



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.26329 OF 2017 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SOMASHEKHAR
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS,
S/O H M RUDRAIAH
NO. 238, 4TH CROSS, 6TH PHASE,
MAHAGANAPATHI NAGARA,
RAJAJINAGARA,
BENGALURU - 560 010.
2. BANGALORE AUTO CHALAKARA
SOUHARDA CO-OP LTD.,
NO. 35/B, 2ND CROSS, 50 FT ROAD,
W.C.ROAD, MAHAGANAPATHI NAGARA,
RAJAJINAGARA,
BENGALURU - 560 010.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. PUTHIGE R. RAMESH, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SMT. LAKSHMI E., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 001.



2. THE COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
T.CHOWDAIAH ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 020.
3. THE COMMISSIONER
FOOD CIVIL SUPPLY AND CONSUMER RELATIONS
DEPARTMENT
MALLESHWARAM,
BENGALURU - 560 003.
4. THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
REGIONAL OFFICE (KARNATAKA)
ESI CORPORATION, NO10, BINNIFIELDS
BINNIPET,
BENGALURU - 560 023.
5. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
YESHASWINI CO OP FARMERS HEALTH CARE TRUST,
6TH FLOOR, M.S.BUILDING
DR AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
6. THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER
KARMIKA BHAVANA
ITI PREMISES, NEAR DAIRY CIRCLE,
BANNERUGHATTA ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 029.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MAHANTESH SHETTAR, AGA FOR R1, R3 & R6;
SRI. B.S. KARTHIKEYAN, ADVOCATE FOR R2;
SMT. GEETHA DEVI M.P., ADVOCATE FOR R4;
R5 DELETED VIDE ORDER DATED 27.03.2019)



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT RESPONDENT NO.1 TO TAKE THE PROCEEDINGS DATED 01.06.2016 AT ANNEXURE-H TO ITS LOGICAL END BY DIRECTING THE CONCERNED THROUGH POSITIVE DIRECTIONS AND FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION ON A TIME BOUND BASIS.

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 have sought for a direction to the respondent No.1 to implement the proceedings dated 01.06.2016 produced at Annexure-H to the writ petition.
2. Heard Sri. Puthige R. Ramesh, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Smt. Lakshmi E., learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri. Mahantesh Shettar, learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondent Nos.1, 3 and 6, Sri. B.S. Karthikeyan, learned counsel for respondent No.2 and Smt. Geetha Devi M.P., learned counsel for respondent No.4.



3. It is argued by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners by referring to Annexure-H that the Government in its Proceedings dated 01.06.2016 had taken a decision to provide certain benefits in favour of the Bengaluru Auto Drivers Souharda Co-Operative Ltd., and the same has not been implemented and therefore, learned Senior Counsel submitted that a direction be issued to the respondent - Government to implement the Proceedings dated 01.06.2016 (Annexure-H).

4. Per contra, learned Additional Government Advocate representing the State submitted that though the Proceedings has been conducted on 01.06.2016 as per Annexure-H, however, it is a matter of policy which is in the domain of the Government and therefore, this Court cannot issue writ to the respondent - State to implement the proceedings dated 01.06.2016, as the same is not finalised, and accordingly, sought for dismissal of the writ petition.

5. Sri. B.S. Karthikeyan, learned counsel for respondent No.2 argued on similar lines.

6. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, I have carefully examined



the proceedings held on 01.06.2016, wherein the High Level Committee of the Officers of the Government have resolved to provide certain benefits to the Bengaluru Auto Drivers Souharda Co-Operative Ltd., with regard to their demands made therein. In that view of the matter, as the meeting has been held for the benefit of the petitioner - Society, however since officially decision has to be taken by the Government and it is a policy matter, and therefore, I am of the view that, this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot direct the respondent - authorities to implement the policy decision of the Government which is required to be considered by the Government, in accordance with law.

7. In that view of the matter, no interference is called for in this writ petition. The writ petition is accordingly, disposed of.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

sac
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 24