Karnataka High Court

Sri Venkataramanappa vs Sri Venkatagiriyappa on 24 February, 2009

Author: H N Das

came in bs:_élismi.sss'\$ci';.V. these: graunds £116 defendants eppcsed the claim

3. It is the case of plaintiff that the scheciule prepert}: or1'_ginaE13-* beiengs to his gandfathez'' Eéagappa. A ☐ the demise of Naga ☐ this SQf:I 1' > Mondappa succeeded to the schedule property. A ☐ the ,. Mendappa the maéntiff'' Eyeing his son continued in '% tixzisyinent of the schedule 13i'G§36I'§3'''. Since the the piaixtti ☐ the possession and enjoymant o1: the o.3, Na 123fi990 for deciaraticcm of titlé » péI'''Iz1a;I.i€1atA The dcfendanis entered a1?§Jearaz1V<:Yi*...§}efor:e;V-:11'; ?7£iéi''-~Couf ☐ filed stateznant inter alia contending tha'ii' \$.agappa had 17W-i} wives by name Akkam;:;:z and are the childrsn of sec-and:.Y;s'i;Ce'4_'f\$:§%:;patr@.;§: time of Qriginai owner Nagappg __hv<--§ Vproperties and sther pfegxerties amifgng __h1'.<s wires Mékamma' and Karngyamnza. Thus the ☐ fendants are §_£: **esas'i<:>z1 of half of the plain: schedule grapertiss, \$21 the révezgue' 'i'ecéz'ds re ☐ thing is the haif share in the échééuic £23: in the ☐ fifie of Ciefendants. Even the apprzai ☐ sé by ☐ h: §ggi:g\$i'':Y;§é..eniry of defendants' name in the ETC extracts 3:32? 14333; 63:2 (A3956 r'i3'\{',3~5}--'¢*'J'''73"1'''m6 o'''

net in exclusive pessessisn cf the {satire piaint schedule properties. Therefére the plaimbff is net entitied fer if \Box fé \Box of deciaration ané injunc-ticm. I find no just £ \Box ble geund te interfere with the \Box hprzge \Box " ju.dwents.

8, I see no substantiai question of 1av€:__t1iaiV .3:*§se\$;' _..f<::-. :21}-"V zsensiderafion in this second appeal thé. appe:1.£_i'&; S dismissed with me artist as to costs. _ LRS.f25022GG9