

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT DHARWAD

[SMT. SHOBHA W/O KRISHNAPPA DASAR

VS.

TIMMANNA S/O KRISHNAPPA DASAR AND OTHERS]

23.09.2025

(PHYSICAL HEARING)

CORAM: ADDL. REGISTRAR JUDICIAL

ORAL ORDER

The learned Counsel for the Appellant is present.

1)Office Objection No.7:

The office has raised the objection that, NOC has to be obtained from the learned Counsel who has conducted the case on behalf of the Revision Petitioner in the RSA.

The learned Counsel for the Petitioner has submitted that, he had earlier filed the Vakalath for the Revision Petitioner and the said Vakalath is not terminated merely because the argument is advanced by another Counsel on behalf of the Petitioners.

Perused the case records.

On perusal of the records in RSA No.5540/2013, it is seen that, the Petitioner herein was represented by the present Counsel, but later he has given the no objection to engage another Counsel and Sri S S Yadrami, Advocate had filed the Vakalath. The case is conducted by Sri Girish Bhat, Advocate.

As per the Circular No.RJ 232/2023 dated : 19.12.2023 of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the office is directed to raise an objection in the event of filing of Review Petition by an Advocate other than the Advocate on record in the original proceedings.

Hence, the Review Petition should have been filed by Sri Girish Bhat, Advocate who has conducted the Original Proceedings and the

RP NO. 100177/2024

learned Counsel, who has filed this Review Petition cannot file the Review Petition.

Hence, place the above office objection along with the above note for the decision of the Hon'ble Court regarding the filing of the present Review Petition by Sri S C Hiremath, Advocate on behalf of the Revision Petitioner as he had given no objection to engage another Counsel and Sri Girish Bhat, Advocate had conducted the proceedings on behalf of the Revision Petition.

ORAL ORDER

[Signature]
23/9/23

(ADDL. REGISTRAR JUDICIAL)

The office has raised the objection that, NOC has to be obtained from the learned Counsel who has conducted the case on behalf of the Revision Petitioner in the RSA. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner has submitted that, he had earlier filed the Vakalat for the Revision Petitioner and the said Vakalat is not terminated merely because the argument is advanced by another Counsel on behalf of the Petitioner. Perused the case records. On perusal of the records in RSA No. 5240/2013, it is seen that, the Petitioner herein was represented by List No.: 56 SI No.: 56 but later he has given the no objection to engage another Counsel and Sri S Yadrani, Advocate had filed the Vakalat. The case is conducted by Sri Girish Bhat, Advocate. As per the Circular No. RJ 232/2023 dated : 19.12.2023 of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, the office is directed to raise an objection in the event of filing of Review Petition by an Advocate other than the Advocate on record in the original proceedings. Hence, the Review Petition should have been filed by Sri Girish Bhat, Advocate who has conducted the Original Proceedings and the