IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S.BHARATH KUMAR

WRIT PETITION NO. 39468 OF 2025 (GM-RES-PIL)

BETWEEN:

1. H.C. BASAVARAJAPPA
S/O CHIKKARUDRAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
R/AT NO.79, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
HEMMIGEPURA, VIDYAPEETA POST,
KENGERI, BANGALORE SOUTH,
BANGALORE-560060.

2. RUDRESHA H.C.
S/O CHANNAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
R/AT NO.47, OLD NO.13,
HEMMIGEPURA,
BANGALORE SOUTH,
BANGALORE-560060.

3. CHANNIGAPPA H.P.
S/O PUTTAMARAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
R/AT NO.11, NEAR ANJANEYA TEMPLE,
HEMMIGEPURA,
BANGALORE-560060.

4. CHANDRASHEKAR H.C.
S/O CHIKKAGALAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
R/AT NO.79, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
HEMMIGEPURA, VIDYAPEETA POST,
KENGERI, BANGALORE SOUTH,
BANGALORE-560060.

Digitally signed by RAKSHA
Location: high court of karnataka

5. ANANDA H.R.
S/O RUDRAMUNIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
R/AT NO.162, S.V.K. KALYANA MANTAPA,
HEMMIGEPURA, BANGALORE SOUTH,
CHUDENAPURA, BANGALORE-560060.

6. PUTTARAJU C.
S/O CHANNAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
R/AT NO.28, CHENNAVEERAIAHNA PALYA,
NEAR NICE ROAD, HEMMIGEPURA,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

7. CHENNAPPA
S/O SIDDALINGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 77 YEARS,
R/AT NO.3, CHENNAVEERAIAHNA PALYA,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

8. SADAIAH C.H.
S/O HANUMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
R/AT CHENNAVEERAIAHNA PALYA,
KENGERI HOBLI, HEMMIGEPURA,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

9. PRASANNA V.
S/O VENKATACHALAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
R/AT NO.08, CHENNAVEERAIAHNA PALYA,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

10. DEVARAJ
S/O BALAKRISHNAPPA N.,
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
R/AT NO.39, 1ST MAIN ROAD,
KODIPALYA, NEAR GOVERNMENT SCHOOL,

KENGERI, BENGALURU SOUTH,
CHOODENAPURA, BENGALURU-560060.

11. HARISH H.
S/O K.R. HONNAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/AT NO.9, KODIPALYA,
CHOODENAPURA POST, KENGERI HOBLI,
BENGALURU SOUTH, BENGALURU-560060.

12. VASANTHAPPA
S/O VENKATAMARAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS,
R/AT NO.08, VARAHASANDRA,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

13. SATISHA V.
S/O VENKATAMARAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
R/AT NO.08, VARAHASANDRA,
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

14. VENKATESH MURTHY
S/O MUNIMARAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
R/AT NO.27, VARAHASANDRA,
KENGERI HOBLI, BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-560060.

15. NAJEER PASHA
S/O BASHA,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
R/AT NO.43, KONNASANDRA,
HEMMIGEPURA-KENGERI ROAD,
BENGALURU-560060.

(NOTE- PETITIONER NO.1, 7 AND 10 ARE NOT
CLAIMING SENIOR CITIZEN BENEFIT)

…PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SHARATH S. GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. MANJUNATH S., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
   BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
   URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
   VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU - 560001.

2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
   DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
   REP. ADDITIONAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO
   GOVERNMENT,
   URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
   VIKASA SOUDHA, BANGALORE-560001.

3. THE UNDER SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
   URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
   (GBA & BENGALURU CITY CORPORATION-2 AND
   COORDINATION),
   VIKASA SOUDHA, BENGALURU-560001.

4. THE GREATER BENGALURU AUTHORITY
   N.R. SQUARE, BENGALURU-560 002,
   REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER.

5. DELIMITATION COMMITTEE
   GREATER BENGALURU AUTHORITY,
   N.R. SQUARE, BENGALURU-560 002,
   REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MITHU G.A., AAG ALONG WITH

SRI. KHAMROZ KHAN, AGA FOR R1 TO R3,

SRI. B.S. SATYANAND, ADVOCATE FOR R4 AND R5)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT TO QUASH THE AMENDED NOTIFICATION DATED 01.12.2025 BEARING NO.UDD 291 BBS 2025 PASSED BY 3RD RESPONDENT, UNDER SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT INSOFAR AS IT CHANGES THE NAME OF "HEMMIGEPURA WARD" TO "KENGERI KOTE" VIDE ANNEXURE-F AND CONSEQUENTLY DECLARE THAT THE FINAL NOTIFICATION DATED 19.11.2025 BEARING NO.UDD 291 BBS 2025 ISSUED BY 3RD RESPONDENT, UNDER SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT SHALL PREVAIL VIDE ANNEXURE-E; AND ETC.,

THIS WRIT PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR JUDGMENT ON 19.11.2026 AND COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT OF JUDGMENT THIS DAY, ***K.S.BHARATH KUMAR, J.,*** PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING :

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S.BHARATH KUMAR

CAV JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S.BHARATH KUMAR)

1. The petitioners have instituted the present writ petition in the nature of a Public Interest Litigation, *inter alia*, seeking the following reliefs:

> *"i. Issue Writ in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ to quash the amended notification dated 01.12.2025 bearing No.UDD 291 BBS 2025 passed by 3rd respondent, Under Secretary to Government, Urban Development Department insofar as it changes the name of "Hemmigepura Ward" to "Kengeri Kote" Vide Annexure-F and consequently Declare that the final notification dated 19.11.2025 bearing No.UDD 291 BBS 2025 issued by 3rd respondent, Under Secretary to Government, Urban Development Department shall prevail; Vide Annexure-E.*
>
> *ii. Issue any other Writ, Order or Directions, as this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant in the circumstances of the case, including the costs of this Writ Petition, in the interest of justice and equity".*

2. We have heard Sri. Sharath S. Gowda, along with Sri. Manjunath S., learned counsel for the petitioners; Sri. Mithun G.A., learned Additional Advocate General, along with Sri. Khamroz Khan, learned Additional Government Advocate, for respondent Nos.1 to 3; and Sri. B.S. Satyanand, learned counsel for respondent Nos.4 and 5, and have perused the material on record.

3. The case of the petitioners is that the State Government, pursuant to the mandate of Section 29 of the Greater Bengaluru Governance Act, 2024 (hereinafter referred to as *'the Act, 2024'*), initiated the process of delimitation of Wards and in that regard, issued guidelines dated 02.09.2025. Thereafter, a draft notification dated 30.09.2025 was published inviting objections from the general public.

4. It is further contended that, upon completion of the process contemplated under the statute and the guidelines, the State Government issued the final notification dated 19.11.2025, confirming the names and boundaries of the Wards exactly as proposed in the draft

notification. According to the petitioners, the respondents thereafter issued the amended notification dated 01.12.2025, unilaterally renaming "Hemmigepura Ward" as "Kengeri Kote", "Mylasandra Ward" as "Kengeri" and "Kengeri Ward" as "Shivanapalya Ward".

5. It is further contended that the amended notification dated 01.12.2025 was issued without publication of any draft notification, in disregard of the procedure prescribed under the guidelines, and without affording the general public an opportunity to raise objections.

6. It is further contended that the guidelines dated 02.09.2025 prescribe a time schedule for the constitution of Wards at the level of the Ward Delimitation Commission. According to the petitioners, once the final notification was published on the basis of the recommendations of the Ward Delimitation Commission, the said Commission became *functus officio*, and no recommendation made by it after publication of the final notification could be acted upon.

7. It is further contended that the Government issued the amended notification dated 01.12.2025 by accepting the recommendations of the Delimitation Commission, which had by then become *functus officio*. Learned counsel accordingly submits that the renaming of "Hemmigepura Ward" as "Kengeri Kote" under the amended notification, being founded on such recommendations, is illegal and arbitrary, and that the amended notification is liable to be set aside.

8. In support of his contentions, learned counsel for the petitioners has placed reliance on the following decisions:

> *"1. Kamla Prasad Khetan and Anr vs Union of India reported in (1957) 2 SCC 18.*
>
> *2. Vanashakti, A Public Trust vs Union of India and ors in PIL No.20/2013."*

9. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.3 and 4 contends that the Greater Bengaluru Authority (hereinafter referred to as *'the GBA'*), pursuant to the guidelines issued by the Government vide notification dated 02.09.2025, undertook the delimitation

of Wards. It is contended that a draft notification dated 30.09.2025 was published and, no objections having been received, the final notification dated 19.11.2025 was issued notifying the names and boundaries of the Wards.

10. It is further contended that, since certain errors had crept into the final notification, the amended notification dated 01.12.2025 was issued renaming "Hemmigepura Ward" as "Kengeri Kote", "Mylasandra Ward" as "Kengeri" and "Kengeri Ward" as "Shivanapalya Ward".

11. It is further contended that, notwithstanding the issuance of the final notification, respondent Nos.3 and 4 were empowered, by virtue of Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, to rectify the errors that had crept into the final notification dated 19.11.2025. It is also contended that the naming of a Ward is a matter of policy within the domain of the State, which the petitioners are not entitled to question. Learned counsel further submits that, in similar cases where the renaming of a Ward was called in question before this Court, the petitions were dismissed with costs.

12. In support of his contentions, learned counsel has placed reliance on the following decisions of Co-ordinate Benches of this Court:

> *"(i) Writ Petition No.17145 of 2024 (LB-BMP) PIL in Smt. Satyalaxmi Rao Vs. State of Karnataka*
>
> *(2) Writ Petition No.2923 of 2026 (LB-RES-PIL) in Sri. Renuka Yallamma Temple Trust Vs. The State of Karnataka"*

13. We have given our careful consideration to the submissions advanced on both sides and have perused the material on record.

14. The record reveals that the Urban Development Department, by notification dated 02.09.2025, issued guidelines for the delimitation of Wards in exercise of the power under Section 29 of the Act, 2024. Thereafter, the Government published a draft notification dated 30.09.2025 proposing the delimitation of Wards and inviting objections from the general public. Upon completion of the objection process, the State issued the final notification dated 19.11.2025.

15. It is further seen that, certain errors and omissions having crept into the final notification dated 19.11.2025, the State issued the amended notification dated 01.12.2025 to rectify the same. By the amended notification, "Hemmigepura Ward" was renamed as "Kengeri Kote", "Mylasandra Ward" as "Kengeri" and "Kengeri Ward" as "Shivanapalya Ward".

16. The entire exercise of delimitation of Wards was undertaken in accordance with Section 29 of the Act, 2024.

17. Section 29 of the Act, 2024 reads as under:

> ***"29. Delimitation of Wards.-*** *(1) For the purposes of election of councillors, each City Corporation shall be divided in to wards on the recommendation of the Delimitation Commission, in such manner that,-*
>
> *(a) the population of each of the wards within the City Corporation in the Greater Bengaluru Area shall, as far as practicable, be the same; and*
>
> *(b) Wards shall be divided within the constituency of a member of Legislative Assembly and no wards shall be spread over to multiple constituencies.*

Explanation: *For the purpose of this section, 'population' means the population of the City published as per the relevant figures of the preceding census.*

(2) The Government shall constitute a delimitation commission consisting of such number of persons as may be prescribed, to recommend to the Government regarding the manner of division of wards.

(3) The Government shall by order determine,-

(a) the wards into which each of the City Corporations, for the purpose of its elections, be divided:

Provided that the number of wards in each City Corporation shall not be more than one hundred and fifty;

(b) the extent of each ward; and

(c) seats shall be reserved in a City Corporation,-

(i) for the Scheduled Castes; and

(ii) for the Scheduled Tribes.

- and the number of seats so reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes shall bear as nearly as may be, the same proportion to the total number of seats to be filled by direct election in each City Corporation as the population of the

Scheduled Castes and of the Scheduled Tribes, respectively, in the said City Corporation bears to the total population of that Corporation.

(d) Such number of seats which shall as nearly as may be, one third of the total number of seats to be filled by direct election in each City Corporation shall be reserved for persons belonging to the Backward Classes.

Provided that, out of the seats reserved under this sub-section, eighty percent of the total number of such seats shall be reserved for the persons falling under category "A" and the remaining twenty percent of the seats shall be reserved for the persons falling under category "B".

Provided further that, if no person falling under category "A" is available, the seats reserved for that category shall also be filled by the persons falling under category "B" and vice-versa.

Provided also that then number of seats so reserved for the Backward Classes under this sub-section shall be so determined, that the total number of seats reserved for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the Backward Classes under this sub-section shall not exceed fifty percent of the total number of seats in the City Corporation. In case, as per the number of seats reserved for the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and the

Backward Classes together exceeds fifty percent of the total number of directly elected seats in the City Corporation, then the seats for the Backward Classes shall be proportionately reduced to ensure that the total reserved seats do not exceed fifty percent.

(4) Not more than fifty percent of the seats reserved for each category of persons belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes as well as the non-reserved seats to be filled by direct election in a City Corporation, shall be reserved for women:

Provided that, the seats reserved in sub-sections (3) and (4) shall be allotted by rotations to different wards of the elections of the City Corporation.

(5) No de-limitation of wards or change of wards for the purpose of reservation shall be made in the City Corporation after its constitution, except for the purpose of general election to that City Corporation and no such de-limitation or change of wards shall, in any manner, affect the existing City Corporation.

[1][Provided that, de-limitation shall be made for the newly included local area within a period of three months.

Provided further that, new de-limitation process shall be conducted after every census, before next General election to the City Corporation, if census

results are available at least six months before the next General election to the City Corporation.][1]

(6) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, where two thirds of the total number of Councillors required to be elected have been elected, the City Corporation shall be deemed to have been duly constituted under this Act."

18. A careful reading of Section 29 of the Act, 2024 makes it evident that the provision deals only with the delimitation of Wards. It contains no provision relating to the naming or renaming of a Ward. Consequently, the amended notification dated 01.12.2025, in so far as it renames the Wards, does not fall within the scope and ambit of Section 29 of the Act, 2024.

19. The amended notification dated 01.12.2025 was issued by the State to rectify the errors and omissions that had crept into the final notification dated 19.11.2025, whereby "Hemmigepura Ward" was renamed as "Kengeri Kote", "Mylasandra Ward" as "Kengeri" and "Kengeri Ward" as "Shivanapalya Ward".

20. Section 21 of the General Clauses Act reads as under:

> *21. Section 21 of the General Clauses Act states:*
>
> *"Where, by any Central Act or Regulation, a power to issue notifications, orders, rules, or bye-laws is conferred, then that power includes a power, exercisable in the like manner and subject to the like sanction and conditions (if any), to add to, amend, vary or rescind any notifications, orders, rules or bye-laws so issued."*

21. A plain reading of Section 21 of the General Clauses Act shows that the power to issue a notification under an enactment includes the power, exercisable in the like manner and subject to the like sanction and conditions, if any, to add to, amend, vary or rescind such notification.

22. It is pertinent to note that, as observed hereinabove, it is only the delimitation of Wards that was carried out upon the recommendations of the Delimitation Commission, in exercise of the power conferred under Section 29 of the Act, 2024. The amended notification was issued independently and not on the basis of any

recommendation of the Delimitation Commission. Consequently, the contention of the petitioners that the State acted upon the recommendations of a Commission which had become *functus officio* does not merit acceptance.

23. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, in ***Sri. Renuka Yallamma Temple Trust v. State of Karnataka*** (***W.P. No.2923 of 2026***), while dealing with a similar challenge, has held at paragraphs 2 to 4 as under:

> *"2. First of all, we find that no fundamental rights of the petitioners or any other person are violated by naming the ward as Beereshwaranagara. Whereas, the petitioners may be of the opinion that the ward in question should be named as Chunchaghatta Ward, clearly, this is not a cause which should engage the judicial time of this Court.*
>
> *3. Any opinion that the petitioners may have or any thought that may pass through their mind cannot be transcribed into a public interest litigation. This is an unjustifiable imposition on judicial time.*
>
> *4. In view of the above, the present petition is dismissed with costs quantified at Rs.5,000/-. The costs shall be paid to the Karnataka State Legal*

Services Authority within a period of two (02) weeks from date."

24. In view of the foregoing, the renaming of the Wards having been effected by the State in accordance with law, in exercise of its power under Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, and the same being a matter of policy falling within the domain of the State; and further, the petitioners having failed to establish any *locus standi* to question the renaming of "Hemmigepura Ward" as "Kengeri Kote", we find no merit in the writ petition. The petition is, therefore, liable to be dismissed.

25. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***dismissed***.

26. Pending interlocutory applications, if any, shall stand *disposed of*.

Sd/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(K.S.BHARATH KUMAR)
JUDGE

GH