



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 20TH 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. 1226 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. BHAGYAVATI
W/O LATE B R CHANDRASHEKAR,
AGED ABOUT 72 YEARS,
2. GIRISH M.C
S/O LATE B.R. CHANDRASHEKAR,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,

BOTH ARE RESIDING AT MAGALU,
MAVINAKERE VILLAGE,
KALASA HOBLI, KALASA TALUK,
CHIKMAGALUR DISTRICT 577124

Digitally
signed by
NIRMALA
DEVI

Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

(BY SRI. K.SHRIHARI, ADVOCATE)

...COMPLAINANTS

AND:

1. SMT.MEENA NAGARAJ C N
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
OFFICE OF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
CHICKAMAGALUR DISTRICT - 577 101
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY



TO REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
VIKAS SOUDHA,
DR.AMBEDKARVEEDHI,
BENGALURU 560 001.

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI.S.H. RAGHAVENDRA, AGA)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT R/W ARTICLE 215 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, BY THE COMPLAINANT, PRAYING TO PASS AN APPROPRIATE ORDER PUNISHING ACCUSED FOR WILLFUL AND DELIBERATE DISOBEDIENCE OF THE ORDER DATED 23.06.2025 PASSED BY THE SINGLE BENCH OF THIS HONBLE COURT IN WP NO.5477/2025, FILED HERewith AS ANNEXURE-A.

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 wilful disobedience of the order dated 23.06.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in Writ Petition No.5477/2025 (KLR-RR/SUR). In terms of the said order, the Deputy Commissioner and the Tahsildar were directed to consider the complainants representations expeditiously.



2. Complainant No.1 claims that her husband was the owner of the parcel of land. She asserted that he was an ex-serviceman and the subject land was granted to him on 30.09.1984. He expired on 08.05.2023.

3. An affidavit of compliance has been filed enclosing therewith a copy of the order dated 07.11.2025, whereby the grant of the land in question has been cancelled as it was found that it was within the Mavinakere - Talagodu Reserve Block, which was declared as a Forest land in terms of the Government Order dated 06.03.1928. Thus, it could not be diverted.

4. Learned counsel for the complainants submits that since an order was passed directing for consideration of the representations, whether rightly or wrongly, the accused are required to implement it and could not question the grant in favor of the complainant No.1's husband. He submitted that the order was based on the assumption that the said grant was valid and no contentions were advanced to question the grant in the writ petition. He submits that the accused are now precluded from questioning the same. He also referred to the decision of the



Supreme Court in the case of ***Prestige Lights Ltd., v. State Bank of India***¹.

5. We find no merit in the aforesaid contentions. The order, the disobedience of which is alleged, merely required the concerned authorities to consider the complainants representations. The said representations were premised on the basis that there was a valid grant. The grant of the subject land which formed the basis of the representations, has been cancelled. Therefore, there is no question of taking any further steps.

6. We are unable to accept that any proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 are required to be initiated.

7. The decision rendered by the Supreme Court in ***Prestige Lights Ltd., (supra)*** has no application whatsoever in the context of the given facts. The said judgment related to a case relating to Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security Interest Act, 2002 [SARFAESI Act]. In the facts of the said case, the Court had observed that the writ

¹ (2007) 8 SCC 449



Court would need to bear in mind the conduct of the party invoking the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The said observations have no application in this case.

8. In view of the above, the complaint is closed.

9. However, we clarify that nothing stated in this order shall preclude the complainants from availing substantive remedies, if any, in respect of the endorsement dated 07.11.2025 or any other order relating to the cancellation of the subject land.

Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE

ND
List No.: 1 SI No.: 13