



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 11661 OF 2026 (GM-KSR)

BETWEEN:

1. KARNATAKA ROLLER SKATING ASSOCIATION (R)
A SOCIETY REGISTERED UNDER KARNATAKA
SOCIETIES REGISTRATION ACT, 1960
NO.20, 1ST CROSS, LAKSHMI SADHANA,
SHANTI NAGAR, BENGALURU-560 025
REP BY ITS SECRETARY
MR. INDUDAR. S

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ANIL KUMAR SHETTY, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI S SHAKER SHETTY., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY DEPARTMENT OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES
REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES,
NO.1, AALI ASKER ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.
3. JOINT REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES,
NO.1, ALI ASKER ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.
4. DEPUTY REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES
4TH CIRCLE, MARGOSA ROAD,
SAHAKARA SOUDHA, MALLESWARAM,
BENGALURU-560 003.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. SARITHA KULKARNI, AGA FOR R1 TO R4)

Digitally signed
by SHWETHA
RAGHAVENDRA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO A) ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI THEREBY QUASHING THE RECOMMENDATION DATED-30.07.2025 BEARING NO.DAB-2/NO/SECTION 25/144/2024-25 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.4 TO THE RESPONDENT NO.2 RECOMMENDING FOR APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR AT ANNEXURE-F ACCORDING TO LAW AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. The Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:

a) Issue a writ of Certiorari thereby quashing the recommendation dated 30.07.2025 bearing No. DAB-2/NO/SECTION 25/144/2024-25, issued by Respondent No.4 to the Respondent No.2 recommending for appointment of administrator at ANNEXURE-F, according to law; and

b) Grant such other relief or reliefs as this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant in the circumstance of the case.

2. An Administrator was appointed to the Petitioner-Society by Respondent No.2.
3. The contention of Sri. Anil Kumar Shetty, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, is that there is no independent application of mind by respondent No.2 satisfying the requirement of Section



25(2)(C)(iii) of Karnataka Societies Registration Act, 1960.

4. His submission is that respondent No.2 has only extracted the various charges and the finding of the enquiry officer and has gone on to appoint an Administrator. There being a violation of Section 25(2)(C)(iii) of the Karnataka Societies Registration Act, 1960, he submits that the reliefs sought are required to be granted.
5. A perusal of the impugned order dated 30.07.2025 at Annexure-F indeed bears out the submissions made by learned counsel for the Petitioner inasmuch as only the charges have been extracted and the finding of the enquiry officer has also been extracted thereafter, and that is the cause for the appointment of an Administrator.
6. This aspect has been dealt with by this Court vide its order dated 29.07.2025 in W.P.No.104203/2025 in the decision of ***Gousemohammad and another Vs.***



The District Registrar of Societies¹, more particularly, paras 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 thereof which are reproduced hereunder for easy reference:

"7.6. The fact that the Registrar can appoint any other person authorised by him in writing to conduct the enquiry does not mean that the enquiry made by such a person is automatically accepted by the Registrar. The person conducting the enquiry is only a delegate of the Registrar and does not substitute the Registrar himself.

7.7. Once, an enquiry has been made, it would be for the Registrar to apply his independent mind to the enquiry report and either accept or reject the said report, and if the report is rejected, a re-enquiry could also be ordered by the Registrar.

7.8. In that view of the matter, I answer the above point raised by holding that the Registrar of Societies in pursuance of an enquiry held by his delegate, appointed by him under subsection (1) of Section 25, cannot as a postman forward the enquiry report as received to the society, the registrar has to apply his mind, accept the report and then forward it to the society in terms of clause (3) in Section 25(2)(C)(iii)."

7. The submission of Sri Anil Kumar Shetty, learned counsel for the petitioner, is also that the enquiry report has not been accepted. A re-enquiry has been ordered. If that be so, the question of appointing an Administrator on the basis of a rejected enquiry report would not arise.

¹ WP.No.104203/2025



8. For the very same reasons as those mentioned in ***Gousemohammad's*** decision, I pass the following:

ORDER

- i) Writ petition is ***allowed***.
- ii) Certiorari is issued, the recommendation dated 30.07.2025 issued by respondent No.4 at Annexure-F, is quashed.
- iii) The matter is remitted to respondent No.2-Registrar for fresh consideration in terms of the observation made in the present matter as also that made in ***Gousemohammad's decision***.
- iv) Reserving liberty to the Registrar to pass necessary orders within a period of six (6) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

**Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE**