



CNR: KAHC010082322025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI

AND

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO.154 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SMT. R. NAGARATHNA
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS
W/O B VEEREPPA REDDY,
VILLA NO.31, GOLDEN HOMES,
PHASE-2, IMDIABELA VILLAGE,
HATTIBELE HOBLI,
BANGALORE - 560 107

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. SUBBA REDDY K N, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI. GOPAL REDDY
S/O LATE NARAYAN REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,
R/A LAKSHMISAGAR VILLAGE,
ATTIBELE HOBLI,
ANEKAL TALUK,
BENGALURU - 562 106

...ACCUSED

(BY SMT. S.SUSHILA SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. SHIVARAJU M K, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by
SUMATHY
KANNAN
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



CNR: KAHC010082322025

THIS CCC IS FILED R/W SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, PRAYING TO INITIATE CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ACCUSED HEREIN FOR THEIR WILLFUL DISOBEDIENCE AND DELIBERATE VIOLATION OF THE ORDER DATED 22.10.2020 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WP NO.58367/2016 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT AND PUNISH THE ACCUSED AS PER THE PROVISIONS OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971 IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI
and
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI)

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. This petition is filed alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 22.10.2020 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.58367/2016 on I.A No.1/2018. The interim order of 22.10.2020, reads as follows:



CNR: KAHC010082322025

"Sri. Vivek Reddy learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and Sri. M.K. Shivaraju, learned Counsel for the third respondent are heard for Orders on I.A. No.1/2018.

Sri. Vivek Reddy, learned Senior Counsel submits that the petitioner is constrained to file the present application because, during pendency of the present writ petition there is an attempt to change the nature of the subject property which is an open land. The learned Senior Counsel submits that despite the finding that the petitioner's name is entered as an Occupant in the RTC for the subject property for the relevant year and in the years thereafter, the petitioner's application is rejected only on the ground that for the years after 1988-89 and thereafter his name is not entered in Columns 12(2) of the RTC. The petitioner's name is deleted only because of a Circular dated 12.09.1989 issued by the Tahsildar, Anekal Taluk for deletion of all the names of the occupants in Column No. 12/2 of the application. The learned Senior Counsel submits that the subsequent spot inspection report could not also be held against the petitioner. The petitioner, who has filed application in Form No. 7A for grant of the land measuring 3 acres 12 guntas of Kambalipura Village, Attibele Hobli, Anekal Taluk as provided in law, has continued in possession of this land even from the time prior to the effective date.

On the perusal of the impugned order and in the light of the grounds urged in support of the petition, this Court is of the considered view that, subject to further orders of this Court, the parties will have to maintain status-quo without changing the nature of the subject property viz., the land in Sy. No.7/1 measuring 3 acres 12 guntas of Kambalipura Village, Attibele Hobli, Anekal Taluk.

Ordered accordingly.

I.A. No.1/2018 is disposed of reserving liberty to the third respondent to seek modification of this order."



CNR: KAHC010082322025

3. The submission made by learned counsel for the complainant is that in the year 2020, certain constructions were put up by the accused on the agricultural land belonging to the complainant. In the writ petition, the order dated 26.09.2016 in Regular Appeal No. 206/2003 passed by the Karnataka Appellate Tribunal is under challenge.

4. The learned counsel for the complainant had pointed out on an earlier occasion that in the year 2020, some constructions were put up by the accused on the agricultural land belonging to the complainant. But the same were demolished by him in the year 2025 and he is carrying on agricultural activity thereon. Pursuant thereto, this Court had summoned the accused for hearing on 'framing of charge'. The accused is present in Court today.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the accused has submitted that the interim order granted by this Court in



CNR: KAHC010082322025

the writ petition clearly noted that the nature of the land was agricultural land. An order of *status quo* was granted by the writ Court with a direction not to change the nature of the subject property. It is submitted, with reference to the statement of objection filed on 23.01.2026, that it was in the year 2022 that the constructions existing on the subject land collapsed due to rains. The collapsed structure was removed by the accused. It is stated that the conduct of the accused would not come under the category of a willful disobedience of the order passed by the writ court.

6. A perusal of paragraph No.9 of the statement of objection which is verified by an affidavit of the accused, reveals that the labour shed put up by the accused had developed cracks and the same were in dilapidated condition and on 01.09.2022 due to heavy rains, the dilapidated condition shed including the poultry farm shed existing on the property collapsed. The accused had given a representation to the Revenue Inspector urging him to



CNR: KAHC010082322025

inspect the collapsed shed and to award suitable monetary compensation for the loss sustained by him.

7. Reference is also made to an affidavit filed on 18.09.2025, which encloses certain photographs purportedly taken on 29.08.2022, showing the collapsed sheds.

8. Given the interim order passed by this Court and the explanation submitted by the learned counsel for the accused, in our opinion, it is not a case of willful disobedience by the accused. Though it is true as contended by the counsel for the complainant, when the shed had collapsed the accused should have approached the Court to seek permission to remove the collapsed structure, however the nature of the land, as recorded by the learned Single Judge of this Court being agricultural land and an open land, its nature has not been changed. It is therefore evident that the accused has maintained *status quo* qua the nature of the property.



**NC: 2026:KHC:52626-DB
CCC No. 154 of 2025**

CNR: KAHC010082322025

9. Hence, the accused is discharged and the contempt petition is accordingly consigned.

**Sd/-
(JAYANT BANERJI)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(TARA VITASTA GANJU)
JUDGE**

KS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 52