



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO.924 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. SRI K.R. NATARAJA
S/O. LATE K.N. RANGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
R/AT H.NO.16, 10/1B,
4TH B CROSS ROAD,
PUTTENAHALLI MAIN ROAD,
6TH PHASE, J.P.NAGARA,
BANGALORE - 560 078.
2. SRI. MAHESH,
S/O. LATE CHANNANJIAH,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
R/AT UYYAMBALLI VILLAGE,
HALAHALLI POST,
KANAKAPURA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562126.

...COMPLAINANTS

(BY SMT. KUSUMA M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSE AND URBAN,
M.S. BUILDING, BANGALORE-560001.

...PRO FORMA RESPONDENT

Digitally signed
by C K LATHA
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



2. SRI. MAJOR MANIVANNAN .P
COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
KUMARAPARK WEST,
BANGALORE - 560020.

...ACCUSED

(BY SMT. B. SUKANYA BALIGA, ADDITIONAL GOVERNMENT
ADVOCATE FOR PRO FORMA RESPONDENT NO.1;
SRI B.S.SACHIN, ADVOCATE FOR ACCUSED NO. 2)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 215 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA R/W SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE
CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, PRAYING TO TAKE COGNIZANCE OF
THE CONTEMPT OF COURT FOR THE DISOBEDIENCE OF THE
ORDERS DATED 14.11.2022 PASSED IN W.P.NO.21177/2022 (BDA)
READ WITH ORDER DATED 05.11.2024 IN CCC NO.1074/2024
(CIVIL) AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The complainants have filed the present complaint alleging
willful disobedience of the order dated 14.11.2022 passed by the
learned Single Judge in Writ Petition No. 21177/2022 (BDA). The
learned Single Judge had disposed of the said petition by reserving



liberty in favour of the complainants to take recourse to such remedies as available in law, including filing an application under Section 38-D of the Bangalore Development Authority Act, 1976 [BDA Act] along with all relevant documents. The court had also clarified that it had not expressed any opinion on the merits/demerits of the rival contentions. However, the court directed that if an application is filed by the complainants along with relevant documents, the BDA would address the grievance and pass appropriate orders.

2. Pursuant to the liberty granted by the court, the complainants have filed an application under Section 38-D of the BDA Act. Earlier the complainants had initiated contempt proceedings on the ground that the accused had failed to take decision on the said application. Since no time frame had been stipulated in the Writ Petition, the contempt proceedings came to be disposed of with a direction to the accused to consider and decide the application within six weeks. The accused has not taken any decision on the said application. In the aforesaid backdrop, the complainants have filed the present complaint.



3. The accused has now filed a memo enclosing therewith an endorsement issued on 24.02.2026 rejecting the complainants application under Section 38-D of the BDA Act.

4. In view of the above, the present complaint is closed. However, we clarify that this would not preclude the complainants from availing of substantive remedies in regard to their grievance, including the endorsement dated 24.02.2026, *albeit* in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(K.S. HEMALEKHA)
JUDGE