

Plaintiff called out absent.

Court notice served on his son and held sufficient.

The learned Counsel for plaintiff is present and submits that in view of his dispossession from suit premises the plaintiff is not co-operating to proceed further in this suit.

It is also brought to the notice of this court the present suit along with suit in OS 346/2025, 347/2025, 348/2025 and 350/2025 were filed by different tenants against the defendant Panchayath on the same cause of action and the plaintiffs in OS No.346/2025, 347/2025 and 350/2025 are present before the court and submits that themselves and the plaintiff in this case and in OS No.348/2025 are dispossessed from their respective suit premises.

The Learned Counsel for plaintiff concurs the said submission. The conduct of the plaintiff in not appearing before the court despite of servicing of court notice on his son would indicate that he is not intrested to prosecute further in this suit.

In the background, the learned Counsel for plaintiff prays to pass suitable order.

Undisputedly this a suit for bare injunction, where the plaintiff claimed that he was in possession of the suit premises as on the date of the suit and further alleged the interference of the defendant to such possession. Now the submission of counsel for plaintiff makes it clear that the plaintiff has been dispossessed from the suit premises, in which he admittedly had possession as a tenant. Under the said background proceeding in this suit will serve no purpose as sought relief sought by the plaintiff become infectuous.

Hence, the following:

ORDER

The suit stand dismissed as infectuous.

Sd/-
(Ravi Kumara.V)
Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Bhadravathi.