



CNR: KAHC010529832026

NC: 2026:KHC:40338
WP No. 23792 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 23792 OF 2026 (LB-BMP)

BETWEEN:

A. VENUGOPAL REDDY
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
S/O LATE A. NARASAREDDY,
RESIDING AT NO. 143,
SHANESHWARA LAYOUT,
ANDRAHALLI, V.N. POST,
BENGALURU-560091.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. R.S. RAVI., SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. HARSHA KUMAR GOWDA H.R.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. CHIEF COMMISSIONER
BRUHAT BENGALURU
MAHANAGARA PALIKE
BENGALURU-560001.
2. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
HEROHALLI SUB-DIVISION,
BRUHAT BENGALURU
MAHANAGARA PALIKE (BBMP)
B.E.L LAYOUT, 1 STAGE,
RAJARAJESHWARI NAGARA ZONE,
BENGALURU-560091.

Digitally
signed by
VANAMALA N
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



NC: 2026:KHC:40338
WP No. 23792 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010529832026

3. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
BBMP HEROHALLI SUB-DIVISION,
WARD NO.72, BENGALURU-560091.
4. MR. R. JANARDHANIAH,
AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS,
S/O LATE MR. RAGHAVAPPA
RESIDING AT SITE
NO. 57B,KATHA NO. 164,
HEROHALLI GRAMA,
YESHWANTHPURA HOBLI,
BENGALURU-560091.
5. MR. J.MOHANKUMAR
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
S/O R. JANARDHANIAH AND
LATE BHAGYALAKSHMI,
RESIDING AT SITE NO.2,
13TH MAIN ROAD, J.C.NAGAR,
MAHALAKSHMIPURA POST,
BENGALURU-560086.
6. MRS. J. NETHRAVATHI, A
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
D/O R.JANARDHANIAH AND
LATE BHAGYALAKSHMI,
RESIDING AT SITE NO.2,
13TH MAIN ROAD, J.C.NAGAR,
MAHALAKSHMIPURA POST,
BENGALURU-560086.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.PAWAN KUMAR., ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R3)



CNR: KAHC010529832026

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 05.11.2024 PASSED BY THE R-2 BEARING NO. SA.KA.AA/ HE.U.V/ RA.RA.NA.VA/ C.O/ 11/ 24-25 AT ANNEX-H; DIRECT THE R-1 TO CONSIDER THE APPEAL DATED 24.07.2026 FILED BY THE PETITIONER PRODUCED AT ANNEX-K.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner asserts ownership of a residential property bearing No.164, Assessment/Sy. No.164 having 'B' Katha No.7108 of Herohalli Village, Yeshwanthpura Hobli, Bengaluru North Taluk, Bengaluru [*the subject property*]. The petitioner is served with a copy of the Confirmation Order in No.11/2024-25 dated 05.11.2024 under Section 248(3) of the Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike Act, 2020 [for short, '*the BBMP Act*'] for demolition on the allegation that the petitioner has constructed a



CNR: KAHC010529832026

residential building without a Sanctioned Plan. The petitioner has filed an appeal against this Order under Section 253 of the BBMP Act, and this appeal is yet to be numbered. The petitioner, notwithstanding the appeal filed, seeks this Court's interference with the afore Confirmation Order dated 05.11.2024.

2. Sri R S Ravi, the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, argues for interference, asserting the following.

[A] The fourth respondent, who does not own any property adjacent to the petitioner's property, has perpetually filed a complaint resulting in initiation of the proceedings under Section 248 of the BBMP Act.

[B] The petitioner is not served with the Provisional Order or the impugned Confirmation Order dated 05.11.2024.



CNR: KAHC010529832026

[C] The petitioner was not aware of the proceedings until the Greater Bengaluru Authority officials visited the petitioner's property on 09.07.2026 stating that they were acting in terms of this Court's Order dated 09.04.2026 in the writ petition in W.P. No.9668/2025 and that there would be demolition.

[D] The petitioner has filed an application under the Right to Information Act, 2005 and the petitioner is only issued with a copy of the provisional order and the notice that is relevant to the property in No.57/B, West Herohalli, Bengaluru within BBMP Ward No. 29. The petitioner has no interest in this property which is different from the petitioner's property, and in fact, it is addressed to the fourth respondent who



CNR: KAHC010529832026

cannot have a locus not being the adjacent owner of the petitioner's property.

3. Sri R S Ravi submits that the petitioner though arrayed as a respondent [*the fourth respondent in the writ petition in W.P. No.9668/2025*], he is not served and therefore an application is filed for recall of the order, and the learned Senior Counsel also submits that if this Court does not intervene to prevent demolition, the petitioner's appeal as against the Confirmation Order would be rendered nugatory. Sri Pawan Kumar, a learned standing counsel for the first to third respondents who accepts notice for these respondents, is heard for disposal of the petition dispensing notice to the fourth to sixth respondents [*the petitioners in the writ petition in W.P. No.9668/2025*].

4. The petitioner is shown as served and unrepresented in the writ petition in W.P.



CNR: KAHC010529832026

No.9668/2025, but the question of condonation of delay and the question relating to the petitioner's grievance with the initiation and culmination of the proceedings under Section 248 of the BBMP Act will have to be examined, and in the meantime, if there is precipitation for demolition, the appellate remedy available to the petitioner under Section 250 of the GBG Act will be of no consequence.

5. Sri R S Ravi is categorical in stating that the construction is completed many years back and occupied by persons [*the tenants*] claiming under the petitioner. On a comprehensive examination of these circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that there must be interference to ensure there is no precipitous action during the pendency of the appeal that the petitioner may file and subject to any interim orders that could be in the appeal. Hence, the following.



CNR: KAHC010529832026

ORDER

[A] The petition stands disposed of calling upon the Greater Bengaluru Authority and its Officers not to take any precipitous action unless the petitioner's appeal is decided or there is an interim order after due opportunity to the petitioner in such appeal.

[B] It is needless to observe that this Court has not examined the merits of the petitioner's grievance with the Confirmation Order as all questions relating thereto must be examined in the appeal.

Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

AN/-