a member of Hindu Joint Family, she is entitled for 1/7th share in the Suit Schedule Properties as they are her ancestral and Joint family Properties?**
- 55) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, in spite of sale of Item No. 1 in favor of Defendant No.19 under Registered Sale Deed dated 17.12.2007, the above Suit filed after 16 years from the date of said alienation is still within limitation period?**
- 56) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, the Judgment and Preliminary Decree passed in respect of the Suit Schedule Properties in O.S. No. 73/2018 is not binding on her?**
- 57) Whether the Defendants No. 11 to 14 prove that, an earlier oral Partition was held in the family in which the Item No. 1 was allotted to the share of Defendants No. 9 and Item No. 2 was allotted to the share of Defendant No. 8 and therefore, the Plaintiff and remaining Defendants are not entitled for any share in the Suit Schedule Properties?**
- 58) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?**
- 59) What order or decree?**

Date: 26.07.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 84/2023

Plaintiff : **Smt. Chennamma**
Vs.
Defendants: **Sri. Basavaraj & Others.**

I S S U E S

- 60) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, as a member of Hindu Joint Family, she is entitled for 1/3rd share in the Suit Schedule Properties as they are her ancestral and Joint family Properties?**
- 61) Whether the Defendant No. 2 proves that, the Suit is bad for non joinder of all the Joint Family Properties?**
- 62) Whether the Defendant No. 3 proves that, the Items No. 3, 4, 6 and 7 of the Suit Schedule Properties are self acquired Properties for Defendants No. 1 and 3 and their father?**
- 63) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?**
- 64) What order or decree?**

Date: 26.07.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 36/2019

Plaintiffs : **Sri. H. Kenchappa & Others.**

Vs.

Defendants: **Smt. H. Yallavva & Others.**

I S S U E S

65) Whether the Plaintiffs prove that, Plaintiffs and Defendants No. 1 to 36 & 41 to 43 are Members of the Hindu Joint Family and Plaintiffs are having 1/4th share in the Suit Schedule Properties which are ancestral Properties?

66) Whether the Defendants No. 2 to 4, 8 & 43 prove that, there was a Partition effected in the year 1995-96 and the said Partition was acted upon as relevant revenue entries were made in the names of the Parties to the Partition and hence the Suit for Second Partition is not maintainable?

67) Whether the Defendants No. 17, 25 and 28 prove that, the Suit is bad for non joinder of necessary parties?

68) Whether the LRs of Defendant No. 40 proves that, the item No. 31 of the Suit Schedule Properties was the absolute Property of Holi Basaiah which was sold under Registered Sale Deeds dated 09.08.1956 and 23.12.1963 in favor of Guddiraiah and K. Subramanya and therefore, the Suit is barred by limitation?

- 69) Whether the Defendant No. 39 proves that, her husband Late Sri. Nimbageri Imamsab had purchased the Item No. 27 under Registered Sale Deed dated 26.11.1985 and after his death, the Defendant No. 39 become the owner in possession by way of inheritance and Item No. 27 is not the Family property of the Plaintiffs?
- 70) Whether the Plaintiffs are entitled the relief of Partition and Separate Possession as sought for?
- 71) What order or decree?

Date: 20.07.2024

Itinerary Senior Civil Judge_
Huvinahadagali.

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 57/2023

Plaintiff : Smt. Manjamma

Vs.

Defendants: Sri. Shanmukhappa & Others.

I S S U E S

72) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, as a member of Hindu Joint Family, she is entitled for 1/4th share in the Suit Schedule Properties and the Gift Deed dated 06.12.2021 is not binding on her Share?

73) Whether the Defendant No. 2 proves that, on 08.01.1988 a document styled ಪಾಲುವಿಭಾಗದ ಪಟ್ಟಿಗಳು was effected and it was acted upon by the parties and therefore, the Suit is not maintainable?

74) Whether the Suit is barred by limitation?

75) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?

76) What order or decree?

Date: 06.07.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 9/2021

A D D I T I O N A L I S S U E S

**77) Whether the Court Fee paid by the
Plaintiffs is Proper and Correct?**

78) Whether the Suit is barred by Limitation?

Date: 05.07.2024.

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 74/2019

ADDITIONAL ISSUES

79) Whether the Defendant No. 4 proves that, he has purchased the Item No. 3 of the Suit B Schedule Property from its absolute owner as a bonafide purchaser for Value on 02.05.20119 and the Plaintiff was having sufficient knowledge about the said Transaction?

Date: 05.07.2024.

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 04/2024

Plaintiff : Sri. Mohan R.

Vs.

Defendants: Smt. Shridevi & Others.

I S S U E S

- 80) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, the Defendants are agreed to sell the Suit Schedule Property for Total Sale consideration amount of Rs. 6 Lakhs and by receiving Advance Sale consideration of Rs. 4 Lakhs on 30.04.2014, they have Executed a Sale Agreement?
- 81) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, the Defendants have Agreed to Execute the Registered Sale Deed by receiving Balance sale consideration Amount of Rs. 2 Lakhs free from all encumbrances as and when the Plaintiff demands?
- 82) Whether the Defendant No. 1 proves that, the relief claimed by the Plaintiff is barred by limitation?
- 83) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?
- 84) What order or decree?

Date: 29.06.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 04/2024

Plaintiff : Sri. Mohan R.

Vs.

Defendants: Smt. Shridevi & Others.

I S S U E S

- 85) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, the Defendants are agreed to sell the Suit Schedule Property for Total Sale consideration amount of Rs. 6 Lakhs and by receiving Advance Sale consideration of Rs. 4 Lakhs on 30.04.2014, they have Executed a Sale Agreement?
- 86) Whether the Plaintiff further proves that, the Defendants have Agreed to Execute the Registered Sale Deed by receiving Balance sale consideration Amount of Rs. 2 Lakhs free from all encumbrances as and when the Plaintiff demands?
- 87) Whether the Defendant No. 1 proves that, the relief claimed by the Plaintiff is barred by limitation?
- 88) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?
- 89) What order or decree?

Date: 29.06.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 17/2023

Plaintiff : Smt. Sharada

Vs.

Defendants: Smt. K. Kamalakshi & Others.

I S S U E S

90) Whether the Plaintiff proves that, herself and the Defendants are Members of Hindu Joint Family and she is having 1/3rd share in the Suit Schedule Properties as they are Joint Family Properties?

91) Whether the Defendant No. 3 proves that, the Suit Schedule Properties are Exclusive properties of Defendants No. 1 to 5 and the Plaintiff's Husband has Purchased the 28 Cents out of 1A 11C in Sy. No. 247 under Registered Sale Deed 16.09.2021 and the Plaintiff has suppressed the same and the Suit is bad for non joinder of Husband of the Plaintiff as Purchaser of Part of Item No. 4?

92) Whether the Plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?

93) What order or decree?

Date: 28.06.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE ITINERATING SENIOR CIVIL
JUDGE AT HUVINAHADAGALI.**

O. S. No. 56/2023

Plaintiffs : Sri. Lakkappa & Another

Vs.

Defendants: Smt. Shambakka & Others.

I S S U E S

- 94) Whether the Plaintiffs prove that, Plaintiffs and Defendants are members of Hindu Joint family and the Suit Schedule Properties are their ancestral and Joint Family Properties in which they are having 1/5th share?
- 95) Whether the Plaintiffs further prove that, in spite of Unregistered Palu Vibhaga Patti dated 20.05.1993 they can maintain this Suit after expiry of more than 20 years from the said Partition?
- 96) Whether the Defendant No.1 proves that, the Suit Schedule Properties are self acquired properties of Late Lakkamma D/o. Halappa and she was died intestate?
- 97) Whether the Suit is barred by limitation?
- 98) Whether the Plaintiffs is entitled the relief as sought for?
- 99) What order or decree?

Date: 21.06.2024

**Itinerary Senior Civil Judge
Huvinahadagali.**

**IN THE COURT OF THE SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & JMFC,
AT HAGARIBOMMANAHALLI.**

O. S. No.23/2020

Plaintiff : Andhra Bank, Rept by Manager

Vs.

Defendant/s: H.M. Gangadhara and Anr.

I S S U E S

- 100)** Whether the plaintiff bank proves that the loan amount of Rs.30,00,000/- borrowed by defendant No.1 in co-obligation of defendant No.2 was agreed by them to repay with interest @ 8.75% p.a. with monthly rests and penal interest @ 2% p.a., in case of default and they have agreed to repay the same in 294 monthly equal installments?
- 101)** Whether the defendant No.1 proves that the suit is barred by limitation?
- 102)** Whether the defendant No.1 proves that one Smt. Meenakshi T who is the vendee of the suit property has paid Rs.10,90,000/- towards his loan amount?
- 103)** Whether the plaintiff bank is entitled the relief as sought for ?
- 104)** What order or decree ?

Date :20.07.2021

**Senior Civil Judge & JMFC,
Hagaribommanahalli.**

IN THE COURT OF THE SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
AT HAGARIBOMMANAHALLI.

O.S. No. 26/2019

Plaintiff/s :

Andhra Bank

Vs.

Defendant/s :

Kommireddy Yeshodakrishna
and Another.

I S S U E S

1. Whether the plaintiff bank proves that the defendants have availed a loan of Rs.25,00,000/- by executing the necessary documents and agreed to repay the same with interest at 8.45% pa with monthly rests and penal interest at 2% pa in case of default and offered the 'B' schedule property as a security?
2. Whether the plaintiff bank is entitled the relief as sought for?
3. What order or decree ?

Date : 30.10.2019

Sr.Civil Judge & JMFC,
Hagaribommanahalli.

IN THE COURT OF THE SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
AT HAGARIBOMMANAHALLI.

O.S. No. 23/2019

Plaintiff/s :

Andhra Bank

Vs.

Defendant/s :

Shivappa Nayaka and others

I S S U E S

4. Whether the plaintiff bank proves that the defendants have availed a loan of Rs.12,00,000/- by executing the necessary documents and agreed to repay the same with interest at 9.45% pa with monthly rests and penal interest at 2% pa in case of default and offered the 'B' schedule property as a security?
5. Whether the plaintiff bank is entitled the relief as sought for?
6. What order or decree ?

Date : 10.10.2019

Sr.Civil Judge & JMFC,
Hagaribommanahalli.

IN THE COURT OF THE SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE,
AT HAGARIBOMMANAHALLI.

O.S. No. 109/2018

Plaintiff/s :

C.H. Somaraju

Vs.

Defendant/s :

P. Jayanthkumar and others

I S S U E S

7. Whether the plaintiff proves that the late Poornachandra Raju and his wife Savithri Devi the father and mother of the 1st defendant have availed a loan of Rs.8,00,000/- from him and executed a promissory note on 10.12.2015 in his favour by agreeing to repay the same with interest @ 24% pa.?
8. Whether the plaintiff is entitled the relief as sought for?
9. What order or decree ?

Date : 17.06.2019

Place : H.B.Halli.

Sr.Civil Judge & JMFC,
H.B.Halli.