

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 20TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VENKATESH NAIK T

WRIT APPEAL NO. 313 OF 2024 (LB-RES)

C/W

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 545 OF 2024

IN WA No. 313/2024

BETWEEN:

1. K R SAGAR GRAM PANCHAYAT
KRISHNARAJASAGAR
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PANCHAYATH DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
SRIRANGAPATNA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571607
2. PANCHAYATH DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
KRISHNARAJASAGAR GRAMA PANCHAYATH
SRIRANGAPATNA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571607
3. THE SECRETARY
KRISHNARAJASAGAR GRAMA PANCHAYATH
SRIRANGAPATNA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571607

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. SHIVAPRAKASH M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SHRI N SWAMYGOWDA
S/O NANJEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS

K R SAGAR, BELAGOLA HOBLI
SRIRANGAPATNA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571607

2. ADHYAKSHA
TALUK PANCHAYATH
SRIRANGAPATNA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571438
3. THE PRESIDENT
ZILLA PANCHAYATH
MANDYA-571401
4. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
M S BUILDING
BANGALORE-01

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B S SATYANAND, ADVOCATE FOR R1)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED
03.01.2024 IN WP No-19799/2017 (LB-RES) AND WP No-
44399/2017(LB-RES).

IN CCC NO. 545/2024

BETWEEN:

SHRI N SWAMY GOWDA
S/O LATE NAJEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS
R/AT: NEAR POLICE STATION ROAD
KRISHNARAJASAGARA-571607
BELAGOLA HOBLI, SRIRANGAPATTANA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. B S SATYANAND, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. SHRUTHI
PRESIDENT

KRISHNARAJA SAGARA GRAMA PANCHAYATH
K R SAGARA
SRIRANGAPATTANA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571401.

2. MR. BASAVARAJU
PANCHAYATH DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
KRISHNARAJA SAGARA GRAMA PANCHAYATH
K R SAGARA
SRIRANGAPATTANA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-5716401.
3. MR. P RAGHU
SECRETARY
KRISHNARAJA SAGARA GRAMA PANCHAYATH
K R SAGARA
SRIRANGAPATTANA TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571401.

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI. SHIVAPRAKASH M., ADVOCATE FOR A1 TO A3)

THIS CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 215 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA R/W SECTION 11 AND 12 OF CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, PRAYING TO ALLOW THE ABOVE COMPLAINT AND PUNISH THE ACCUSED PERSONS FOR DELIBERATELY AND WILLFULLY DISOBEYING THE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS DATED 03.01.2024, PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE OF THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WP NO.44399/2017 C/W WP NO.19799/2017 (LB-RES) AND FURTHER PUNISH THE ACCUSED PERSONS FOR AN ACT OF COMMITTING CONTEMPT OF THE COURTS ORDERS UNDER ARTICLE OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA R/W SECTION 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971.

THESE WRIT APPEAL & CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED ON 13.07.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT, THIS DAY, THE **VENKATESH NAIK T. J.**, PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VENKATESH NAIK T

CAV JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VENKATESH NAIK T)

This Writ Appeal is filed challenging the order dated 03.01.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P. No.44399/2017 connected with W.P. No.19799/2017 (LB-RES). The Contempt of Court Case is filed alleging wilful disobedience of the said order.

2. The brief facts of the case are as under:

Respondent No.1, Sri N. Swamy Gowda, claims to be the absolute owner of the site bearing Khata No.156, measuring 100 x 120 feet, situated at Krishnarajasagara, Srirangapatna Taluk, Mandya District. The Government of Karnataka acquired 856 acres and 36 guntas of land and notified the said area under Section 369 of the Karnataka Municipalities Act, 1964, vide notification dated 30.08.1979, declaring the said area as the Krishnarajasagara Notified Area with effect from 01.09.1979. respondent No.1, Sri Swamy Gowda, claims that, he is the occupant of the property and in possession thereof, his name was entered in the demand

registers of the Hulikere Grama Panchayat. The Notified Area Committee issued a Hakku Patra (document of title/rights) on 06.04.1989.

3. In the mean-while, respondent No.1, Swamy Gowda, applied for renewal of the licence on 07.05.2012 and an endorsement came to be issued by the appellants on 04.06.2012 stating that, since respondent No.1 had not proved his title, the licence could not be renewed. Therefore, respondent No.1 submitted a detailed representation to the appellants enclosing all the relevant documents. However, an endorsement came to be issued on the very same date rejecting the representation of the respondent, once again reiterating that respondent No.1 could not seek building permission in respect of the property.

4. Parellely, the appellant Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat passed Resolution No.7(i) dated 08.09.2008, cancelling the khata of respondent No.1. Later, respondent No.1, being unaware of the said resolution, came to know that Smt. B.N. Sowbhagya had challenged the said resolution before the President of the Taluk Panchayat, Srirangapatna, in Appeal No.5/08-09. The said appeal was allowed, and the resolution

passed by the Srirangapatna Grama Panchayat dated 06.02.2009 was quashed. The matter was remanded to appellant No.1, Krishnarajasagar Grama Panchayat, for fresh consideration vide order dated 14.07.2014. However, no order was passed by the Grama Panchayat. Thereafter, on 24.01.2015, the appellants issued an endorsement informing respondent No.1 that the licence would not be granted. Hence, respondent No.1 filed W.P.No.44399/2017 seeking the following reliefs:

"a) Issue a writ of mandamus directing the Respondent Nos.2, 3 and 4 to continue the khatha in the name of the petitioner, collect taxes and issue building license as per the order dated 06.11.2015 in Appeal No.4/2014-15 passed by the Respondent No.5-President, Taluk Panchayat, Srirangapattana (Annexure-AB), which is also affirmed by the Respondent No.6-President, Zilla Panchayat, Mandya vide Letter dated 20/06/2017 (Annexure-AG).

b) Pass such other orders in the facts and circumstances of the case and in the interests of justice and equity."

5. Ultimately, the learned Single Judge allowed the writ petition filed by respondent No.1 and by order dated 03.01.2024 passed the following order:

- i) The writ petition is allowed.*
- ii) A mandamus is issued, respondents No.2, 3 and 4 are directed to continue the Khatha bearing Khatha No.156 Krishnarajasagara, Srirangapattan Taluk, Mandya District in favour of the petitioner. They are further directed to collect the past taxes without levy of any penalty or interest since the petitioner was always ready to pay the taxes, it is only on account of respondents No.2, 3 and 4 that taxes are not collected.*
- iii) Respondents No.2 to 4 are also directed to issue the building license as per the order dated 6.11.2015 in Appeal No.4/2014-15 as affirmed by the order dated 20.06.2017 by the President, Zilla Panchayat, Mandya within a period of 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.*

6. Being aggrieved by the order passed by the learned Single Judge in the writ petition, the appellants, Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat, represented by its Panchayat Development Officer and its Secretary, have filed this Writ Appeal.

7. We have heard Sri Shivaprakash, learned counsel for the appellants and Sri B.S. Satyanand, learned counsel for respondent No.1.

8. Sri Shivaprakash, learned counsel for the appellants, submits that the Tahsildar, in his letter dated 21.12.2001 stated that respondent No.1 was trying to encroach upon the Government land bearing Sy.No.175 adjacent to the Post Office, Krishnasagara village, though the said land in Survey No.175 had not been granted in his favour. Therefore, the Tahsildar, Srirangapatna requested the Grama Panchayat, Krishnarajasagar to cancel the khata (entry in the assessment list). Accordingly, the Krishnarajasagar Grama Panchayat cancelled the entry in the assessment list bearing No.146 by its resolution dated 08.09.2008. Thus, respondent No.1 preferred appeal to the Executive Officer, Taluk Panchayat, Srirangapatna, who in-turn, by order dated 14.07.2014, allowed the appeal filed by respondent No.1 under Sections 269 and 64(5) of the Karnataka Grama Swaraj and Panchayat Raj Act, 1993, (for short, "the Act") and directed the Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat to reconsider the decision regarding continuing khata in the name of respondent No.1 and to issue the building licence, since the earlier decision was contrary to the principles of natural justice. In view of non-functioning of Adhyaksha, the respondent sought an endorsement and hence on 24.01.2015, the Krishnarajasagar

Gram Panchayat issued an endorsement stating that licence cannot be granted to respondent No.1. Thereafter, respondent No.1 preferred appeal No.TPS:Appeal 4/2014-2015 before the Adhyaksha, Taluk Panchayat, Srirangapatna, against the endorsement dated 24.01.2015 and the resolution. However, the Adhyaksha, Taluk Panchayat, allowed the appeal and set-aside the proceedings dated 08.06.2008 and held that the Gram Panchayat has no power to cancel the khata and directed the appellants to continue the khata in the name of respondent No.1 and to grant building licence without issuing notice to any person concerned.

9. It is further contended that respondent No.1 is relying upon Hakku Pathra dated 06.04.1989, stated to have been issued by the Notified Area Committee, Krishnarajasagara. The survey number mentioned in the Hakku Pathra is Sy.No.291. The corrigendum, which is stated to have been issued on 06.04.1989, mentions Sy.No.297 and not Sy.No.291. Both the documents are alleged to be created documents, and by virtue of these documents, respondent No.1 is trying to encroach upon the land bearing Sy. No.175, measuring 120 x 100 feet. The lands bearing Sy. Nos.291, 297 and 175 belong to the Government. Neither Krishnarajasagara

Grama Panchayat nor the Notified Area Committee were empowered to transfer any portion of these lands. As the aforesaid lands do not belong to the Grama Panchayat/Notified Area Committee, no land can be transferred without the prior approval of the competent authority, nor can it be disposed of without following the prescribed procedure. The name of respondent No.1 has been entered illegally in the assessment list as Khata No.156 without there being any resolution of the Grama Panchayat or the Notified Area Committee.

10. It is further contended that respondent No.1 had filed a suit in O.S. No.487/1989 against one Papanna seeking relief of permanent injunction in respect of land bearing Sy.No.291, measuring 100 x 120 feet, situated at Srirangapatna, and the suit was decreed on 26.02.1991. It is further contended that respondent No.1 had filed O.S.No.149/2001 seeking permanent injunction against the appellants in respect of Khata No.156, measuring 100 x 120 feet and the same was dismissed and hence, respondent No.1 preferred appeal in R.A.No.31/2007 and the same was allowed and the matter was remanded for fresh consideration and ultimately O.S.No.149/2001 was dismissed on 20.10.2010 and therefore, no Civil Court has held that respondent No.1 is the

owner of the property in question. If any person is aggrieved by any original order of the Grama Panchayat, he may file an appeal under Section 269 of the Karnataka Grama Swaraj and Panchayat Raj Act, 1993. Section 237 of the Act does not provide for any appeal, but it empowers the authorities to suspend a resolution of the Grama Panchayat in the public interest. As per the provisions of the Karnataka Panchayat Raj (Grama Panchayat Taxes and Fees) Rules, 1994, the names of the owner, occupier of the land and building are to be included in the assessment list for the purpose of payment of property tax. Therefore, an entry in the assessment list can be made only pursuant to a resolution of the Grama Panchayat, and the assessment list is not a document of title.

11. It is contended that as per Rule 11, the Grama Panchayat may, at any time, alter the assessment list by deleting an entry in respect of any land if such an entry has been erroneously made in the assessment list through fraud, accident, or mistake. The Grama Panchayat authorities, under the Act, cannot hold or declare any person to be the owner of the property.

12. It is further contended that the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.19799/2017 has not been conclusively determined and the validity of the order passed by the Adhyaksha of the Taluk Panchayat has also not been decided in accordance with law. The learned Single Judge erred in directing the issuance of building licence for the construction of a building on Government land. Thus, the order passed by respondent No.2–Adhyaksha is without jurisdiction.

13. It is further contended that the petition filed before the Adhyaksha of the Taluk Panchayat under Section 237 of the Act is not maintainable, and that respondent No.2 could not have set aside a resolution, which had already been set aside by the appellate authority. It is further contended that the authorities under Section 237 of the Act can only suspend a resolution and cannot issue any positive direction. There should be an executable order to exercise the power under Section 237 of the Act. Hence, respondent No.2, the Adhyaksha of the Taluk Panchayat, had no power to hold or declare any person to be the owner of the property, as it is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Civil Court to declare the ownership of the property. Therefore, respondent No.2 committed an error in issuing a direction to the appellant, Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat,

to enter the name of a person who has no right, title, or interest over the Government land. Respondent No.2 also has no jurisdiction to direct Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat to issue building licence, as respondent No.1 is not the owner and has no right or title in respect of the schedule property. More importantly, respondent No.1 cannot encroach upon the Government land. On all these grounds, learned counsel prays to allow the appeal.

14. *Per contra*, Sri B.S. Sathyanand, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1 vehemently contended that respondent No.1 is the absolute owner of the site bearing Khata No.156, measuring 100 x 120 feet. He is the occupant and is in possession of the property in question. His name was shown as the occupant in the demand register of the Hulikere Grama Panchayat. The Notified Area Committee, taking into account the documents submitted by respondent No.1, recognised him as the occupant and issued Hakku Patra on 06.04.1989 upon receipt of the prescribed fees. Thereafter, respondent No.1 made an application to the Notified Area Committee seeking permission to put up a compound wall and a commercial complex on the aforesaid property, for which permission was also granted on 19.05.1989.

15. It is contended that the appellants are interfering with the possession of respondent No.1 without any basis. Insofar as the appeal filed by respondent No.1 in R.A.No.70/2010 is concerned, the same has attained finality and no further appeal has been preferred by either the appellants or respondent No.2. When respondent No.1 applied for renewal of the licence on 07.05.2012, an endorsement came to be issued by the appellants-Grama Panchayat on 04.06.2012 stating that, since respondent No.1 had not proved his title, the licence could not be renewed.

16. It is further contended that the learned Single Judge, after considering the factual and legal aspects of the matter, rightly directed the appellants to continue the khata bearing No.156 of the Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat in favour of respondent No.1 and to collect the arrears of taxes without levying any penalty or interest, since respondent No.1 was always ready to pay the taxes, and it was only on account of respondent Nos.2 to 4 that the taxes were not collected. Further, respondent Nos.2 to 4 were also directed to issue a building licence in terms of the order dated 06.11.2015 passed in Appeal No.4/2015-16, as affirmed by the order dated 20.06.2017 passed by the President, Zilla Panchayat, Mandya.

It is contended that the impugned order does not call for any interference at the hands of this Court. Therefore, learned counsel prays to dismiss the appeal filed by the appellants.

17. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for both the parties and perused the material available on record. The following point which arises for our consideration is:

"Whether the appellants have made out sufficient grounds for setting aside the impugned order, and whether the same warrants interference by this Court?"

18. A perusal of the material on record discloses that the Tahsildar, Srirangapatna, in his letter dated 21.12.2001 stated that respondent No.1 was trying to encroach upon Government land bearing Sy.No.175 adjacent to the Post Office, though no land in Sy.No.175 had been granted to him. The Tahsildar, therefore, requested the Grama Panchayat to cancel the illegal khata (entry in the assessment list). Accordingly, the Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat cancelled the entry in the assessment list bearing No.156 by its resolution dated 08.09.2008.

19. Under the Karnataka Grama Swaraj and Panchayat Raj Act, 1993, in order to challenge the cancellation of an illegal, fraudulent, or wrongly entered property khata (Form Nos.9 and 11), the aggrieved person must file a statutory appeal under Section 269 of the Act before the Executive Officer of the Taluk Panchayat. A Grama Panchayat does not have the inherent power to arbitrarily cancel a khata once it has been entered, and such cancellation must be scrutinised by the designated appellate authority. Since the Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat cancelled the khata, respondent No.1 preferred an appeal before the Executive Officer, Taluk Panchayat, Srirangapatna, under Section 269 of the Act, being aggrieved by the order/resolution of the Grama Panchayat regarding the property assessment. Hence, it is just and necessary to analyse Section 269 of the Act. Section 269 reads as under:

"269. Appeals.- [(1) Any person aggrieved by any original order of the Grama Panchayat under this Act, unless appeal is provided elsewhere in this Act, may within thirty days from the date of such order appeal to the Executive Officer.]

(2) The Appellate Authority may after giving an opportunity to the appellant to be heard and after such

enquiry as it deems fit, decide the appeal and its decision shall be final.

(3) Any appeal under sub-section (1) pending before the Zilla Parishad shall on the date of commencement of the Karnataka Panchayat Raj Act, 1993 stand transferred to the Assistant Commissioner and such appeal shall be decided by him as if it has been filed before him."

20. The perusal of above provision and the facts and circumstances of the present case, it appears that respondent No.1 had filed an appeal under Section 64(5) of the Act before the Taluk Panchayat. Hence, it is just and necessary to analyse section 64(5) of the Act, which read as under:-

"(5) An appeal shall lie to the [Executive officer] from any order or direction or notice of the Grama Panchayat under sub-section (1), (2) or (3) and his decision on such appeal shall be final.

[(5A) Gram Panchayats shall strictly comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1961 in the matter of issue of building license or approvals of housing or residential layouts. Any approval in violation of any of the provisions of the Town and Country planning Act, 1961 shall be construed as "misconduct" for which the concerned officer or official shall be liable for disciplinary action.]"

21. As per Section 237 of the Act, the competent authority has the power to suspend the execution of unlawful

orders or resolutions and to direct that necessary steps be taken for the change of khata.

22. Whereas, in the present case, the Adhyaksha of the Srirangapatna Taluk Panchayat passed an order in favour of respondent No.1 directing that his khata be continued and further directed the authorities to issue a building licence and collect taxes from respondent No.1. These executive orders were challenged in the writ petitions, and ultimately the learned Single Judge, in W.P.No.44399/2017 and W.P.No.19799/2017, directed the authorities to continue the khata, receive the taxes, and issue the building licence in favour of respondent No.1.

23. Respondent No.1 had filed an application for the continuation of the khata, collection of taxes in respect of his property, and issuance of a building licence. The only ground on which the appellants, Krishnarajasagara Grama Panchayat and respondent Nos.2, 3, and 4 have been avoiding the performance of the aforesaid acts is that respondent No.1 is not the owner of the property and he has not established his ownership and that the Tahsildar had addressed a letter claiming that the State Government is the owner.

24. Insofar as the direction of the Tahsildar, Krishnarajasagar Gram Panchayat is concerned, the State has not asserted any rights over the property or made any claim contrary to the claim of respondent No.1 either in the present case or in the original suit bearing O.S.No.149/2001 or RA.No.70/2010. In fact, the learned Government Advocate also submitted that the lis is between respondent No.1, the appellants, and respondent Nos.2 to 4. A perusal of the material available on record clearly demonstrates that a Hakku Patra had been issued in favour of respondent No.1 as far as in the year 1989 by the Notified Area Committee and taxes had been collected by the said Committee, and that the Committee had granted permission to construct a compound wall and a commercial complex on 19.05.1989. However, it was only in the year 1993 that a claim in respect of the property was made by the Assistant Executive Engineer, K.R.S. Division. The said litigation ultimately ended in favour of respondent No.1 by the order dated 13.01.2012 passed in R.A.No.70/2010. The claim of the Assistant Executive Engineer, Krishnarajasagara, having been rejected and the claim of respondent No.1 having been upheld, it was for the appellants and respondent Nos.2 to 4 to

issue the necessary khata, collect the taxes, and also grant the building licence in favour of respondent No.1.

25. Respondent No.1 has been in settled position of the property. The Hakku Pathra was issued in the name of respondent No.1, Khata and tax records had existed for decades. Now, the appellants Gram Panchayat have acted contrary to the orders of Appellate Authority passed under the Karnataka Grama Swaraj and Panchayatraj Act. In fact, the appellant - Gram Panchayat relied upon the direction of the Tahsildar for cancellation of the khata. The State itself has not sought eviction of respondent No.1 through due process of law. The Gram Panchayat would not have to refuse the building licence merely on the ground of disputed title, when no competent Court had declared respondent No.1 to be a trespasser of the land in question and the competent Civil Court has protected the possession of respondent No.1 in an injunction suit.

26. In the case of **Rame Gowda (Dead) by LRs v. M. Varadappa Naidu (Dead) by LRs and Another** reported in **(2004) 1 SCC 769**, the Hon'ble Apex has held that the

occupant in "settled possession" cannot be dispossessed without due process of law.

27. In ***State of U.P. and Others v. Maharaja Dharmender Prasad Singh and Others*** reported in **(1989) 2 SCC 505**, the Hon'ble Apex Court ruled that the Government cannot arbitrarily forfeit a property lease or use extra-judicial force to take back possession without following due process of law.

28. Therefore, respondent No.1 has been in possession of the property since 1989, his possession is protected by virtue of the judgment passed in R.A.70/2010, the Notified Area Committee has issued a Hakku Pathra in his name, the Gram Panchayat was collecting taxes from respondent No.1 for several years. The fact that the Government never initiated eviction proceedings against respondent No.1 and therefore the Gram Panchayat could not have to interfere with the possession of respondent No.1, merely on the basis of the letter issued by Tahsildar, Srirangapatna. The Gram Panchayat alleged that the property belongs to the Government, but the Government never filed eviction proceedings.

29. The operative portion of the judgment passed in R.A.No.70/2010 also demonstrates that the appeal filed by respondent No.1 was allowed and the present appellants are restrained from interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. The First Appellate Court also observed that *"Further, it is ordered that the defendants are at liberty to evict the plaintiff from the suit schedule property by following due process of law."* It shows that the possession of respondent No.1 shall not be disturbed in view of the judgment passed by the First Appellate Court in R.A. No.70/2010. If the State Government has any grievance, it has a separate remedy to evict respondent No.1 by following due process of law. Therefore, viewed from any angle, the learned Single Judge has rightly directed the appellants to continue the khata of respondent No.1 and further directed them to issue building licence and collect taxes from respondent No.1. The said directions do not warrant any interference by this Court. Accordingly, we find no merit in the appeal. Hence, we pass the following:

ORDER

- i) The Writ Appeal filed by Krishnarajasagara Gram Panchayat is ***dismissed***.
- ii) C.C.C.No.545/2024 is ***closed*** with liberty to the complainant to file a fresh petition, in case, the directions issued in the order of learned Single Judge are not complied with.
- iii) The Panchayat should comply the order within four weeks.
- iv) In the facts and circumstances of the case, there will be no order as to costs.

Pending Interlocutory Applications in both the matters shall stand disposed of.

Sd/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(VENKATESH NAIK T)
JUDGE

AM/MN