



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 1188 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. M/S. SIGNPOST INDIA LIMITED
A COMPANY INCORPORATED
UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE
COMPANIES ACT, 1956,
HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT 202
PRESSMAN HOUSE,
NEAR SANTACRUZ AIRPORT
TERMINAL VILE PARLE EAST, MUMBAI,
MAHARASHTRA, INDIA-400099.

AND ITS REGIONAL OFFICE AT
NO. 18, PRITHAM PLAZA,
YELLAMAN KOIL STREET,
OFF KENSINGTON ROAD,
ULSOOR, BENGALORE -560008.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY AND
ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT
MR. RAVI REDDY.

2. MR. SHRIPAD PRAHALAD ASHTEKAR
S/O. MR. PRAHLAD ASHTEKAR,
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS,
RESIDING AT 903,

Digitally
signed by
NIRMALA
DEVI
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



STERLING SEA FACE,
ANNIE BESANT ROAD, WORLI,
MUMBAI 400018.

...COMPLAINANTS

(BY SRI. ANANT MANDGI, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. PATIL J M, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI.MAHESHWAR RAO
CHIEF COMMISSIONER
BRUHAT BENGALURU
MAHANAGARA PALIKE
BBMP HEAD OFFICE,
CORPORATION CIRCLE,
BENGALURU-560002,
2. SRI. MOUNISH MOUDGIL
SPECIAL COMMISSIONER
THE OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL
COMMISSIONER (REVENUE/
ADVERTISEMENT),
BBMP, N R SQUARE,
BANGALORE -560002.
3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE -560001,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI. B L SANJEEV, ADVOCATE FOR A1 & A2
SRI. S.H. RAGHAVENDRA, AGA FOR A3)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF
THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, BY THE
COMPLAINANT, PRAYING TO INITIATE CONTEMPT



PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ACCUSED FOR THEIR WILLFUL AND DELIBERATE DISOBEDIENCE OF THE JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 20.06.2025 PASSED BY THIS HONBLE COURT IN WP NO.26349/2024 AND PUNISH THE ACCUSED.

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 MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

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 20.06.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in Writ Petition No.26349/2024 (LB-BMP). In terms of the said order, the accused (BBMP) was directed to abide and give effect to the terms and conditions of the Joint Memorandum of Compromise entered into between the parties in Writ Petition No.17728/2021 which was also recorded by the Court. The BBMP was also directed to permit the complainants to erect and maintain advertisement hoardings/display structures at locations mutually identified in accordance with the said



compromise and in line with the terms of the Public Private Partnership Agreement executed between the parties.

2. There is a controversy as to whether spots or sites were mutually identified.

3. The accused has filed an affidavit enclosing therewith minutes of a meeting held on 21.08.2025, at which the complainant's representative was also present. The minutes of the meeting indicate that the directions issued by the Court were noted and the complainants were directed to sit with the BBMP and mutually identify the spots to erect commercial hoardings. The relevant extract of the said minutes is set out below:

Special Commissioner brought to the notice the specific para of the order of the High Court which states as "(iv) Consequently, BBMP shall permit the petitioner to erect and maintain advertisement hoardings/display structures at locations mutually identified in accordance with the said compromise, and in line with the terms of the public-private partnership agreement executed between the parties".

XXXX

The order of the Hon'ble High Court in the Writ Petition No.26349/2024 of dated 20/06/2025 is clear that the spots of advertisement shall be as mutually agreed



upon the same is also the part of agreement dated 01/03/2019 at page 29, Any erection of advertisements on footpaths also violates order dated 12/8/24 of Hon'ble High court in W.P.No.57990/2017 and Agreement.

The agency was instructed to sit with BBMP and mutually identify the spots to erect commercial hoarding and only then proceed as clearly ordered by Hon'ble High Court and enshrined in the Agreement. Erection of commercial advertisements on the footpaths is impermissible.

(emphasis supplied)

4. The accused had also produced the proceedings of the prior meetings, where the BBMP had called upon the complainants to identify any spot (other than the roads or footpaths) including on BBMP properties and properties belonging to private or government and submit a proposal. BBMP also assured that it would consider the same expeditiously and give its decision.

5. Learned counsel for the complainants submits that the hoardings are necessarily to be put up on footpaths and roads and the BBMP's insistence that the hoardings not be put up on roads and footpaths amounts to disobedience of the orders passed by this Court.



6. We are unable to readily accept the said contention. It is the settled law that no person can be punished for disobedience of any order passed by the Court unless the orders are unambiguous and clear.

7. In the present case, we do not find any specific direction permitting the complainants to put up the hoardings on roads or footpaths. On the contrary, the Court has directed that the hoardings be put up at spots as mutually agreed.

8. As noted above, there is some dispute regarding the location where the advertisements/boards can be put up.

9. In view of the above, we are not persuaded to accept that any proceedings for willful disobedience of the orders are required to be initiated.

10. The complaint is accordingly closed.

11. We, however, clarify that this will not preclude the parties from availing other remedies including seeking an appropriate clarification from the concerned Court.



HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:8368-DB
CCC No. 1188 of 2025

12. Pending IAs., if any, also stand disposed of.

Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE

ND List No.: 1 SI No.: 26