



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 12064 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. VINAY J
S/O JAYAGURU C.G
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
R/AT 83, PLOT S-2, 1ST FLOOR
2ND CROSS, GKW LAYOUT
MARENAHALLI WARD
VIJAYANAGAR, BENGALURU - 560 040.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI VINAY J - PATY IN PERSON)

AND:

1. MANAGING DIRECTOR AND CEO,
TEK SYSTEMS INDIA
DIVISION OF ALLEGIS SERVICES INDIA PVT LTD
COMMERCE @ MANTRI LEVEL 2, 3, 4
No. 12/1 AND 12/2, NS PALYA
BANNERGHATTA ROAD
BENGALURU - 560 076.
(INCORPORATED UNDER COMPANIES ACT)

...RESPONDENT

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO TAKE COGNIZANCE OF THE PETITIONER'S EXTREME INDIGENCY AND PASS SUITABLE DIRECTIONS TO EXPEDITE THE HEARING OF W.P. No.16549/2025 AND THE CONNECTED MATTER W.P. No.22302/2025 (GM-CPC) ON A PRIORITY/OUT-OF TURN BASIS AND ETC.

Digitally signed
by NAGARAJA
B M



Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

Captioned petition is filed seeking following reliefs:

(i) Take cognizance of the Petitioner's extreme Indigency and pass suitable directions to expedite the hearing of W.P.No.16549/2025 & the connected matter W.P.No.22302/2025 (GM-CPC) on a priority/out-of-turn basis.

(ii) Any other orders, alternative remedy or directions that may be appropriate in nature as per the facts and circumstances of the case.

2. At the outset, this Court is constrained to observe that the present writ petition is wholly misconceived and not maintainable. The petitioner, appearing as a party-in-person, has invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a direction to a Co-ordinate Bench of this very Court to dispose of writ petitions in W.P.No.16549/2025 c/w W.P.No.22302/2025. Such a relief is ex-facie



impermissible. It is a settled principle of judicial discipline that a Bench of co-equal strength cannot issue directions to another Co-ordinate Bench in respect of matters pending consideration. The prayer sought, therefore, strikes at the very foundation of institutional propriety and is liable to be rejected on this short ground alone.

3. This Court also deems it necessary to record its disquiet at the increasing tendency of litigants appearing as party-in-person to institute proceedings of the present nature, which are not only legally untenable but also tend to consume valuable judicial time. While access to justice is a cherished constitutional value and litigants cannot be shut out merely on the ground that they appear in person, such liberty cannot be permitted to degenerate into an unregulated licence to file misconceived and frivolous petitions. The present case is a classic illustration where the process of the Court is invoked without any semblance of legal foundation.



4. This Court is of the considered opinion that the mechanism presently in place for permitting litigants to appear and prosecute matters as party-in-person requires immediate reconsiderations. While the right of a litigant to appear in person is an integral facet of access to justice, such a right is not absolute and must operate within the discipline of procedural law and institutional efficiency. The material placed before this Court indicates that the scrutiny presently undertaken at the threshold is largely perfunctory, resulting in petitions being mechanically numbered without adequate examination of whether the pleadings disclose a legally tenable cause of action or seek reliefs that are maintainable in law.

5. It is incumbent upon the Committee constituted by this Court to exercise a far more rigorous and meaningful scrutiny while considering requests of litigants seeking permission to appear as party-in-person. The Committee is not expected to undertake an adjudicatory exercise on merits; however, it is duty-bound to ensure that the



litigant demonstrates a minimum level of competence to understand and assist the Court in the adjudicatory process.

6. This Court has repeatedly noticed that, despite pointed queries, party-in-person litigants are often unable to assist even on basic facts, with pleadings that fail to disclose a clear cause of action or articulate coherent reliefs, thereby compelling the Court to reconstruct the lis from vague pleadings, an exercise alien to adversarial adjudication and one that consumes precious judicial time. It is, therefore, imperative that permission to appear as a party-in-person before a Constitutional Court is not granted for the mere asking, but only upon satisfaction of a high threshold, ensuring the litigant's ability to present structured pleadings, articulate a legally cognizable grievance, and effectively assist the Court.

7. This Court cannot remain oblivious to a growing and rather disconcerting trend, where permission to



appear as party-in-person is granted on superficial considerations such as fluency in English or mere articulation skills, without assessing the litigant's capacity to present legally structured pleadings or to assist the Court effectively. Fluency in language, by itself, is no substitute for legal comprehension. Equally, the educational background or qualifications of the applicant cannot be treated as wholly relevant.

8. Though this Court was initially inclined to impose exemplary costs of Rs.1,00,000/- on the petitioner for having instituted the present proceedings, which are thoroughly misconceived, this Court, taking a lenient view, refrains from doing so. However, the petitioner is cautioned to be circumspect in invoking the jurisdiction of this Court in future.

9. For the foregoing reasons, the writ petition stands dismissed as not maintainable. Liberty is, however, reserved to the petitioner to work out his remedies in



accordance with law before the appropriate Bench where the writ petitions in W.P.No.16549/2025 c/w W.P.No.22302/2025 are presently seized of the matter.

10. Registry is directed to forthwith communicate a copy of this order to the Committee for compliance of the directions issued in paragraphs above.

Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE