**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 11310 OF 2026 (GM-RES)**

**BETWEEN:**

SRI. V. RAVI KUMAR
S/O LATE G.K. VEERABHADRAPPA.
AGED ABOUT-42 YEARS,
ADVOCATE, ENROLLMENT NO. KAR/3176/2010.
"SURYA LAW CHAMBER", NO. 51
OPP. MANDI MOHALLA POLICE STATION
K.T. STREET, MYSURU - 570 021.

…PETITIONER

(BY SRI. BHASKAR C.R, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY
WHO IS ALSO THE CHAIRMAN
MYSURU PALACE BOARD
OFFICE AT - VIDHANA SOUDHA
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU - 560 001.

2. THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF KANNADA AND CULTURE
ROOM NO.3, GROUND FLOOR
VIKASA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE - 560 001.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ADITYA DIWAKAR, AGA)

Digitally signed by SHARADAVANI B
Location: High Court of Karnataka

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO-DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS TO CONSIDER AND DISPOSE OF THE PETITIONERS FINAL NOTICE DATED 21.02.2025 (ANNEXURE-A) ALONG WITH ITS ENCLOSURES (ANNEXURES A-1 TO A-13) WITHIN A TIME FRAME TO BE FIXED BY THIS HONBLE COURT.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

**ORAL ORDER**

This petition is filed seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus against the respondents, alleging their continued inaction and intentionally ignoring 13 complaints of corruption within the Mysore Palace Board.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the State.

3. At the outset, learned AGA raises a preliminary objection as to the maintainability of the present writ petition, contending that the reliefs sought are not founded on any personal or individual legal injury suffered by the petitioner, but are in the nature of issues concerning alleged irregularities and

corruption in the functioning of the Mysore Palace Board, which squarely fall within the domain of public interest litigation.

4. Having given anxious consideration to the rival submissions and on perusal of the pleadings and material placed on record, this Court finds considerable force in the preliminary objection. The contours of jurisdiction under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India are well delineated. A writ petition at the instance of an individual is ordinarily maintainable when the petitioner demonstrates infringement of a legally enforceable right or a personal legal injury. The jurisdiction is essentially remedial and is invoked to redress a specific grievance personal to the litigant.

5. In contradistinction, when the reliefs sought transcend individual rights and are directed towards addressing issues affecting the public at large, such proceedings partake the character of a public interest litigation. In such cases, the procedural and substantive safeguards governing public interest litigation are required to be strictly adhered to, including bona fides of the petitioner, absence of personal

interest, and compliance with the rules framed for entertaining PILs.

6. In the present case, even if the averments made in the writ petition are accepted at their face value, the grievance articulated by the petitioner pertains to alleged corruption and maladministration in a statutory body, namely the Mysore Palace Board. The petitioner has not demonstrated any direct or personal legal injury, nor is there any assertion of violation of a specific legal right vested in the petitioner. The reliefs sought are general in nature and intended to subserve a larger public cause. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the present writ petition, though styled as an individual writ petition, is in substance a public interest litigation.

7. This Court cannot permit the well-settled procedural safeguards governing public interest litigation to be bypassed by camouflaging such proceedings as an ordinary writ petition. Entertaining such petitions in the present form would dilute the discipline required in PIL jurisdiction and open floodgates for unregulated litigation.

8. In that view of the matter, the writ petition is held to be not maintainable in its present form. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedy in accordance with law, including by initiating proceedings in the nature of a public interest litigation before the competent forum, subject to compliance with the governing rules and requirements.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***disposed of***.

**Sd/-**
**(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)**
**JUDGE**

HDK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 23