



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 18783 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. ABHISHEK
S/O. JAGADEESH,
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS
LAKSHMI TYRES AND ALIGNMENT,
SRI VISHWAKARMA SEVA TRUST BUILDING,
LEFT SIDE OF B.M.ROAD,
WARD NO.4, NEAR THEJASVI THEATER,
SRINIVAS SAWMIL,
SAKALESH PURA TOWN,
SAKALESH PURA - 573 134.
HASSAN DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SRINIVAS A.R, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed
by SHWETHA
RAGHAVENDRA

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

AND:

SRI. VISHWAKARMA SEVA TRUST BUILDING
LEFT SIDE OF B.M.ROAD,
WARD NO.4, NEAR THEJASVI THEATER,
SRINIVAS SAWMIL, SAKALESH PURA TOWN,
SAKALESH PURA - 573 134.
HASSAN DISTRICT.

(i) REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRESIDENT SRI. HARISHACHAR,
S/O. LATE MADAVACHAR,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,



(ii) SECRETARY
SRI. DINESH,
S/O. SRINIVASACHAR,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS.

...RESPONDENT

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION, QUASHING THE LOK ADALAT ORDER DATED 13/09/2025 PASSED IN O.S. NO.59/2023 ON THE FILE OF THE SENIOR CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC, SAKALESHPUR, AS PER ANNEXURE-A, B AND C AS NULL AND VOID AND NON-EST IN THE EYES OF LAW, HAVING BEEN OBTAINED BY FRAUD AND COLLUSION AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

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

- a) *Issue a Writ of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, quashing the Lok Adalat order dated 13/09/2025 passed in O.S. No.59/2023 on the file of the Senior Civil Judge & JMFC, Sakaleshpur, as per Annexure 'A' 'B' & 'C' as null and void and non-est in the eyes of law, having been obtained by fraud and collusion.*
- b) *Issue appropriate writ to restore O.S. No.59/2023 on the file of the Senior Civil Judge & JMFC,*



Sakaleshpur, to its original file and proceed to adjudicate the suit in accordance with law;

c) Grant costs of the present proceedings in favour of the Petitioner;

d) Pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit, proper and expedient in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice and equity.

2. The respondent had filed a suit in O.S.No.59/2023 for eviction of the petitioner from the scheduled property as also certain other ancillary deeds. The parties having represented that if the matter is referred to mediation, the dispute is likely to be settled. The trial Court, considering that there is an element of settlement vide order dated 24.07.2025, referred the matter to mediation.
3. Subsequently, the parties requested for the matter to be referred to the Lok-Adalat, which was so referred vide order dated 12.09.2025. Before the Lok-Adalat, both parties appeared and filed a compromise petition. The said compromise petition was read over to the parties. They had categorically indicated that they voluntarily accepted the compromise, and it is on that basis that the compromise was accepted by the Lok-Adalat.



4. A perusal of the order sheet indicates that the petitioner has signed the said order sheet and also has been identified by his counsel. Similarly, the representative of the respondent was also been identified by his counsel, and he has signed the order sheet. The compromise petition, which has been filed, has also been signed by the petitioner identified by his counsel.
5. In furtherance of the said compromise, a decree was also drawn up. These are now being challenged by the petitioner on the ground that there was a misrepresentation by the respondent. The respondent had indicated that the respondent, in its meeting, would consider the extension of the tenancy of the petitioner, which has not been considered, and it is in that background, on account of the alleged misrepresentation that the petitioner had executed the compromise petition.
6. There being no dispute as regards the execution of the compromise petition and the acceptance thereof, the only issue being related to misrepresentation. The terms of the compromise petition being clear, the petitioner cannot now, after executing the compromise petition in the year 2025, challenge the



same on the ground that there was a misrepresentation.

7. If at all any of the representations on the part of the respondent have not been adhered to, it would always be available for the petitioner to agitate the same in an appropriate forum.
8. Reserving such liberty, petition stands **disposed**.

Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

GJM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 9