



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 104 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SMT. RENUKA N
WIFE OF T.K. VENKATESH
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.356
AVALAHALLI VILLAGE
VIRGONAGAR POST
BENGALURU EAST TALUK
BENGALURU 560 049.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. JANARDHANA G, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT YESHODA
W/O. V. VASUDEV,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
RESIDING AT AVALAHALLI VILLAGE,
VIRGONAGAR POST,
BANGALORE EAST TALUK,
BANGALORE-560049

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI. N S BHAT, ADVOCATE)





THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, BY THE COMPLAINANT, PRAYING TO TAKE COGNIZANCE OF THE OFFENCE COMMITTED BY THE ACCUSED FOR DISOBEYING THE UNDERTAKING GIVEN TO THIS HONBLE COURT IN CCC NO.682/2021 DATED 03.01.2023 UNDER ANNEXURE-C AND CONSEQUENTLY PUNISH HER FOR THE SAID ACT.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The complainant has filed the present complaint alleging willful disobedience of an order dated 03.01.2023 passed by this Court in CCC No.682/2021.
2. The controversy relates to the accused carrying on construction work over the subject property. The complainant filed an application *inter alia* seeking a direction to restrain the accused from carrying on any construction in the suit property. Apparently, an interim order dated 21.01.2021 was passed. Thereafter, the complainant filed an application, IA No.V in OS No.54/2013, seeking a direction to the concerned police station for



implementation of the said application. The said application was rejected by an order dated 05.03.2021.

3. The complainant filed an appeal against the said order [MFA No.260/2021]. The said appeal was disposed of by an order dated 21.01.2021. The said order indicates that the accused had made a statement that apart from completing the work already undertaken, she would not put up any further construction on Schedule 'D' properties. The Court had also noted the statement of accused that she had completed the construction and also the repair work and painting.

4. Thereafter, the complainant filed a contempt petition, CCC No.682/2021, which was disposed of by order dated 03.01.2023 recording the statement of the accused, that she would neither put up further construction nor effect any repair works in the schedule 'D' property. The contempt petition was closed by recording the undertaking of the accused that she would not put up any further construction nor effect any repair works in the subject property. It appears that not withstanding the undertaking the accused has carried on certain renovation and repair works.



5. Learned counsel for the accused submits that the said works are only for the purpose of maintenance of the building and no new construction has been raised.

6. Considering the controversy involved in the present case, we do not consider it apposite to initiate proceedings for Contempt of Court Act, 1971. It would be open for the parties to approach the Civil Court for early disposal of their suit. Complaint is accordingly, is closed.

7. All pending applications are also disposed of.

Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE

Vmb
List No.: 1 SI No.: 21