



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE
REVIEW PETITION NO. 100148 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. MURALIDHARRAO
RAGHAVENDRARAO KULKARNI
AGE. 74 YEARS,
OCCUPATION. AGRICULTURE,
44/72, HONDADAKATTI BUILDING,
NEAR SAMBHAVANATH JAIN TEMPLE,
HIND CROSS, HOSUR (EAST)
HUBBALLI 580021 (KA).
2. BHAGYASHREE SUDHEENDRA KULKARNI
AGE. 47 YEARS,
OCCUPATION. HOUSEHOLD,
2/5/91, BRINDAVANA,
NEAR PANCHALINGESHWAR TEMPLE,
NOOLA GALLI,, SEDAM 585222 (KA).
3. PREETI NAGENDRA DESAI
AGE. 40 YEARS,
OCCUPATION. HOUSEHOLD PLOT NO. 9,
SULOCHANA GREEN PARK SOCIETY
NEAR MAKING HEADLINES,
BEHIND SEASONS BUSINESS CENTER
AUNDH, PUNE 411007 (MH).
4. RAVI MURALIDHAR KULKARNI,
AGE. 33 YEARS,
OCCUPATION. PRIVATE,
44/72, HONDADAKATTI BUILDING,
NEAR SAMBHAVANATH JAIN TEMPLE,





IIND CROSS, HOSUR (EASTT)
HUBBALLI 580021 (KA).

(PETITIONER NO.1-3 IS REP. BY GPA HOLDER
THE PETITIONER NO.4)

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI KINI NAGPRASAD SURESH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SHARADABAI RAVAJIRAO KULKARNI
AGE. 71 YEARS,
OCCUPATION. HOUSEHOLD,
CONTENDED ADDRESS KULKARNI BUILDING,
NEAR JAIN MANDIR, 2ND CROSS,
HOSUR, HUBBALLI.
2. THE HUBBALLI DHARWAD MUNICIPAL
CORPORATTION (HMDC),
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
HDMC, HUBBALLI

...RESPONDENTS

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER ORDER 47 RULE
1 READ WITH SECTION 114 OF CPC, PRAYING TO ALLOW THE
REVIEW PETITION BY SETTING ASIDE THE ORDER DATED
28.10.2025 DISMISSING THE CRP NO.100097/2025 AND
CONSEQUENTLY ALLOW CRP NO.100097/2025 IN THE INTEREST
OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION THIS DAY,
THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE



ORAL ORDER

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the review petitioners.

2. This review petition is filed assailing the order dated 20.10.2025. In terms of the impugned order, the petition filed by the review petitioner is dismissed. The review petitioner had assailed the Order rejecting his application to reject the plaint.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that when the Civil Revision Petition was heard, the clause in the agreement which mandated the vendor to execute the sale deed as and when called upon to do so, was not brought to the notice of the Court.

4. It is his further submission that after the death of the vendor, no notice is issued to the legal representatives of vendor/defendants/review petitioners. That being the position, it is contended that the suit is barred.



5. The Court is of the view that the said contention cannot be accepted on Order VII Rule 11 application and contention raised falls within the scope of trial.

6. No apparent error is made out in the impugned order. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(ANANT RAMANATH HEGDE)
JUDGE

CHS
List No.: 19 Sl No.: 6