



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

REVIEW PETITION NO. 88 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SRI SHAIK ROSHAN SUHAIL
S/O. SHABEER AHMED,
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS,
R/AT 69, 14TH CROSS,
AL KAREEM MASJID,
GOVINDAPURA MAIN ROAD,
ARABIC COLLEGE,
BENGALURU - 560 045,

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. TEJAS N., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE COMMISSIONER
GREATER BENGALURU AUTHORITY (GBA)
N.R. SQUARE,
HUDSON CIRCLE,
NEAR CORPORATION, BBMP
BENGALURU - 560 002.

2. MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH,
GREATER BENGALURU AUTHORITY,
SARVAGNANAGAR, COX TOWN,
BENGALURU - 560 008.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. PAWAN KUMAR, ADVOCATE)





THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER ORDER 47 RULE 1 R/W SEC. 114 OF CPC, PRAYING TO ALLOW THE ABOVE REVIEW PETITION BY REVIEWING THE JUDGMENT DATED 02.02.2026 PASSED IN WP NO.1826/2026 (LB-BMP) IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. The petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:-

- i. "Allow the above review petition by reviewing the judgment dated 02.02.2026 passed in WP No.1826/2026 (LB-BMP) in the interest of justice and equity.*
- ii. Allow this petition with costs throughout; and*
- iii. Grant such other and further reliefs as this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant in the circumstances of the case, to meet the ends of justice."*

2. This Court vide order dated 02.02.2026 in W.P.No.1826/2026 taking into consideration that in the RMP-2031, the property of the petitioner was



classified as residential had rejected the said writ petition. Subsequently, the matter has been moved.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner had filed a memo stating that RMP-2031 has been given up and it is RMP-2015 which is applicable.

4. Having perused RMP-2015, it has seen that the property of the petitioner is classified as commercial in nature. That being so, I am of the considered opinion that it is by inadvertence that the petitioner could not place the same on record. Moreso, in view of proposed RMP-2031 having been indicated to come into force, he was not aware of the withdrawal of RMP-2031.

5. In that view of the matter, I pass the following:-

ORDER

- i. The review petition is ***allowed***.



- ii. The order dated 02.02.2026 passed and W.P.No.1826/2026 is recalled.
- iii. W.P.No.1826/2026 is allowed. Respondents are directed to consider the representation dated 25.11.2025 as per Annexure - B, in terms of RMP-2015 and grant the trade license requested for on compliance with all other requirements under the Greater Bengaluru Governance Act, 2024 within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
- iv. Needless to say if all compliances have been made, the respondents shall open the seal of the shop or the premise of the petitioner and hand it over to the petitioner within the like time frame.

SD/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

MH/-
List No.: 2 SI No.: 15