



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 18TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 233 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRI SUDHEESH V SHETTY
S/O SRI VENUGOPAL SHETTY.
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS.
R/AT SRISHTI, NEAR CHETAN CLINIC.
KUKKE KATTE VILLAGE.
UDUPI TALUK, UDUPI DISTRICT
PROPRIETOR OF DIAL MANTRA.
MANTRA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.
NEAR GANDHI STATUTE,
MALPE BEACH, POST MALPE,
UDUPI-576 108.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. RAJASHEKAR S, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. DR. K VIDYAKUMARI
THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER.
UDUPI DISTRICT AND CHAIRMAN.
MALPE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.
SHIVALLI, RAJATHADRI.
MANIPAL, UDUPI DISTRICT.
UDUPI-576 104.





2. SRI. RAYAPPA.
SECRETARY
MALPE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.
UDUPI MUNICIPALITY,
KAVI MUDDANNA ROAD.
UDUPI-576 101

3. SRI. UDAYA SHETTY.
COMMISSIONER.
THE UDUPI CITY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
KAVI MUDDANNA ROAD,
UDUPI-576 101,

4. SRI. KUMAR C. U.
SECRETARY.
THE DISTRICT TOURISM
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE,
SHIVALLI, RAJATHADRI,
A WING, 2ND FLOOR,
MANIPAL. UDUPI DISTRICT.
UDUPI-576 104

5. STATE OF KARNATAKA.
DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM
VIKASA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI. S.H. RAGHAVENDRA, AGA FOR A1 AND A5
SRI. T.I. ABDULLA, ADVOCATE FOR A2)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 215 OF
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA R/W SECTION 11 AND 12 OF THE
CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, BY THE COMPLAINANT,
PRAYING TO INITIATE CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST
THE ACCUSED PERSONS AND PUNISH THEM SUITABLY AND
APPROPRIATELY FOR THE CONTEMPT OF COURT
COMMITTED BY THE ACCUSED PERSONS FOR NOT



OBEYING THE ORDER DATED 16.12.2024 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE OF THIS HONBLE COURT IN WP NO.34270/2024 VIDE ANNEXURE-A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The complainant has filed the present complaint alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 16.12.2024 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P. No.34270/2024 (GM-RES). In terms of the said order, the learned Single Judge had granted interim order as prayed for till the next date of hearing. The interim prayer as sought for by the complainant is re-produced as under:

Pending disposal of this Writ Petition, the Petitioner respectfully prays that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased stay the operation and execution of the impugned order dated 16.11.2024 in No.MaAaSa:CR:153/2024-25 issued by the respondent No.3 cancelling the Work Order issued in favour of the petitioner vide Annexure-A and all further proceedings pursuant thereto and direct the respondent authorities to permit the petitioner to resume/carry on the maintenance and developmental activities specified in the work order and grant such other and further reliefs



as this Hon'ble court deems fit and proper under the circumstances of this case, in the interest of justice and equity.

2. A plain reading of the said order indicates that it had two limbs. First, complainant had sought stay of the operation of the order dated 16.11.2024 whereby the work order was cancelled and second that the direction be issued to the complainant to resume/carry on maintenance and developmental activities specified in the work order.
3. It is the complainant's grievance that while the complainant has been permitted to carry on work, the same is confined to certain items of work order.
4. In view of the above, we find merit in the complainant's contention that given the blanket interim order granted by the learned Single Judge, the accused could not have confined the complainant to carry out execution of the certain works. Subject to further orders that may be passed by the learned Single Judge, the complainant cannot be interdicted from carrying on works in terms of the work order.



5. Learned Government Advocate submits that with this clarification the complainant will not be interdicted till further orders are obtained from the learned Single Judge.

6. In view of the said statement, the complaint is closed with liberty to the complainant to revive the same.

**SD/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**SD/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE**

BS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 8