



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S.KINAGI

WRIT PETITION NO. 4453 OF 2026 (CS-RES)

BETWEEN:

SMT.GEETHA A
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
W/O M. RAVI,
R/O NO. 1079, 34TH CROSS,
4TH MAIN, VIDYARANYAPURAM,
MYSURU, MYSURU DISTRICT.570008.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MAHANTESH T S., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MYSURU DISTRICT CO OPERATIVE MILK
FEDERATION
(NANDINI MILK PARLOUR)
BANNUR ROAD,
ALANAHALLI POST
MYSURU-570 028
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.





2. THE DIRECTOR (MARKETING)
MYSURU DISTRICT CO-OPERATIVE MILK
FEDERATION, BANNUR ROAD,
ALANAHALLI POST,
MYSURU-570 028

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SUMANTH L BHARADWAJ., ADVOCATE FOR R1
R2 SERVED THROUGH HAND SUMMONS)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 27-01-2026 BEARING NO. MY SA HAA O/MA.V/N.KSHI.KEM/2025-26 AS AT ANNEXURE-N ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1, AND CONSEQUENTLY, (B) ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER WRIT OR DIRECTION, DIRECTING THE RESPONDENTS TO RESTORE THE VACANT POSSESSION OF THE RENOVATED SHOP SITUATED AT THE OLD DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGES COURT PREMISES, MYSORE AND PERMIT HER TO CONTINUE TO DO HER BUSINESS IN NANDINI MILK PARLOUR BY SUPPLYING HER ALL THE MILK AND MILK ITEMS AND PRODUCTS SO AS TO ENABLE HER TO SELL THE SAME AS WAS BEING DONE EARLIER TO THE LITIGANT PUBLIC ADVOCATES AND COURT STAFF.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S.KINAGI



ORAL ORDER

The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking the following reliefs:

- "A. *To issue a writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, quashing the impugned order dated 27.01.2026 bearing No. MY SA HAA O/ Ma.V/N.Kshi.Kem/2025-26 as at Annexure-N issued by Respondent No. 1 and consequently,*
- B. *Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other writ or direction, directing the respondents to restore the vacant possession of the renovated shop situated at the old district and sessions judges court premises, Mysore and permit her to continue to do her business in Nandini Milk Parlour by supplying her all the milk and milk items and products so as to enable her to sell the same being done earlier to the litigant public; advocates and court staff*
- C. *Grant such other relief or reliefs as may deem fit to grant in the facts and circumstances of the case."*

2. Brief facts, leading rise to the filing of this writ petition are as follows:

2.1. The petitioner was allotted the shop premises at the Old District and Sessions Court, Mysuru for running



Nandini Milk Parlour during 2007-08. Respondent No.2 has issued the office order dated 16.04.2025 stating that as the shop premises where the petitioner is running the business in Nandini Milk Parlour has become old, needs repair and renovation to attract the customers, as such instructed the petitioner to remove all stock in the shop and hand over the vacant possession for such renovation and when the petitioner sought for the alternate premises, she was assured that soon after the renovation, the renovated premises would be delivered to her. However, instead of handing over the renovated premises, respondent No.2 passed the order of cancellation dated 27.05.2025 cancelling the licence of the petitioner. Further, the petitioner made a representation dated 02.06.2025 to the respondents to redeliver the possession of the shop premises. The petitioner challenged the cancellation order dated 27.05.2025 passed by respondent No.2 before this Court in WP No. 16727 of 2025. This Court disposed of the said petition directing the respondents to hold an enquiry regarding the allegations



made against the petitioner by giving an opportunity of hearing vide its order dated 28.10.2025.

3. Thereafter, once again, the respondents passed the order of cancellation dated 27.01.2026 which was communicated to the petitioner on 05.02.2026. Hence, this writ petition.

4. Heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondents.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, the impugned order of cancellation passed by the respondents is contrary to the direction given by this Court in WP No. 16727 of 2025, wherein this Court had directed to hold an enquiry regarding the allegations made against the petitioner. He submits that, as such no enquiry is held by the respondents. He submits that, no opportunity of being heard was provided to the petitioner before passing the impugned order. He submits that, the said order is cryptic in nature and arbitrary. Hence, on these grounds, prays to allow the writ petition.



6. *Per contra*, the learned counsel for the respondents submits that, the impugned order is passed by the respondents after giving the opportunity of being heard to the petitioner. He submits that, in furtherance of the directions issued by this Court, the notice was issued to the petitioner, her reply to the said notice was considered and after having conducted the enquiry, the impugned order came to be passed. He further submits that, the Office of the Prl. District and Sessions Court, Mysuru has sent a communication dated 10.02.2026, wherein it is stated that the petitioner herein has not paid the rent and electricity charges, and thereby violated the terms and conditions stipulated by this Court. Accordingly, on these grounds, prays to dismiss the petition.

7. Perused the records and considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties.

8. It is undisputed that the petitioner was running the Nandini Milk Parlour in the premises of Old District and Sessions Court Complex, Mysuru. Respondent No.2 passed



the order of cancellation dated 27.05.2025 cancelling the licence of the petitioner to run the shop. Further, the petitioner made a representation dated 02.06.2025 to the respondents to redeliver the possession of the shop premises. The petitioner challenged the cancellation order dated 27.05.2025 passed by respondent No.2 before this Court in WP No. 16727 of 2025. This Court disposed of the said petition directing the respondents to hold an enquiry regarding the allegations made against the petitioner by giving an opportunity of hearing vide its order dated 28.10.2025. Further, the respondents passed the impugned order of cancellation dated 27.01.2026 which was communicated to the petitioner on 05.02.2026.

9. From the perusal of the impugned order at Annexure N, it discloses that the petitioner was irregular in paying the rent and has not paid the electricity bill timely. Thereby, the petitioner has violated the terms and conditions stipulated. There has been a significant decline in the daily turnover and that the petitioner is engaged in selling the expired products. However, from the perusal of the order



passed by this Court in WP No. 16727 of 2025, it discloses that the petitioner herein had assailed the earlier cancellation order dated 27.05.2025 wherein this Court had disposed of the said petition directing the respondents to serve the notice and thereafter, hold the enquiry regarding the allegations made against the petitioner after giving her the opportunity of being heard.

10. From the perusal of the impugned order, it becomes clear that, in furtherance of the order passed by this Court in the aforesaid writ petition, the notice was issued to the petitioner dated 02.12.2025 (Annexure G), to which the petitioner replied on 11.12.2025 (Annexure M) and further, the enquiry was conducted on 14.01.2026.

11. Further, the learned counsel for the respondent has filed a memo along with the document, wherein he has produced the communication dated 10.02.2026, a perusal of which discloses that the petitioner herein has not paid the



rent and electricity charges and thereby violated the terms and conditions stipulated by this Court.

12. In view of the above discussion and in view of the letter addressed by the Office of the District and Sessions Court, Mysuru, it becomes clear that, in furtherance of the order passed by this Court, the enquiry was held wherein the petitioner herein was given the opportunity of being heard and thereafter, the impugned order came to be passed. For the foregoing discussion, I find no grounds to entertain this writ petition.

13. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

- i. The writ petition is ***dismissed***;
- ii. Pending application(s), if any shall stand disposed of.

**Sd/-
(ASHOK S.KINAGI)
JUDGE**

PA
CT:KHV
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 43