

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 25<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JULY, 2013

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.L.MANJUNATH  
AND  
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI MALIMATH

**WRIT APPEAL NO.5580/2012(LB-BMP)**

BETWEEN

- 1 SRI SURESH BABU  
S/O LATE K AMAL NATHAN  
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS  
RESIDING AT MUNIYAPPA GARDEN LAYOUT,  
2<sup>ND</sup> PHASE, 3<sup>RD</sup> MAIN,  
K.R.PURAM, BANGALORE-36
- 2 SRI SATISH KUMAR  
S/O LATE K AMAL NATHAN  
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS  
RESIDING AT MUNIYAPPA GARDEN LAYOUT,  
2<sup>ND</sup> PHASE, 3<sup>RD</sup> MAIN,  
K.R.PURAM, BANGALORE-36 ... APPELLANTS

(By Sri : T CHANDRAPPA & K.V.CHANDRA REDDY, ADV.  
FOR APPELLANTS (ABSENT) )

AND :

- 1 THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER  
BBMP, K R PURAM SUB DIVISION  
K R PURAM, BANGALORE
- 2 SRI B H JOSEPH KENNEDY  
S/O LATE A B HARRY  
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS  
RESIDING AT MUNIYAPPA GARDEN LAYOUT,  
2<sup>ND</sup> PHASE, 3<sup>RD</sup> MAIN,  
K.R.PURAM, BANGALORE-36  
... RESPONDENTS

THIS WRIT APPEAL FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED IN THE WRIT PETITION NO.13706/2010 DATED 21/08/2012.

THIS APPEAL COMING ON FOR ORDERS THIS DAY, MANJUNATH J, DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

JUDGMENT

The appeal was presented on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2012 with full of Office objections. Since Office objections were not complied with within the time stipulated, the matter was listed before the Registrar (Judicial) on 13.3.2013, on which date, the counsel for the appellants did not appear before the Registrar. Still he granted two weeks time for the appellants to comply with the office objections. Even thereafter Office objections were not complied with. Therefore, the matter was listed before this Court on 18.6.2013, on which date also Advocates for the appellants did not appear. Still this court granted 2 weeks time to do the needful as a last chance. Till today the Office objections are not complied with.

2. Therefore, the matter is listed today. When the case was called in the morning, the appellants counsel was not present. When the case is called at 12.30 noon also

the appellants counsel is not present. In the circumstances, we do not see any reasons to adjourn the matter.

3. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Sd/-  
JUDGE

Sd/-  
JUDGE

Ak