



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 15TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

WRIT PETITION NO.21161 OF 2017 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. REMCO (BHEL) HOUSE BUILDING
CO OPERATIVE SOCIETY LIMITED
NO.356, 5TH MAIN, RPC (REMCO) LAYOUT
HAMPI NAGARA
BENGALURU-560 104
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT
VIJAYAKUMAR
S/O LATE GOPALAKRISHNA,
AGED 55 YEARS.
2. MAHARUDRA KAMMAR
S/O DEVENDRAPPA
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
NO.502, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE,
RAJARAJESHWARI NAGAR,
BENGALURU-560 098.
3. SHAKUNTHALA
D/O SITARAM IYENGAR,
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS,
R/AT NO.807, 9TH 'A' MAIN ROAD,
REMCO LAYOUT,
BENGALURU-560 040.

Digitally signed by
ARUNKUMAR M
S
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



4. K.G.MANJUNATH
S/O LATE GURUMURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
R/AT NO.478, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE,
BENGALURU-560 098.

5. RAJU NARAYAN MORE
S/O NARAYAN MORE
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
R/AT NO.506, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.

6. BHEEMAPPA P DASHYAL
S/O SARAPPA
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
R/AT NO.511, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.

7. SHARADAMBA
W/O PUTTAVEERAAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
R/AT NO.521, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.

8. K.Y.RAJANNA
S/O KRISHNAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
R/AT NO.505, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.



9. H.R.SHANKAR
S/O H.R.RAMASWAMY,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
R/AT NO.508, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.
10. J. KUBHER
S/O JAGANATH RAO,
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,
R/AT NO.479, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.
11. A. BALAKRISHNA
S/O ANNAMALAI,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
R/AT NO.479, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.
12. CHIKKADASU
S/O VENKATAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
R/AT NO.476, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.
13. VENUGOPAL L.
S/O T. LAKSHMAN,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
R/AT NO.476, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.



14. UDAYA KUMARI
W/O AJIT,
AGED AOUT 55 YEARS,
R/AT NO.476, BHEL LAYOUT,
2ND STAGE, PATTANAGERE
BENGALURU-560 098.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SARAVANA S., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
KARNATAKA STATE COMMISSION FOR
SCHEDULED CASTE AND SCHEDULED TRIBE
NO.14/3, 2ND FLOOR, CFC BUILDING,
NRUPATHUNGA ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. A.C. MANJUNATH, ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH ALL
FURTHER PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO THE ISSUANCE OF
NOTICE DATED 25.02.2017 AS PER ANNEX-E1 TO E13.

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

1. In this writ petition, petitioners are assailing the notices dated 25.02.2017 (Annexure-E1 to E13) issued by the respondent.

2. Sri. Sarvana S., learned counsel appearing for the petitioners contended that, the respondent - Commissioner has no jurisdiction to interfere with the civil right of the parties is concerned and same has to be adjudicated in a manner known to law. In this regard, he refers to the Judgment of this Court in W.P.No.63405/2016 dated 23.11.2020.

3. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate sought to justify the impugned notices issued by the respondent.

4. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, I have carefully examined the averments made in the writ petition and the averments made in the notices produced at Annexure-E series. In this regard, it is relevant to consider Section 10 of the Karnataka



State Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Act, 2002, wherein, Section 10 of the Act makes it clear that the Commission is not empowered to adjudicate upon the rights of the parties and that the said provision provides for power vested with the Commission of Enquiry with regard to object for which the said Act has been enunciated therein.

5. In that view of the matter, following the declaration of law made by this Court in W.P.No.63405/2016 dated 23.11.2020 and the order dated 09.10.2020 in W.P.No.46279/2013, I am of the opinion that the impugned notices produced at Annexure-E series are liable to be quashed. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is allowed. The impugned notices at Annexure-E1 to E13 are hereby quashed. It is open for the parties to resolve the dispute in a manner known to law.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

sac
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 22