



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 3881 OF 2026 (GM-PDS)

BETWEEN:

SRI RANJITH D K
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
S/O LATE D.S.KANTHARAJU,
BYRAPURA VILLAGE,
ALUR TALUK,
HASSAN DISTRICT 573 218

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SHIVARAMU H.C.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF FOOD
AND CIVIL SUPPLIES, VIKAS SOUDHA,
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU 560 001.
2. THE JOINT DIRECTOR OF FOOD
AND CIVIL SUPPLIES,
HASSAN DISTRICT.
HASSAN.-573201





3. COMMISSIONER OF FOOD
AND CIVIL SUPPLIES,
5TH FLOOR, MARKETING FEDERATION BUILDING,
CUNNINGHAM ROAD,
BENGALURU 560 052

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ADITYA DIWAKARA, AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ENDORSEMENT DATED 14.01.2026 ISSUED BY R2 IN NO. JI A HA/ A TA. C R 05/2025-26 AT ANNEX-B; TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS TO RESPONDENT NO.2 TO TRANSFER OR ISSUE AUTHORISATION IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONER FORTHWITH IN TERMS OF ORDER DATED 13.12.2024 PASSED IN WP NO.33154/2024 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-C WITHOUT SEEKING ANY PERMISSION/ORDER FROM THE RESPONDENT NO.3 AS THE RESPONDENT NO.2 ALONE IS COMPETENT TO TRANSFER THE AUTHORISATION.

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



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

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner is aggrieved by the second respondent's Endorsement dated 14.01.2026. The second respondent has rejected the petitioner's application for transfer of authorization to run a *Fair Price Depot* and the petitioner's request for transfer is on the demise of his father Mr. D. S. Kantharaju on 29.11.2025. The petitioner's father was issued with authorization to run a *Fair Price Depot* at Byrapura Village. The second respondent has rejected the petitioner's application citing the age of the petitioner's father.

Mr. H. C. Shivaramu, the learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the second respondent could not have rejected the request for transfer of authorization because of his father's age as of the date of his demise emphasizing that this Court's



consistent view has been that the authorization must be transferred irrespective of the age and educational qualification of the authorization holder. Mr. Aditya Diwakara, the learned Additional Government Advocate, who is called upon to accept notice for the respondents, is heard in the light of the afore. This Court finds considerable force in the submissions because irrefutably this Court's consistent view has been that the transfer of authorization cannot be rejected on these grounds. Therefore, the following:

ORDER

- [a] The petition is allowed.
- [b] The impugned Endorsement dated 14.01.2026 is quashed directing the second respondent to transfer the authorization in favour of the petitioner.
- [c] If the petitioner satisfies all other requirements, this transfer shall be



completed within a period of two [2]
months from the date of receipt of a
certified copy of this order.

**Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE**

RB