



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

WRIT PETITION NO. 6574 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. B.P.GANAPATHY,
S/O. LATE B.B.PONNAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS
R/O. KONA JAGERI VILLAGE,
PARANE POST, NAPOKLU NAD,
MADIKERI TALUK,
KODAGU DISTRICT-571214.
2. PALEYANDA A BASAPPA
S/O. LATE PALEYANDA AIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
R/O. PALANGALA VILLAGE,
KEDAMULLOOR POST,
VIRAJPET TALUK,
KODAGU DISTRICT-571218.
3. K.A.LAVAKUMAR
S/O. LATE K.APPACHU
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
4. K.A.KUSHAKUMAR
S/O. LATE K.APPACHU
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS

PETITIONERS NO.3 AND 4 ARE
R/O. PODAVADA VILLAGE,
ARAPATTU POST, NAPOKLU HOBLI,
MADIKERI TALUK,
KODAGU DISTRICT-571214



5. C.K.POOVANNA
S/O. C.K.KALAI AH
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS
R/O. NO.9, SOUTH COORG CLUB BUILDING,
GENERAL THIMMAIAH ROAD,
VIRAJPET, KODAGU-571218

WORKING AS ELECTED PRESIDENT,
BAR ASSOCIATION OF VIRAJPET

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SACHIN B.S., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF LAW,
JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
ROOM NO.33, GROUND FLOOR,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE REGISTRAR GENERAL
HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA
OPPOSITE TO VIDHANA SOUDHA,
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ADITYA DIWAKARA, AGA FOR R1;
SMT. KRUTIKA RAGHAVAN, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 OF 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO A) QUASH THE NOTIFICATION ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.1 BEARING NO.LAW LCE/321/2025 DATED 12.12.2025 WITHDRAWING THE JURISDICTION OF 7 VILLAGES FROM THE COURTS OF VIRAJPET AND TRANSFERRING TO THE COURTS OF KODAGU-MADIKERI AS PER ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

The captioned writ petition is instituted by the litigants and office bearers of the Virajpet Bar Association, calling in question the Government Notification dated 12.12.2025 (Annexure-A), whereby the jurisdiction of seven villages has been withdrawn from the Courts at Virajpet and consequently reallocated to the Courts at Kodagu-Madikeri. The petitioners have also assailed the consequential proceedings and order passed by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Kodagu, giving effect to the said notification.

2. Learned Additional Government Advocate, on instructions, has filed a memo placing on record the very same Government Notification dated 12.12.2025, which is also produced by the petitioners at Annexure-A. The said notification indicates that the reallocation of territorial jurisdiction has been undertaken in the backdrop of



administrative exigencies arising out of the formation/reorganisation of a new Taluka and for ensuring effective and convenient administration of justice.

3. This Court, on careful examination of the impugned notification, finds that the local limits of jurisdiction of seven villages, which were hitherto falling within the jurisdiction of the Courts at Virajpet, have now been withdrawn and included within the jurisdiction of the Courts at Madikeri. The notification further discloses that the said reorganisation and reallocation of jurisdiction has been effected by the State Government in consultation with the High Court, as mandated under the relevant statutory framework governing the establishment and territorial jurisdiction of civil courts.

4. The reallocation of territorial jurisdiction of courts, particularly in the context of formation of a new Taluka or administrative reorganisation, is essentially a matter of policy. Such decisions are taken to streamline



judicial administration, ensure accessibility, and cater to the needs of the litigant public at large. When such a policy decision is taken by the State in consultation with the High Court, the scope of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is extremely limited. Unless the decision is demonstrated to be arbitrary, mala fide, or in violation of statutory provisions, this Court would be slow to interfere with such administrative and policy decisions.

5. In the present case, the petitioners have not made out any legally sustainable ground to demonstrate that the impugned notification suffers from arbitrariness or illegality warranting interference. The mere inconvenience alleged by the members of the Bar or few litigants cannot be a ground to invalidate a policy decision taken in larger public interest and in consultation with the High Court.

6. In that view of the matter, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case is made out for



interference with the impugned notification or the consequential proceedings.

The writ petition, being devoid of merit, is accordingly ***dismissed***.

SD/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE

CA
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 62