



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

WRIT PETITION NO. 3215 OF 2025 (GM-CON)

BETWEEN:

1. MR. G S PANIRAJ,
EX DIRECTOR,
71 YEARS
M/S VYALIKAVALL HOUSE BUILDING
CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY,
62, 7TH MAIN, BETWEEN 8TH AND 9TH CROSS,
MALLESHWARAM, BANGALORE-560003.

...PETITIONER

(BY SMT. GEETHA MISRA., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. DR. V S RAJAMMA
W/O C S BELAGAVI,
R/A 300, 14TH MAIN,
BDA HIG COLONY,
RMV EXTENSION STAGE II,
BANGALORE-560094
2. M/S VYALIKAVALL HOUSE BUILDING
CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY,
NO.151, 15TH CROSS, ADARSHA BHAVAN,
2ND FLOOR, MALLESHWARAM,
BANGALORE-560003.

...RESPONDENTS

(R1 AND R2 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)





THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE AWARD/ORDER PASSED BY KSCDRC IN CC 312/2024 AT ANNEXURE-G DATED 30.03.2016 AS THE SAME HAS BEEN PASSED BY THE FORUM ON A COMPLAINT BARRED BY LIMITATION AND WITHOUT JURISDICTION, BASED ON FRAUDULENT, FORGED DOCUMENTS, THUS MAKING THE ORDER ILLEGAL, NULL AND VOID IN THE EYES OF LAW, ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH)

1. The present writ petition has been filed impugning the order dated 30.03.2016 passed by the Karnataka State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Bengaluru (for short '***the State Commission***') in Consumer Complaint No.312/2014 filed by the respondent No.1 herein.

2. The State Commission, vide its order dated 30.03.2016, has allowed the complaint in part and directed the petitioner to refund the amount of Rs.60,000/- together with interest @ 18% p.a. from the



date of respective payment till the date of realisation. The State Commission has also directed payment of litigation costs of Rs.25,000/- within a period of 45 days from the date of communication of the order.

3. The respondent No.1 initiated execution proceedings in E.A.No.47/2017. The State Commission, vide order dated 21.12.2024 passed in the execution application, has issued arrest warrant against the petitioner (judgment debtor) through the Commissioner of Police.

4. Despite the impugned order having been passed on 30.03.2016, it has not been challenged before the National Commission by the petitioner. It is not the case of the petitioner that he has complied with the order. The order dated 30.03.2016 has not been executed even after 10 years from the date of passing of the order. Only when the non-bailable warrant was issued against the petitioner vide order dated 21.12.2024 passed by the State Commission in the execution application, he has approached this Court.



Therefore, we find no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

5. Further, we observe that the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 and Consumer Protection Act, 2019 are complete code. Unless all the available remedies are exhausted, a writ petition cannot be entertained by this Court.

6. With the aforesaid observations, we dismiss the writ petition.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(T.M.NADAF)
JUDGE**

NG
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 16