



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

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

WRIT APPEAL NO. 518 OF 2026 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SHRI. SHARANABASAPPA S KALASHETTY
SON OF SHRI. SANGANNA,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
RESIDING AT FLAT NO. L4 301,
GODREJ ETERNITY,
HOLIDAY VILLAGE ROAD,
THALGHATTAPURA,
BENGALURU - 560109.
2. SHRI. NARESH RANED NAGRAJ
SON OF SHRI. NAGRAJ R.C.,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
RESIDING AT FLAT NO. K3-101,
GODREJ ETERNITY,
HOLIDAY VILLAGE ROAD,
THALGHATTAPURA,
BENGALURU - 560109.
3. SHRI. VARDHI REDDY
VENKATA KALYAN REDDY
HUSBAND OF SMT. GAJULAPALLI
LEELA MANASA,

Digitally
signed by
REKHA R
Location:
High Court
of
Karnataka



AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
RESIDING AT FLAT NO. L4 302,
GODREJ ETERNITY,
HOLIDAY VILLAGE ROAD,
THALGHATTAPURA,
BENGALURU - 560109.

4. SMT. GEETHA PRAKASH
WIFE OF SHRI. K. PRAKASH,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
RESIDING AT FLAT NO. L4 003,
GODREJ ETERNITY,
HOLIDAY VILLAGE ROAD,
THALGHATTAPURA,
BENGALURU 560109.
5. SHRI. RAJAGOPALAN NATARAJAN
SON OF SHRI. S.K. RAJAGOPALAN,
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS,
RESIDING AT FLAT NO. L4 104,
GODREJ ETERNITY,
HOLIDAY VILLAGE ROAD,
THALGHATTAPURA,
BENGALURU 560109.
6. SHRI. R.N. RAGHAVAN
SON OF SHRI. A.R. RAGHAVAN,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
RESIDING AT FLAT NO. K3 004,
GODREJ ETERNITY,
HOLIDAY VILLAGE ROAD,



THALGHATTAPURA,
BENGALURU - 560109.

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. BALAGOPAL MENON.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN
DEVELOPMENT AND MUNICIPALITIES,
M.S. BUILDING,
BANGALORE 560 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.
2. KARNATAKA TANK CONSERVATION AND
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
MINOR IRRIGATIONS
DEPARTMENT,
BEEJA BHAVAN BELLARY ROAD,
HEBBAL, BENGALURU
KARNATAKA - 560 024
REPRESENTED BY ITS CEO.
3. BANGALORE MYSORE
INFRASTRUCTURE CORRIDOR
AREA PLANNING AUTHORITY
NO. 05, LOOP LANE,
RACECOURSE ROAD,
BANGALORE 560009.
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN.



4. GODREJ TOWNSHIP
DEVELOPMENT LTD
GODREJ ONE, 5TH FLOOR,
PIROJSHANAGAR,
EASTERN EXPRESS HIGHWAY,
VIKHROLI (EAST), MUMBAI,
MAHARASHTRA 400079.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.MOHAMMED JAFFAR SHAH., AGA FOR R1;

SRI. RAGHUNATH V., ADVOCATE FOR R2;

SRI. YOGESH D NIAK., ADVOCATE FOR R3;

SRI. BADRI VISHAL., ADVOCATE FOR R4)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO [A] ALLOW THE WRIT APPEAL;
[B] SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 30.01.2026 PASSED BY THE
LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE OF THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WRIT
PETITION No. 2541/2026 (WP-LB)C.

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY,
JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

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



ORAL JUDGMENT

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

This intra Court appeal has been filed against the interim order dated 30.01.2026 passed by the writ Court in W.P. No.2541/2026 whereby the writ petition has been directed to be treated as Public Interest Litigation in terms of the public interest norms and rules of the High Court.

2. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants'/petitioners' interest is involved in the subject matter of the writ petition inasmuch as the impugned construction is being put up in front of their apartments in violation of the buffer zone norms under the relevant provisions and rules.

3. Learned counsel for the private respondents as well as the learned Additional Government Advocate do not dispute the assertion that the subject matter of the writ petition is not of public interest but of personal interest.

4. As the learned counsel for the respondents also do not support the impugned order, and the learned counsel for the appellants as well as respondents are consensus ad idem to



set aside the order and remand the matter to the learned single Judge for deciding the writ petition on merits.

5. Therefore, the writ appeal is allowed setting aside the impugned order dated 30.01.2026 in W.P. No.2541/2026 and the matter is remanded to the writ Court for decision on merits as the subject matter of the writ petition does not appear to be of a Public Interest Litigation.

6. Respondent No.4 is restrained from putting up any construction or carry out further construction of Organic Waste Converter till the final decision by the writ Court.

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

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

AN/-