



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

WRIT PETITION NO. 6415 OF 2026 (BDA)

BETWEEN:

SRI. GURU H. M.
S/O. MUNIRAJU V.,
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,
R/AT NO.1113, 6TH BLOCK,
C SECTOR, NPKL LAYOUT,
HOSAPALAYA, RAMOHALLI POST,
BENGALURU -560 060.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. NISHANTH A. V., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARA PARK WEST,
BENGALURU-560 020,
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER.
2. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
NO.2 SUB-DIVISION,
NADAPRABHU KEMPEGOWDA
LAYOUT DIVISION,
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
BENGALURU - 560 020.



3. BANGALORE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY COMPANY
LIMITED (BESCOM),
REPRESENTED BY THE
ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
K-1 SUB- DIVISION,
Kengeri, BENGALURU - 560 060.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. K. KRISHNA, ADVOCATE FOR R1,
SRI. A. CHANDRACHUD, ADVOCATE FOR R2 AND R3)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE NOTICE
DATED 17.02.2026 BEARING NO.BEN.A.PRA/ SAKANIA
(NPKL)/15/2025-26 ISSUED BY THE R2 VIDE ANNEXURE-A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner has called in question the correctness
of the validity of the notice dated 17.02.2026, whereby
the respondent - Bangalore Development Authority (BDA)
has noticed that there has been violation in the sanction
plan vis-a-vis the construction put up and that further
action would be taken, including informing the electricity
supply authorities to cut off the power supply.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the notice at Annexure-A is bereft of details and does not specify the alleged violation. It is submitted that unless the notice contains details regarding alleged violation, the petitioner will not be in a position to take his stand by way of reply and satisfy the authorities as to the adherence to sanction plan and the applicable rules during construction.

3. Learned counsel Sri. K. Krishna appearing for the respondent - BDA submits that the notice could have been issued after noticing violations.

4. Having perused the notice at Annexure-A, it is clear that the notice does not refer to the nature of violations. The violations of the sanction plan by way of deviation in construction ought to be stipulated in order to enable the petitioner to take a stand as regards alleged violation of sanction plan that is stated to have occurred while putting up constructions.



5. Accordingly, petition is disposed of, restraining the respondent - BDA from taking any action pursuant to the notice at Annexure-A, till the proceedings relating to ascertainment of violation of sanction plan are adjudicated upon as per the scheme under the Act.

6. The authority may issue a fresh notice which would be deemed to be a continuation of notice at Annexure-A and such notice to state the nature of alleged violation upon which petitioner to make out his reply and the authority may adjudicate upon the proceedings as is permissible under the provisions of Karnataka Municipalities Act.

7. Needless to state, till the proceedings initiated are concluded regarding violation of the sanction plan, the authority is restrained from taking any action towards demolition or giving instructions to the authority to cut of the essential amenities. Accordingly, the petition is ***disposed of***. All contentions are kept open.



8. I.A.No.1/2026 is disposed of, by dispensing the petitioner from production of certified copy of Annexure-A. I.A.No.2/2026 is disposed of, by waiving of the requirement of production of typed/legible copy of Annexures-G, H, J and N.

Sd/-
(S SUNIL DUTT YADAV)
JUDGE

MCR