



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 19565 OF 2026 (GM-KSR)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. GAYATHRI KULKARNI
W/O GIRIPRASAD KULKARNI
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
ADVOCATE: ENROLLMENT NO.2515/99
THE HARIHARA ADVOCATE'S ASSOCIATION (R)
MEMBER, COURT COMPLEX, HARIHARA,
DAVANGERE DIST - 577 601.
2. SMT. ROOPA KALAL
D/O SHANKARAPAP
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
ADVOCATE: ENROLLMENT NO.711/2019
THE HARIHARA ADVOCATE'S ASSOCIATION (R)
MEMBER, COURT COMPLEX, HARIHARA,
DAVANGERE DIST - 577 601.
3. SMT. LOHITHA V
W/O H.V. CHANDRASHEKAR
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
ADVOCATE: ENROLLMENT NO.2305/2000
THE HARIHARA ADVOCATE'S ASSOCIATION(R)
MEMBER COURT COMPLEX, HARIHARA,
DAVANGERE DIST - 577 601.
4. SMT. BHAGEERATHI G.H
W/O SIDDALINGASWAMY

Digitally signed
by SHWETHA
RAGHAVENDRA
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
ADVOCATE: ENROLLMENT NO.2108/2013
THE HARIHARA ADVOCATE'S ASSOCIATION(R)
MEMBER, COURT COMPLEX, HARIHARA,
DAVANGERE DIST - 577 601.

5. SMT. VANAJAKSHI PATIL
W/O GANGADHARAPPA N.B,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
ADVOCATE ENROLLMENT NO.KAR/688/2021
THE HARIHARA ADVOCATE'S ASSOCIATION (R)
MEMBER, COURT COMPLEX, HARIHARA,
DAVANGERE DIST - 577 601.

6. MRS. FARAHAN KHANUM N
W/O KHALANDER KHAN
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,
ADVOCATE ENROLLMENT NO.3361/2021
THE HARIHARA ADVOCATE'S ASSOCIATION (R)
MEMBER, COURT COMPLEX, HARIHARA,
DAVANGERE DIST - 577 601.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. K. GURUDHATTA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE KARNATAKA STATE BAR COUNCIL
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
OLD ELECTION COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
CUBBON PARK, BANGALORE - 560 001.
2. THE HARIHARA ADVOCATES ASSOCIATION(R)
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY/PRESIDENT
COURT COMPLEX, HARIHARA
DAVANGERE DISTRICT - 577 601.



3. D.M. SWAMINATHAN
ADVOCATE, RETURNING OFFICER
THE HARIHARA ADVOCATE'S ASSOCIATION(R)
MEMBER, COURT COMPLEX, HARIHARA,
DAVANGERE DIST - 577 601.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SWAMY SHIVA PRAKASH H, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE ELECTION NOTIFICATION/CALENDAR OF EVENTS DATED 16.06.2026 ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT VIDE ANNEXURE-A 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. Sri. G. Nataraj, learned counsel accepts notice for respondent No.1. Sri. Swamy Shiva Prakash H., learned counsel accepts notice for respondent No.2.
2. Notice to respondent No.3 is dispensed with in view of the proposed order to be passed.
3. Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:



- a. *Issue a writ in the nature of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, quashing the election notification/calendar of events dated 16.06.2026 issued by the 3rd respondent vide Annexure-A;*
- b. *Direct the respondents to comply with the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 1494/2025 by providing appropriate reservation for women, including exclusive reservation for the post of Treasurer and 30% for executive committee members, before conducting any election;*
- c. *Issue a writ of mandamus or appropriate 1st and 2nd writ/order/direction, directing the Respondents to consider and decide the Petitioner's representations dated 17.06.2026 and 25.06.2026, vide Annexure C and D*
- d. *Pass any other order or direction that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the case.*

4. The petitioners claim to be practising women advocates at Harihara and members of the Harihara Advocates' Association. Respondent No.2 is a Society registered under the Karnataka Societies Registration Act, 1960, and is the association of advocates practising at Harihara.
5. Contending that the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP No.1494/2025 have not been complied with, inasmuch as appropriate reservation for women has not been provided, the petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of the election notification/calendar of events dated



16.06.2026 issued by respondent No.3, the Returning Officer.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has directed that 30% reservation be provided for women. According to him, such reservation is required to extend to all elective posts as well as the Executive Committee. It is contended that reservation having been provided only to the post of treasurer and in respect of the Executive Committee does not satisfy the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.
7. Respondent No.2 entered appearance even before issuance of notice and filed a statement of objections contending that, as the elections were scheduled to be held on Sunday, 05.07.2026, the present petition has been filed belatedly with the sole intention of stalling the election process. Along with the statement of objections, certain documents have also been produced.
8. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 places reliance upon the minutes of the meeting dated 10.07.2025 of the Association, wherein the office-bearers and Executive Committee members unanimously resolved to comply with the directions issued by the Hon'ble



Supreme Court in SLP (C) No.1404/2025 by reserving the post of Treasurer for a woman candidate and providing 30% reservation for women in the Executive Committee.

9. It is further submitted that, in pursuance of the said resolution dated 10.07.2025, the calendar of events dated 16.06.2026 was issued. The said calendar of events clearly indicates that the post of Treasurer has been reserved for a woman candidate and that, out of the 11 posts of Executive Committee Members, three posts have been reserved for women.
10. It is further submitted that petitioner No.3 had initially filed her nomination for contesting for the post of Vice-President, petitioner No.4 was the sole contestant for the post of Treasurer, and petitioner Nos.2 and 5 had initially filed nomination for the posts of Executive Committee Members.
11. On the aforesaid basis, it is contended that the petitioners have voluntarily participated in the election process, filed their nominations, and their nominations had been accepted. Therefore, it is submitted that the writ petition deserves to be dismissed by recording the compliance made by



respondent No.2 with the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

12. The fact that the resolution dated 10.07.2025 was passed accepting and implementing the directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, as also the issuance of the calendar of events dated 16.06.2026, is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners. His only contention is that the number of seats reserved for women in the Executive Committee does not amount to 30%, inasmuch as, there being 11 Executive Committee Members, 30% would work out to approximately four seats.
13. I am unable to accept the said contention. Thirty per cent of 11 works out to 3.3. The respondents have reserved three seats for women, which substantially complies with the requirement of 30% reservation. In the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any infirmity in the action taken by respondent No.2. Accordingly, the writ petition deserves to be **disposed of.**
14. Subsequently, during the post-lunch session, the matter was mentioned by learned counsel for the petitioners. It was submitted that the existing Managing Committee had informed the petitioners



that amendments to the Rules and Regulations of the Association were proposed, and that, acting upon such representation, some of the petitioners had withdrawn their nominations.

15. This Court is unable to accept the said submission. Once the election process has commenced and the election machinery has been set in motion, the question of convening an Annual General Meeting or any other meeting for the purpose of amending the Rules and Regulations does not arise. In any event, the said contention does not furnish any ground warranting interference by this Court.

Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE