



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD**  
**DATED THIS THE 27<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MARCH, 2026**  
**BEFORE**  
**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P.SANDESH**  
**REVIEW PETITION NO.100134 OF 2025**

**BETWEEN:**

THE NEW INDIA ASSURANCE CO.LTD.,  
BY ITS SENIOR DIVISIONAL MANAGER,  
CLUB ROAD AT BELAGAVI-590001,  
DIST. BELAGAVI, R/BY. ITS AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RAICHUR GURURAJ NARSHIMHARAO, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. DR. MAHESHKUMAR GURUMURTHEPPA UMARANI,  
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,  
OCC. CONSULTING ORTHOPEDIC SURGEON,  
R/O. GANGA SURGICAL AND FRACTURE CLINIC,  
AT GOKAK-591307.
2. SHRI SANTRAM S/O. RAMAPPA MADAR,  
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,  
OCC. AGRICULTURE, R/O. JOKANATTI,  
TQ. MUDALAGI, DIST. BELAGAVI-591312.
3. M/S. SATISH SUGARS LIMITED  
BY ITS MANAGER, AT. HUNASHYAL,  
P.G.-591307, TQ. GOKAK, DT. BELAGAVI.
4. KARNATAKA MEDICAL COUNCIL,  
BY ITS REGISTRAR NO.16/6,  
MILLER TANK BED AREA VASANTHA NAGAR,  
BENGALURU-560052.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.ASHOK R. KALYANASHETTY, ADVOCATE FOR R1 IS APPEARED  
THROUGH VC;  
NOTICE ISSUED TO R2-R4 ARE SERVED BUT UNREPRESENTED)

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 114 READ WITH  
ORDER XLVII RULE (1) (A) R/W. SECTION 114 OF CPC, PRAYING TO  
REVIEW/RECALL THE JUDGMENT DATED 30.09.2024 PASSED IN W.P. NO  
105277/2024 (GM.CPC) AND TO HEAR THE WRIT PETITION ON MERITS  
BY ALLOWING THIS REVIEW PETITION IN THE ENDS OF JUSTICE AND  
EQUITY.

VINAYAKA  
B V

  
Digitally Signed  
by VINAYAKA B V  
Date: 2026.04.06  
10:11:49 +0530



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

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.P.SANDESH

**ORAL ORDER**

Heard the learned counsel for the review petitioner and  
learned counsel for respondent No.1.

2. This review petition is filed on the ground that the vakalath was filed subsequent to disposal of the writ petition, hence, an opportunity has to be given to hear the review petitioner. However, the said ground cannot be considered to review the order of this Court. This Court while disposing of the writ petition had notified the review petitioner and the same has been served and in the order itself, it is categorically stated that respondent Nos.1, 3 and 4 are served, but there was no representation. Hence, the Court cannot review the order subsequent to filing of the vakalath by the learned counsel on record. Hence, no ground to review the same.

3. It is also noticed that there was delay even after filing of the vakalath subsequent to disposal of the writ petition. The vakalath was filed on 05.10.2024 and this review petition was filed on 27.10.2025 with the delay of 362



days. Thus, it is very clear that the review petitioner was aware of disposal of the writ petition and even having the knowledge of disposal, there is inordinate delay in filing the review petition. Hence, the delay also cannot be condoned. In that view of the matter, no ground to review the order passed by this Court. Accordingly, the delay application is rejected, consequently, the review petition also stands ***dismissed.***

**SD/-**  
**(H.P.SANDESH)**  
**JUDGE**

JTR  
CT:PA  
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 2