

ITEM NO.29

COURT NO.12

SECTION IV-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 28340/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 08-01-2024
in RFA No. 100079/2017 passed by the High Court of Karnataka
Circuit Bench at Dharwad]

RENAVVA @ LAKSHMI & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SHANTILKUMARSWAMY R. SUBRAMANYA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 141838/2025 - ADDITION / DELETION / MODIFICATION PARTIES
IA No. 141836/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING
IA No. 141837/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 20-06-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MEHTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASANNA B. VARALE

[PARTIAL COURT WORKING DAYS BENCH]

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Shankar Divate, AOR

For Respondent(s) :

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.
2. The instant special leave petition is directed against the judgment dated 8th January, 2024 passed by the High Court of Karnataka, Circuit Bench at Dharwad in RFA No. 100079/2017 whereby the High Court accepted the appeal preferred by respondent No. 1 (defendant No. 9 in the trial Court) and rejected the suit filed by the petitioners-plaintiffs.
3. Defendant No. 9 (respondent No. 1 herein) had purchased the land in question under a registered sale deed dated 10th March,

2003. The plaintiffs (petitioners herein) claiming to be the legal heirs of the propositus claimed a stake in the said land on the strength of the amendment under Section 6 of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956, introduced vide Amendment Act, 2005 to claim that the sale was void because their rights in the land were adversely affected by the said sale. After considering the entire factual and legal scenario, the High Court held that the prohibition contained in Section 6 of the amended Hindu Succession Act, 1956 did not have any effect on the registered sale deed which was executed prior in point of time to 20th December, 2004, i.e., before the introduction of the amending provision. The High Court in support of these conclusions placed reliance on the judgment of this Court in the case of *Vineet Sharma v. Rakesh Sharma*, (2020) 9 SCC 1.

5. Having heard and considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners and after going through the impugned order, we do not find any error or infirmity in the impugned judgment so as to interfere therein.

6. Hence, the special leave petition is dismissed as being devoid of merit.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(KANCHAN CHOUHAN)
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

(DIVYA BABBAR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)