



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

WRIT APPEAL NO. 85 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

IK KAVITHA
WIFE OF SA GOPAL
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
PROPRIETOR OF SRI. MAHALAKSHMI
FERTILIZERS AND CHEMICALS,
FISH FEED UNIT, NO.2,
VANDARAGUPPE, BM ROAD,
CHANNAPATNA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT
KARNATAKA 562160
ALSO RESIDING AT NO.204,
PETMARC APARTMENT KAPIKAD,
NEAR KUNTIKANA, BIJAI,
MANGALORE DISTRICT - 575004
KARNATAKA

Digitally
signed by
NIRMALA
DEVI

Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. N.S. SRIRAJ GOWDA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY
AND FISHERIES (FISHERIES),
VIKASA SOUDHA,



DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDI,
BENGALURU 560001
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY

2. THE DIRECTOR,
THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES,
2ND FLOOR, PODIUM BLOCK,
VISHWESHWARAIHAH CENTRE,
DR.B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDI,
BENGALURU 560 001
3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES,
7TH CROSS, KUVEMPU NAGAR
CHANNAPATNA
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 573116
4. THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,
THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES,
7TH CROSS, KUVEMPU NAGAR
CHANNAPATNA
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 573116

...RESPONDENTS
(BY SRI. K.S. HARISH, GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO CALL FOR RECORDS IN WP
NO.4330/2024, ALLOW THE PRESENT WRIT APPEAL AND SET
ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 11/11/2025 PASSED BY THE
LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE OF THIS HONBLE COURT IN WP
NO.4330/2024 AND CONSEQUENTLY AND ETC.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY
HEARING, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN
AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA



ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The appellant has filed the present appeal impugning an order dated 11.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in Writ Petition No.4330 of 2024 (GM-RES). The appellant had filed the said petition impugning an order dated 07.09.2023, whereby the petitioner's request and representation for grant of subsidy was rejected. The petitioner also prayed that directions be issued to respondent No.2 [Director, Department of Fisheries, Bengaluru] to act upon the order dated 05.10.2020 and pay a sum of ₹68,69,288.40 as subsidy. The learned Single Judge noted that the appellant had not produced the bills in respect of which subsidy was claimed and accordingly, disposed of the petition by reserving liberty to the appellant to submit the necessary documents with a further direction that the same would be considered in accordance with law.

2. It is the appellant's case that he has submitted all the necessary bills and therefore, the learned Single Judge erred in not considering the same.



3. The appellant's claim related to the subsidy for the Blue Revolution Scheme floated by the Government, *inter alia*, providing subsidy for the construction of a Fish Seed Manufacturing Unit. The appellant had made an application along with a project report for establishment of a fish seed production unit with a capacity of 10 tons under the said 'Blue Revolution' Scheme. The said report was considered and by an order dated 05.10.2020, permission was granted to the appellant to establish the unit, subject to the conditions stipulated under the Centrally Sponsored Blue Revolution Scheme and the submission of documents as required by National Fisheries Development Board [**NFDB**].

4. The relevant extract of the memorandum sanctioning the appellants project reads as under:-

"The said proposal is considered for the year 2018-19. Permission is hereby granted to establish the unit subject to the terms and conditions of the Centrally Sponsored Blue Revolution Scheme, the submission of documents required by NFDB, and the execution of an agreement to abide by the stipulated requirements. Further, permission is granted subject to the condition that the subsidy shall be released only after the inspection of the unit as per rules, limiting the total project cost to Rs. 148.565 Lakhs, with the subsidy capped at 40% under the General Category."



5. It is apparent from the above, that the release of subsidy was contingent on the inspection of the units as per rules, limiting the total project cost of ₹148.565 lakh. The subsidy was also capped at 40% under the General Category.

6. The appellant claims that thereafter, the lease deed was executed between the tenant and the Sericulture Department for setting up a Fish Seed Manufacturing Plant.

7. The appellant claims that it completed the construction of the Fish Seed Manufacturing Unit on 12.03.2021 and submitted the bills pertaining to the costs incurred by it for construction and purchase of various equipment. However, the bills are not placed on record. The learned counsel for the appellant referred to a document annexed at Annexure-E to the present appeal. The said document is an abstract of the various bills. Though the abstract refers to bill numbers and the amounts, however, the bills are not on record. The learned counsel further submits that there are no further bills apart from the said document, which is produced at Annexure-E to the present appeal.



8. We are unable to accept the said statement because the abstract refers to the specific bills and other the details of the bills as well.

9. Notwithstanding the same, the learned counsel insists that there are no bills and contends that there is no requirement to submit the further documents as the appellant is mainly seeking implementation of the orders passed sanctioning the subsidy. He submits that there is no need for producing any other documents since, the concerned Minister for Fisheries, Ports and Inland Water Transport, Government of Karnataka, had by letter dated 27.07.2023 directed urgent release of the subsidy for the appellant's unit. Therefore, the concerned authorities were not required to undertake any further exercise except to disburse the subsidy as claimed. He submits that the appellant had submitted various representations prior to the issuance of the order dated 27.07.2023 as well as thereafter. However, the subsidy has not been released.

10. We find no merit in the appellant's contention. The order dated 27.07.2023 required the release of subsidy after verifying the



bills and verifying that the conditions of sanction under the Blue Revolution Scheme, have been complied with.

11. As noted above, the sanction letter dated 05.10.2020 expressly provided that the subsidy will be released after inspection of unit as per rules.

12. The Hon'ble Minister's letter dated 27.07.2023, on which the appellant rests his case also expressly directed as under:-

"It is hereby directed to urgently release the subsidy for the said unit under Women's Quota, based on original bills submitted."

[emphasis supplied]

13. Clearly, the release of subsidy is contingent on the bills submitted and their verification.

14. The appellant's claim for subsidy was examined and rejected by letter dated 19.07.2023. The reason for rejection is articulated in the said letter. The said letter indicates that the investigation team led by the Joint Director of Fisheries, Bengaluru, was directed to visit the appellant's unit and inspect the site and verify the documents regarding whether the site is in the name of beneficiary



or obtained on a lease basis. The team was also required to verify whether the machinery installed in the unit was purchased after the issuance of the work order or is old machinery. The team was also tasked with verifying the genuineness of the bills for machinery from the respective agencies and submit a report. The relevant extract of said letter reads as under:-

"Accordingly, under Reference (2), the investigation team led by the Joint Director of Fisheries, Bengaluru, conducted a spot inspection on 27/06/2023 and submitted a report along with relevant documents. The report states that the site intended for the establishment of the Fish Feed Production Unit was obtained on lease from the Department of Sericulture for the purpose of establishing a "Pupa Processing Unit," and litigation regarding this matter is pending before the High Court.

Since the site is not in the name of the beneficiary, the machinery was purchased prior to the issuance of the work order, and the bills were found to be not genuine, the opinion has been submitted that there is no scope to consider the said unit for a subsidy under the 'Blue Revolution' scheme. This opinion has been accepted, and it is hereby directed to issue a suitable endorsement (rejection notice) to the applicant."

15. We find no grounds to fault the reasons for rejection of the petitioner's claim for subsidy.

16. Despite the said rejection, the appellant continued to make representations. The same finally came to be rejected by impugned



endorsement dated 07.09.2023. The operative portion of the said endorsement is similarly worded as the findings noted in the letter dated 19.07.2023.

17. We also note that although the appellant was informed of the specific reasons for rejection of the claim of subsidy including the question as to the genuineness of the bills furnished, the appellant has not produced any documents to support the same. As noted above, the appellant's stand – at least before this Court – is that there are no bills other than the abstract of bills as furnished. And, there is no necessity to produce any other document. We find no merit in the said contentions and accordingly reject them.

18. In view of the above, the present appeals is dismissed.

19. All pending applications are also disposed of.

**Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE**