

PETITIONER:
SR. N. N, UMAPATHY

Vs.

RESPONDENT:
B.V. MUNIYAPPA

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 25/03/1997

BENCH:
K. RAMASWAMY, D.P. WADHWA

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R

Leave granted.

We have heard counsel for both the parties.

This appeal by special leave arise from the judgment of the Karnataka High Court, made on 28.8.1996 in C.R.P. No. 2780/95. The admitted position is that the predecessor of the respondent had a mining lease in S. NO. 14 of Venkatapura Village. The High Court has noted as under :

"Admittedly, in the case on hand, the plaintiff (respondent herein) having purchased the machinery plant installed over the said extent of the suit land from his vendor, had been in continuous actual possession thereof since November, 1989. It is also an undisputed fact that the plaintiff's vendor was in possession and enjoyment of property from 1984 till November, 1989 on which date he delivered possession to the plaintiff under the said agreement. Admittedly, the Government is the true owner of the suit property."

In view the above undisputed factual position, the only question for consideration is injunction pending suit under Order XXXIX, Rules 1 and 2, Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, though the trial Court had not granted the injunction and the appellate Court reversed it? The High Court on the above facts maintained ad-interim injunction, pending the suit.

It is also admitted case that the appellant has mining lease in respect of 1 acre 16 gunthas of land in he same survey number in which the respondent has bey a lease deed dated November 29, 1993. The respondent cannot unlawfully be dispossessed from the lands nor his possession and enjoyment intradicted except in accordance with the due process of law.

Under these circumstances, though the appellant has s lease, he cannot be given possession by the Government

except after duly ejecting the respondent in accordance with law. It would appear that subsequently on a representation made by the respondent, the Government acknowledged the factum of his possession and agreed to ratify his continuance in possession subject to his paying Rs. 12 lacs and odd per acre and further amount as contemplated by the Government order.

Under these circumstances, the injunction granted by the High Court is in accordance with law and the respondent is entitled to the protection of his lawful possession by way of ad-interim injunction.

The appeal is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

JUDIS