



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 4909 OF 2026 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. C G MYLARAPPA
S/O GUTTEPPA
RETD POLICE OFFICER.
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,

2. SMT G NAGARATNAMMA
D/O GUTTEPPA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS.

3. C G PRABHAKAR
S/O GUTTEPPA
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,

ALL ARE R/AT 4TH CROSS,
HAGALU AREA,
JOGIMATTI ROAD,
CHITRADURGA TOWN 577501

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. M.R.HIREMATHAD, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
R/BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
VIDHANA SOUDA
BENGALURU-560001

2. THE COMMISSIONER
URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.





CHITRADURGA-577501

3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR
DEPT.OF TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING.
NO-47, 1ST FLOOR,
JCR EXTENSION, 1ST CROSS,
CHITRADURGA. 577501
4. THE PANCHAYAT DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
MADAKARI GRAMA PANCHAYAT,
MADAKARI PURA
CHITRADURGA- 577 50.1
5. G N PRAKASH REDDY
S/O NARASIMHAREDDY,
AGE-NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER
R/AT TEACHERS COLONY,
IUDP LAYOUT, CHITRADURGA-577501.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.AKASH KUMAR GOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR R2 & R3
SRI. N.PRAVEEN KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R4
SMT.SPOORTHY V., HCGP FOR R1
V/O/DT:25.02.2026, NOTICE TO R5 DISPENSED WITH)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE APPROVAL OF COMMERCIAL SINGLE SITE AND ITS PLAN BEARING NO. CHI. NA. PRA/NA.YO/E-27322/VAA,E/NI.A/2025-2026/276 DATED 24.07.2025 PRODUCED AT ANNEX-C AND C1 APPROVED BY THE R2 CONSEQUENTLY KINDLY BE PLEASED TO ISSUE THE WRIT OF MANDAMUS BY DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PETITIONER DATED 20.12.2025 PRODUCED AT ANNEX-D AND ANOTHER REPRESENTATION DATED 28.01.2026 PRODUCED AT ANNEX-J.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ



ORAL ORDER

1. Learned HCJP accepts notice for respondent No.1. Sri Akash Kumar Gowda, learned counsel accepts notice for respondent No.2 and Sri No.Praveen Kumar, learned counsel accepts notice for respondent No.4.
2. Notice to respondent No.5 is dispensed with in view of the proposed order to be passed.
3. The petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:

*"WHEREFORE, The petitioner prays that the this Hon'ble court be pleased to issue Writ of certiorari by quashing the approval of commercial single site and its plan bearing No.Chi.Na.Pra/Na.Yo/E-27322/Vaa,e/Ni.A/ 2025-2026/276 dated 24.07.2025 produced at **ANNEXURE - C AND C1**, approved by the respondent No.2, consequently kindly be pleased to issue the writ of mandamus by directing the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 20.12.2025 produced at **ANNEXURE-D** and another representation dated 28.01.2026 produced at **ANNEXURE-J** also prayed for issue any other direction which the court may think fit in the interest of justice and equity."*

4. The petitioner claims to be owner of the land in Survey No.83/10 measuring 20 guntas situated at Chitradurga town. Respondent No.5, being the owner of the land in



Survey No.140/1B measuring 2 acres 20 guntas, has got the same converted and thereafter applied to respondent No.2 for a single site plan for commercial building. The same having been granted, the petitioner has submitted an objection stating that while obtaining such a plan, no road has been left for access to the petitioner, whose land is situated behind the land of respondent No.5. The said, representation not having been considered, the petitioner is before this Court seeking for the aforesaid relief.

4. A perusal of Annexure-C1 being the plan relating to respondent No.5 indicates that the land of the petitioner is abutting the National Highway and respondent No.5 has obtained a single unit development plan for commercial complex.
5. What is pertinent to observe is that it is not a layout plan which has been obtained, but only a single unit plan for development of commercial complex. Such a single unit plan does not require any road to be shown or left within the said property to give access to the petitioner. If at all the petitioner has no access and claims easementary



rights or otherwise, it is for the petitioner to institute appropriate proceedings seeking such an access. The petitioner cannot object to a plan, which has been sanctioned in accordance with law, more so when there is no requirement for respondent No.5 to make available any access in his land to the land of the petitioner.

5. With the above observations, petition stands ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE**