



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

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

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 231 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRI NAGESHAPPA
S/O LATE SIDDALINGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS,
AGRICULTURIST,
R/AT KONDAPURA VILLAGE,
TALYA HOBLI,
HOLALKERE TALUK,
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT-577527

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. SAMEER S N, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT SASHIKALA
W/O BASAVARAJAPPA
D/O LATE SHIVAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
R/O KONDAPURA VILLAGE,
TALYA HOBLI,
HOLALKERE TALUK,
NOW R/O MANANGI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
CHITRADURGA TALUK AND DISTRICT 577520

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI. M.G. KANTHARAJAPPA, ADVOCATE)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTION 11 AND 12 OF THE
CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, BY THE COMPLAINANT,

Digitally
signed by
NIRMALA
DEVI
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



PRAYING TO PUNISH THE ACCUSED FOR CIVIL CONTEMPT FOR DISOBEDIENCE OF ORDER IN WP NO.3446/2024 (GM-CPC) DATED 20.02.2024 PASSED BY THE HONBLE SINGLE JUDGE OF THIS HONBLE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT PRINCIPAL BENCH.

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 the order dated 20.02.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P. No.3446/2024 (GM-CPC). The said writ petition was filed impugning an order dated 03.01.2024 passed by the Prl. District and Sessions Judge, Tumakuru in M.A. No.14/2023. The learned Single Judge did not examine the merits, however, directed the parties to maintain status-quo in all respects till the disposal of the suit (O.S. No.54/2021).

2. The complainant alleges that despite an order of status-quo, the accused has harvested crops on the subject land. The suit in question is for specific performance in respect of the schedule property. We note the schedule property is not described in the



present contempt petition. But we are informed that it is fully described in the plaint which is not in record.

3. Considering that the dispute is in regard to the immovable property and both the parties are claiming possession of the same, it is difficult to accept that harvesting the crops, would constitute *ex-facie* a violation of the status-quo order passed by the learned Single Judge. The status-quo order must be construed to mean the status-quo as to the nature, title and possession of the property in question. Since there is no determination, *prima-facie* or otherwise as to the status of the possession of the subject property, we do not consider it apposite to initiate any proceedings of contempt under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

4. The complaint is, accordingly, closed.

**Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE**