



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S SUNIL DUTT YADAV

WRIT PETITION NO. 16552 OF 2025 (BDA)

BETWEEN:

SRI. PREMASAGAR GOWDA
S/O N. SRIKANTA,
AGED 25 YEARS,
R/AT NO. 25/2, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
1ST A-CROSS, MALLATHAHALLI LAKE,
SMV LAYOUT, 9TH BLOCK,
BENGALURU - 560 056.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M.B.CHANDRA CHOODA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
DEPT. OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
T. CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
KUMARAPARK WEST,
BENGALURU - 560 020,
REP BY ITS COMMISSIONER.
3. THE REVENUE OFFICER,
NORTH DIVISION, BDA,
BENGALURU - 560 032.



4. CANARA BANK,
ARM BRANCH-1, NO. 88,
M. G. ROAD, BENGALURU - 560 001,
REP BY ITS MANAGER.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. SAVITHRAMMA, AGA FOR R1;
SRI. AJAY KUMAR M., ADV. FOR R2 AND R3;
SRI. VIGNESH SHETTY, ADV. FOR R4)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER BEARING NO.BDA/REVENUE(N)/20/2025-26 DATED 29/05/25 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 VIDE ANNEXURE-N, BY WAY OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI, IN SO FAR IT RELATES TO RESIDENTIAL SITE BEARING NO.91, HAVING PID NO.6000020091 COMPRISED IN RESIDENTIALLY CONVERTED LAND PROPERTY BEARING SY.NO.62/P1 MEASURING 1 ACRES 20 GUNTAS SITUATED AT LAKE MIST LAYOUT, JARAKBANDEKAVAL VILLAGE, YELAHANKA HOBLI, BENGALURU NORTH TALUK, BENGALURU DISTRICT AND ETC.,

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

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



ORAL ORDER

W.P.No.16552/2025 is de-linked from the connected matters and ordered separately.

2. The petitioner has sought for setting aside of the order passed by respondent No.3 at Annexure-N, whereby katha standing in the name of the petitioner was cancelled. Various contentions have been raised in the present petition regarding the correctness of the action of the Bangalore Development Authority (BDA) in cancelling katha standing in the name of the petitioner.

3. It is noticed that during the pendency of the proceedings, the katha is stated to have been restored in the name of the petitioner. Such assertion by the impleading applicant is not controverted. The impleading applicant has filed a memo and produced the proceedings of the BDA which would indicate that the cancellation of katha in the name of the petitioner has been restored.



4. Taking note that the endorsement at Annexure-N in effect does not survive, the legal grievance of the petitioner stands restored and the petition is disposed of as not calling for adjudication.

5. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that by virtue of Annexure-N certain rights have been created in favour of the bank and subsequent developments have taken place including issuance of sale certificate which has prejudiced the petitioner.

6. The petitioner's grievance is regards certain actions in the interregnum between Annexure-N and the restoration of katha. It is open for the petitioner to take legal recourse available as regards such action, if aggrieved. All contentions in that regard are kept open.

7. Learned counsel for the impleading applicant submits that certain rights have flowed to the impleading applicant. That however cannot be a subject matter of adjudication in the present petition, in light of the



subsequent events. All legal contentions of the impleading applicant as well are kept open to be raised appropriately.

8. The impleading application is disposed of, as not calling for further adjudication as the contentions have been noticed above.

Accordingly, petition is ***disposed of***.

**Sd/-
(S SUNIL DUTT YADAV)
JUDGE**

MCR