NC: 2024:KHC-D:9350
WP No. 60831 of 2011

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, DHARWAD BENCH

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF JULY, 2024

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.G.S. KAMAL

WRIT PETITION NO.60831 OF 2011(S-DIS)

BETWEEN:

R. CHAMAPPA S/O. T.R. RANGANAIK,
AGE: 60 YEARS, OCCUP: RETD SECOND DIVISION ASSISTANT, HUBLI-DHARWAD, MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, HUBBALLI.

…PETITIONER

(BY SRI ANANT P. SAVADI, ADVOCATE – ABSENT)

AND:

1. THE COMMISSIONER, HUBLI-DHARWAD MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, HUBBALLI – 580 020.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA, BY ITS SECERTARY TO GOVT., URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPATMENT, VIKAS SOUDHA, BANGALORE – 560 001.

3. ADDITIONAL REGISTRAR, ENQUIRIES-1, KARNATAKA LOKAYUKTA, BANGALORE.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI R.H.ANGADI, ADVOCATE FOR R1;
SRI ANIL KALE, ADVOCATE FOR R3;
SRI P.N.HATTI, HCGP FOR R2)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER KIND OF WRIT OR WRIT TO QUASH THE ORDER NO.HDMC 22 GAE 98 DATED:30/08/2010 PASSED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT, THE COPY OF WHICH IS PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A, BY ALSO QUASHING THE ENQUIRY REPORT OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT DATED:12/09/2005 AND NO LOK/ARE-1/ENQ-60/2022-23 IN ANNEXURE-G AND ETC.,

Digitally signed by V N BADIGER
Location: High Court of Karnataka

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING - B GROUP, THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER

1. On 28.05.2024 after hearing the respective counsel appearing for the parties, this Court had directed the learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 & 3 to secure the records relating to the enquiry of the petitioner.

2. Matter was thereafter listed on 05.06.2024, 12.06.2024, and on 25.06.2024, on all these dates, learned counsel for the petitioner has remained absent. There has been no representation.

3. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 & 3 on the order hand has secured the records, as directed by this Court. On 25.06.2024 taking note of the continuous absence of the learned counsel of the petitioner, this Court had directed that the matter to be listed today with a specific direction that, if there was no representation, appropriate orders, including dismissal of the petition for non-prosecution would be passed.

4. Even today also there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. The matter is pending since 2011 and it is clear that the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting this matter. Accordingly, petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

SD/-
JUDGE

VNP*/CT-ASC
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 8