



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE P SREE SUDHA

CIVIL PETITION NO. 429 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SMT. M B VANAMALA
AGED ABOUT 77 YEARS,
W/O LATE SRI D.L. LAXMANA GOWDA,
RESIDING AT MADABUR,
MADABUR POST, N R PURA TAUKE
CHIKKAMAGALURU-577 134.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. AURNA SHYAM, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. GNANESH H KEMPANNA., ADVOCATES)

AND:

1. MASTER VIHAAN RAGHAV
S/O LATE RAGHAV LAXMANA GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 11 YEARS,
REP. BY HIS MOTHER AND
NATURAL GUARDIAN
SMT SHARANYA B R
2. SMT SHARANYA B R
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
W/O LATE RAGHAVA LAXMANA GOWDA

BOTH RESPONDENT NO.1 AND 2
ARE RESIDING AT NO.D-212 (II FLOOR)
JORDINE BLOCK, BRIGADE GARDANA
R.B.I LAYOUT, J P NAGAR, 7TH PHASE
BENGALURU-560 078.

Digitally signed
by
PADMA SHREE
SHEKHAR DESAI
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



3. MRS SINDHU PRUTHIV DABBANGADDE
W/O PRUTHVI D S
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
R/A B-1, 1402, WATERILY
SHANTHIGRAM, GANDHINAGAR,
GUJARAT-382 501

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. R.S. RAVI, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. G. NAGARAJULU NAIDU, ADVOCATE FOR R1 AND R2)

THIS CP IS FILED UNDER SECTION 24 OF CPC, PRAYING
TO TRANSFER OS NO.8124/2024, PENDING ON THE FILE OF
THE HONBLE XII ADDITIONAL CITY CIVIL AND SESSIONS
JUDGE, BENGALURU (CCH-27), TO THE HONBLE SENIOR
CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC, (NARASHIMARAJAPURA (N.R.PURA)
CHIKKAMAGALURU DISTICT.

THIS PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED
ON 17.03.2026 COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF
ORDERS THIS DAY, **P SREE SUDHA J.**, DELIVERED THE
FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE P SREE SUDHA

CAV ORDER

This transfer petition is filed by the petitioner
against respondent Nos.1/daughter-in-law and
respondent No.2/grandson and also her daughter
(respondent No.3) for transfer of O.S.No.8124/2024,
pending on the file of XII Addl. City Civil and Sessions



Judge, Bengaluru to the Senior Civil Judge and JMFC, Narashimarajapura (N.R.Pura), Chikkamagalur District.

2. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that she is a senior citizen suffering from age-related ailments and health difficulties. She resides in Madabur Village within N.R.Pura taluk of Chikkamagaluru. She has no other person to accompany her during her travel to Bangalore and frequent travel causes physical, financial and logistical hardships and that the distance from NR pura to Bangalore is 310 kilometers.

3. Out of 18 properties filed in the suit, except residential flat at Bangalore, wherein respondent Nos.1 and 2 resides, and a residential site at Shivamogga, the other 16 properties are situated within the jurisdiction of NR Pura Taluk and within the territorial limits of NR Pura courts. All movables properties, such as agricultural implements, vehicles, household movables, shop/commercial movables are also situated in NR Pura



and it is convenient to produce them for verification before NR Pura Taluk courts. Further, all relevant bank documents, passbooks, financial documents relating to joint family properties are maintained in the banks located in NR Pura, as the **financial nucleus** of the family is sheltered there. Further, witnesses such as revenue officials, neighbours, members of the community, and other material witnesses who have knowledge of the facts of the case, as well as the respondent's paternal family, are all residents of N.R. Pura, therefore, requested for transfer of this petition. Further stated that CC No. 467/2024 and CC No. 458/2024 are the private complaints filed by respondent No.2, at NR pura and that they are pending before Civil Judge and JMFC, NR Pura. Therefore, requested for transfer of OS No.8124/2024 from XII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bangalore to Senior Civil Judge and JMFC, Narashimarajapura, Chikkamagaluru district.



4. In the objection filed by the respondent, it is stated that she was working as a Software Engineer at Infosys and was married to Raghava M.L., on 26.10.2009. Out of the said wedlock, a son was born on 05.12.2013. She resigned from her job in March 2020 in order to take care of her son and his education. The husband of respondent No.1 namely Raghava M.L., was suffering from blood cancer and he died intestate on 06.03.2023, at that time he was drawing a salary of Rs.69 lakhs per annum. It is further stated that her father-in-law also passed away on 26.12.2022. Her father is a retired employee, without pension and he has no other source of income, other than the income from his terminal benefits.

5. Respondent No.3 is the sister-in-law of respondent No,2. It is stated that her mother-in-law and sister-in-law in collusion had transferred Rs.82 lakhs which was in the name of her husband to the account of respondent No.3. It is further stated that they changed the nomination forms in respect of fixed deposits which



were in the name of her husband for a sum of Rs.21,55,940/- in Canara Bank, NR Pura Taluk and the said amount was thereafter transferred to the account of respondent No.3. It is further stated that the petitioner and respondent No.3, without her knowledge had obtained the signature of her husband and opened an account in Bank of Baroda, NR Pura, prior to his death. It is alleged that her father-in-law had deposited a sum of Rs.11,02,476/- in the name of her husband in the said bank, and the amount was also subsequently transferred to the account of respondent No.3 and her name was shown as nominee.

6. It is further contended that respondent No.2 was not permitted to receive service benefits of her husband. Though respondent nos.1 and 2 had agreed to pay one-third of the service benefits to the petitioner, the same has not been complied with. As such, they are facing financial hardship and are depending upon retired father, who has no pension and income. It is further stated that



they have filed PCR No. 61/2024 on 02.02.2022. The petitioner has filed Misc No.349/2025 seeking transfer of OS No.8124/2024 to court where other connected suits are also pending.

7. Initially they filed for transfer of the OS No.8124/2024 pending on the file of CCH-13 which was withdrawn and transferred to CCH-27 wherein P&SC Nos.220/2023 and 601/2023 were disposed of on 02.06.2025. Aggrieved by the said order, respondent Nos.1 and 2 preferred WP.No.18962/2025 which was disposed of on 14.07.2025 with a direction to consider the matters independently. Respondent No.2 lodged two complaints on 09.06.2024 and 10.06.2024 before NR Pura Police Station, against the present petitioner, respondent No.3 and the concerned bank officials. The respondent No.2 also filed another private complaint against the petitioner and respondent No.3 and the concerned bank officials the said complaint was registered



as PCR No.62/2024 dated 08.07.2024 and the trial court took cognizance and passed order dated 08.07.2024 to register criminal case against the accused persons and issue summons to the accused.

8. Respondent No.3 filed a civil suit and also a criminal case against respondent No.2 against the editor of the newspaper at Ahmadabad and sought decree of permanent injunction against defendants and also sought damage of Rs.10 crores . The trial court at Ahmadabad had rejected the application on 09.10.2024.

9. In the meanwhile, respondent No.2 along with minor son filed a suit for partition of the family properties. Further, the petitioner and respondent No.3 filed Crl.P.No.8055/2024 in C.C.No.467/2024 and Crl.P.no.8072/2024 in C.C.No.458/2024 and they are pending before the High Court of Karnataka.



10. The respondent No.1 filed transfer petition (Civil) No.771/2025 and transfer petitioner (Criminal) No.254/2025 for transfer of the cases filed at Ahmedabad to the competent courts at Bangalore before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble Apex court vide its order dated 17.12.2025 allowed and transferred the cases to Karnataka High Court. It is further stated that the petitioner is a senior politician and an very influential person and she is trying to grab the property in collusion with her daughter. It is contended that, in such circumstances, the respondent would not be in a position to effectively defend the civil suit for partition before the Courts at N.R. Pura.

11. It is stated that the petitioner is hale and healthy and had recently travelled to Malaysia and Singapore along with her relatives and friends. It is further stated that she regularly visits to Bengaluru to attend party meetings. Respondent son is studying in 6th



Standard at Kumaran's Child Home. It is alleged that the petitioner and respondent No.3 are not allowing them to enter in the house constructed by her husband at NR Pura and that the petitioner is not paying proceeds accrued from the income of the joint property and is attempting to grab the property in collusion with her daughter. The petitioner stated that she has no friends and relatives to assist her in Bangalore. However, it is contended that she owns three cars, including the car purchased by the husband of respondent No.2. It is further stated that she possess approximately 15 acres of a areca nut plantation and has substantial deposits, indicating that she has sufficient independent sources of income. It is contended that petitioner need not personally appear before the court and can take the assistance of her advocates and also can appear through video conferencing. Hence, requested to dismiss the application.



12. Respondent herein is wife of Raghava M.L., and is presently residing with her three-year-old son at her parental home. It is stated that her father is retired and has no pension and has no other source of income.

13. On the other hand, the petitioner is stated to be a political leader and an influential person. There is no material on record to establish that she is unable to travel from N.R. Pura to Bengaluru. On the contrary, respondent stated that she frequently travels to Bengaluru to attend party meetings and she has financial source of income and she is influential person.

14. In view of the above averments, this court finds that the petitioner in collusion with her daughter and son-in-law are trying to trouble respondent Nos.1 and 2. Further, if the case is transferred to her native place i.,e N.R.Pura, there is no possibility of conducting fair trial at that place. Accordingly, this Court finds that the transfer petition is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed.



15. However, considering her age, she is at liberty to file chief affidavit for marking of documents and cross examination can be done through Commissioner or through video conferencing at her place of choice.

16. It is brought to the notice that out of 18 properties, 16 properties are located in N.R. Pura, which has no relevance for this case.

Therefore, this petition is ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(P SREE SUDHA)
JUDGE

AKV
CT:NR