HC-KAR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 38382 OF 2025 (GM-KSR)

BETWEEN:

SRI NARASIMHA RAJU,
AGED 68 YEARS
SON OF NARASAPPA
RESIDING AT NO.69,
2ND MAIN ROAD,
CHIKKALASANDRA
BENGALURU-560 061

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VIVEK SUBBA REDDY, SENIOR ADVOCATE
FOR SRI. G R MOHAN., ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by VANAMALA N
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
   BY REGISTRAR OF SOCIETIES
   NO.01, ALI ASKAR ROAD
   BENGALURU-560 001

2. THE DISTRICT REGISTRAR
OFFICE OF DISTRICT
REGISTRAR OF SOCIETIES ZONE-4
SAHAKARA SOUDHA, 3RD FLOOR
8TH CROSS MALLESWARAM
BENGALURU-560 003

3. THE DEPUTY REGISTRAR
OFFICE OF DISTRICT REGISTRAR OF SOCIETIES
ZONE-4 SAHAKARA SOUDHA,
3RD FLOOR 8TH CROSS
MALLESWARAM
BENGALURU-560 003

4. KARNATAKA FILM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
CRESCENT ROAD
BENGALURU-560 001
BY ITS PRESIDENT

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B. RAVINDRANATH, AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE 1ST RESPONDENT TO CONSIDER HIS REPRESENTATION DATED 03-11-2025 AS PER ANNEXURE-J AND 3RD RESPONDENT TO INITIATE APPROPRIATE PROCEEDINGS AS PER THE REQUEST MADE BY THE PETITIONER DATED 28-10-2025 AS PER ANNEXURE -G.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner, a member of the fourth respondent [*the Karnataka Film Chamber of Commerce*] seeks the following relief with a request for interim order directing the first and the third respondents to postpone the elections scheduled to be held on 31.01.2026.

> "*Issue a Writ of Mandamus or directions to the 1st Respondent to consider his representation dated 03.11.2025 as per Annexure 'J' and 3rd Respondent to initiate appropriate proceedings as per the request made by the Petitioner dated 28.10.2025 as per Annexure 'G'.*

The petitioner has filed his representation which reads as under:

> *"1 - The competent authority had passed a status co order against the illegal suspension order passed by the respondent against the petitioner, the competent authority had passed*

the status co order after hearing, letter dtd 25/11/2025.

2 - The respondent has ignored the status co order of the authority and issued the show cause notice of expulsion to the petitioner dtd 24/3/2025 and called for explanation on 30/10/2025 (letter dtd 8/10/2025) at the office of the respondents (time not mentioned in the letter) by violating the law and taking law into their own hands and committed a punishable crime.

3 - The respondents have not objected the status co order which was passed by the authority and not submitted an application for vacating the status co order before initiating any action against the petitioner.

4 - The term of the management committee was over in the month of June as per the bye-law of Karnataka film chamber of commerce. The president has not taken permission to extend the duration beyond one year.

5 - The chamber is not a punishing authority for any matters on social medias like Face book, Whatsapp, Instagram, Twitter, Google etc. offences committed on social media come under

CEN (cyber economic and narcotic) cell only, KFCC has not approached the cell instead it has taken law into its hand committed a crime by violating the procedure of STATUS CO ORDER passed by the authority.

6 - Since the status co was ordered by the authority it is also the responsibility of the District registrar of societies to take an appropriate action against the secretary and the president by resolving the case of illegal suspension."

The petitioner has filed this representation alleging that notwithstanding the *Status Quo* order against his suspension, he has been issued with the Show Cause Notice for expulsion.

Mr. Thejesh, the learned counsel for the fourth respondent, places on record a copy of the fourth respondent's Communication dated 22.12.2025 informing the petitioner that he is expelled from the membership. This Court must opine that if the petitioner is aggrieved either by the decision to keep

him under suspension or to expel him from membership, he must necessarily avail remedy as permissible under Section 9 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 because facts, which could afford the third respondent's reasons to take such a decision, must necessarily be inquired after a trial. If the petitioner subject to such trial, proposes to participate in the elections, he must also seek appropriate relief in such suit including any request for interim order.

The petition stands disposed of with liberty as aforesaid.

SD/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

RB