



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

REVIEW PETITION NO. 320 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

MATHA TECHNOLOGIES,
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER
AND DULY AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY,
MR. RAMAPPA RATHOD,
O/A NO. 106, MATHURA KRUPA,
1ST MAIN, 5TH CROSS, SAPTHAGIRI NAGARA,
YALAKKI SHETтар COLONY,
DHARWAD-580 004.

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI PRABHULING K. NAVADGI, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI SANJEEVINI PRABHULING NAVADGI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION,
6TH FLOOR, M.S.BUILDING,
DR. ABEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU -560001.

2. THE COMMISSIONER
DEPARTMENT OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION,
GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA,
TANTRIKA SHIKSHANA BHAVANA,
PALACE ROAD, BENGALURU – 560001.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI KIRAN V. RON, AAG FOR
SRI MAHAMMED JAFAR SHAH, AGA)

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 114 READ
WITH ORDER 47 RULE 1 OF CPC, PRAYING TO REVIEW THE ORDER
DATED 25.04.2026 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN WP
NO.12143/2026 AND GRANT RELIEF AS SOUGHT FOR IN WP NO.
12143/2026.

Digitally signed
by
MOHAN KUMAR
B SHELAR
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



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

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)

The captioned review petition is filed seeking review of the order passed by this Court in W.P.Nos.121-143/2025 and connected W.P.Nos.121-145/2025.

2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the review petitioner, taking this Court through the judgment sought to be reviewed, would contend that the writ petitions came to be dismissed on the premise that the contract in question was for a fixed tenure of five years and that the contractual period had expired by efflux of time. He would submit that this Court has proceeded on an erroneous understanding of the terms of the contract and, therefore, the judgment warrants review.

3. Per contra, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondent-State would vehemently oppose the review petition. He would submit that the writ petitions were not dismissed merely on the ground that the contractual period had expired. Inviting the attention of this Court to the



judgment under review, he would contend that every contention advanced by the petitioner was considered in detail and the findings recorded are based on an exhaustive examination of the contractual clauses as well as the governing statutory framework. He would therefore submit that, under the guise of a review, the petitioner is seeking a rehearing on merits, which is impermissible in law.

4. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on carefully perusing the judgment sought to be reviewed, this Court finds no merit in the review petition. A plain reading of the judgment would indicate that this Court had formulated as many as six points for consideration and has independently dealt with each of them by assigning detailed and cogent reasons. While one of the grounds for dismissal was founded on Clause 9 of the agreement, the judgment is by no means rested solely on the expiry of the contractual tenure. This Court has also undertaken an elaborate examination of the relevant contractual stipulations, the circular issued by the Finance Department mandating compliance with the prescribed procurement procedure, including submission of the Letter of



Intent through the e-procurement portal, and the statutory scheme governing public procurement.

5. This Court had further recorded a categorical finding that the award and execution of the contracts suffered from procedural irregularities, particularly in the manner in which the tendered work came to be split between two entities, contrary to the scheme and object of the Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurements Act, 1999. These findings were arrived at after an elaborate consideration of the pleadings, contractual terms and the applicable legal framework.

6. The grounds urged in the present review petition, on a careful examination, do not disclose any error apparent on the face of the record. The review petitioner seeks to persuade this Court to take a different view on issues that have already been extensively considered and conclusively adjudicated. Such an exercise would necessarily amount to a rehearing of the writ petitions on merits, which is wholly outside the limited jurisdiction of this Court under Order XLVII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. The power of review is not an



appellate power and cannot be invoked merely because another view is possible or because the petitioner seeks reconsideration of findings already rendered. Unless there exists a manifest error apparent on the face of the record or any other ground recognized under Order XLVII Rule 1 CPC, the judgment cannot be reopened in review.

7. Since the review petitioner has failed to demonstrate any error apparent on the face of the record or any other ground warranting exercise of the limited review jurisdiction, this Court finds no justification to interfere with the judgment sought to be reviewed. The review petition, being devoid of merit, is accordingly ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE

CA
CT:GSM
List No.: 19 Sl No.: 1