KARN020000302022



Presented on : 07-01-2022

Registered on : 10-01-2022

Decided on : 07-04-2022

Duration : --

IN THE COURT OF PRL. SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE & CJM., AT RAMANAGARA.

:PRESENT:

Presided Over by Smt.Anupama Lakshmi.B., B.A., LL.B., Addl. Senior Civil Judge & JMFC.
Ramanagara.

O.S. No.15/2022

DATED: THIS THE 07th DAY OF APRIL 2022

Plaintiff: Sri.G.Krishnamurthy

-V/s-

Defendants: Smt.Gowramma and Others

* * * *

<u>I.A.I</u>

Applicant: Sri.G.Krishnamurthy - - (Plaintiff)

-V/s-

Opponents: Smt.Gowramma and Others - - (Defendants)

Orders on I.A.I filed Under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of C.P.C.,

The applicant/plaintiff has filed the present application for temporary injunction restraining the opponents/defendants from alienating the suit schedule property in favour of the 3rd parties till disposal of the suit.

2. The applicant/plaintiff has sworn to an affidavit annexed to the application and submitted that, the defendant No.1 is the absolute owner of the suit schedule property and she entered into an agreement to sell with the plaintiff, on 07-04-2014 by receiving 50% of the sale consideration amount. Thereafter, the plaintiff approached the defendants No.1 to 11 to get the sale deed executed in

his favour. But, the defendants No.1 and 2 have entered into an agreement to sell with the defendants No.12 and 13 for a consideration amount of Rs.35,00,000/-. That the plaintiff has approached the defendants No.1 to 11 after execution of sale agreement but the said defendants postponed execution of the sale deed for one or other reasons.

That the plaintiff could not send legal notice to the the defendants No.1 and 2 have defendants because already executed another sale agreement by suppressing the agreement executed in favour of the plaintiff. There is every likelihood of defendants No.1 and 2 executing the sale deed in favour of the defendants No.12 and 13. If the sale deed is executed it will lead to multiplicity of proceedings causing irreparable injury to the plaintiff. Hence, the application.

3. The opponents/defendants No.111 filed statement of objections through their counsel by denying the case of the plaintiff. According to the said defendants, the sale agreement is barred by law of limitation. That the defendants No.5 and 12 minors but are necessary appointing a guardian application for for the said defendants is not filed. That the suit is barred by limitation. Hence, the plaintiff cannot be granted the relief claimed by Moreover, the signatures found in the sale the him. agreement are not the signatures of the family members of the defendants as the defendants have not signed the created sale agreement. Therefore, the defendants No.1 to 11 prayed for rejection of the application with costs.

opponents/defendants No.12 filed The and 13 statement of objections. According to the said defendants the sale agreement dated:07-04-2014 is alleged registered sale agreement and sufficient stamp duty is not Therefore, the document is liable to be impounded. That the suit is barred by limitation. Therefore, the defendants No.12 and 13 by denying the case of the plaintiff prayed for dismissal of the application with exemplary costs.

- 4. Heard.
- 5. The following points arise for my determination:
- (1) Whether the plaintiff has made out a prima-facie case?
- (2) Whether the balance of convenience lies in favour of the plaintiff?
- (3) Whether the plaintiff would suffer irreparable loss and injury if temporary injunction is not granted in his favour?
- (4) What order?
- 6. My findings on the above points are as under:

Point No.1: In the Negative

Point No.2 : In the Negative

Point No.3: In the Negative

Point No.4: As per final order for the following:

REASONS

7. **Points No.1 to 3**: These points are inter connected with one another, therefore to avoid repetition and for the sake of convenience they are taken up together for consideration.

The present suit is for the relief of specific 8. performance of sale agreement dated:07-04-2015. As per the agreement, the opponents have agreed to sell the suit schedule property to the applicant for Rs.95,00,000/-. As per the document, the applicant Rs.45,00,000/- and paid the had remaining Rs.50,00,000/- ought to have been paid at the time of registration of sale deed with in 11 months from the date of sale agreement. But, according to the applicant the opponents No.1 to 11 have executed the registered sale agreement in respect of suit schedule property in favour of the opponents No.12 and 13. Therefore, if the sale deed is executed in favour of opponents No.12 and 13 it will cause injury to the applicant. Hence, the applicant has sought for

the relief of temporary injunction against the opponents.

9. The applicant has produced sale agreement dated:07-04-2014. A perusal of the sale agreement shows that, the said agreement has been executed on stamp paper of the value of Rs.500/- i.e., the document is an insufficiently stamped document. It is law that, an insufficiently stamped document cannot be looked into for any purpose and no relief should be granted on the basis of such document. Therefore, this Court is of the view that, the applicant has not made out a prima-facie case in his favour and balance of convenience does not lie in his favour and he will not suffer hardship if temporary injunction is refused. Therefore, I answer Points No.1 to 3 in the Negative.

10. **Point No.4**: Based on findings in Points No.1 to 3, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

IA-I filed by the applicant/plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of CPC is rejected.

(Dictated to the Stenographer and computerized by him, corrected, signed and then pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the $\mathbf{07}^{\text{th}}$ day of April $\mathbf{2022}$.)

Dictated on : 06/07-04-2022 Transcribed on : 06/07-04-2022 Checked on : 07-04-2022 Signed on : 07-04-2022

(Smt.Anupama Lakshmi.B)
Prl. Senior Civil Judge & CJM.,
Ramanagara.

Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app "eCourts Services" from Android or iOS