



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 3<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF JULY, 2026**

**PRESENT**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT**

**AND**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K**

**REVIEW PETITION NO. 106 OF 2026**

**BETWEEN:**

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA  
DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY  
ENVIRONMENT AND BIOLOGY  
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY  
M.S. BUILDING,  
BANGALORE- 560 001.
2. THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FOREST  
BANGALORE CIRCLE,  
ARANYA BHAVAN  
MALLESHWARAM 18TH CROSS,  
ARANYA BHAVAN  
BANGALORE- 560 003.
3. THE CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS  
BANGALORE CIRCLE,  
ARANYA BHAVAN  
MALLESHWARAM 18TH CROSS,  
ARANYA BHAVAN  
BANGALORE- 560 003.
4. DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS  
SOCIAL FORESTRY RANGE

Digitally signed by  
PANKAJA S  
Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA



KOLAR-563 003.

5. RANGE FOREST OFFICER  
SOCIAL FORESTRY  
KOLAR RANGE- 563 114.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI.REUBEN JACOB, AAG A/W  
SRI.V.SHIVAREDDY, AGA)

**AND:**

SRI. LAKSHMANA  
S/O LATE VANARASHAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS  
WORKING AS A FOREST WATCHER  
OFFICE OF DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FOREST  
SOCIAL FORESTRY DIVISION  
KOLAR-563 101-

RESIDING AT WARD NO.1  
TAMAKA POST AND VILLAGE  
KOLAR TALUK  
KOLAR DISTRICT- 563 101.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. SUBRAHMANYA BHAT M., ADVOCATE)

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER ORDER XLVII  
RULE 1 READ WITH SECTION 114 OF CPC, 1908 READ WITH  
ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA  
PRAYING TO CALL FOR RECORDS IN W.P.NO.26016/2024 (S-  
KSAT) AND REVIEW AND RECALL THE IMPUGNED ORDER  
DATED 29.04.2025 PASSED IN W.P.NO.26016/2024 (S-KSAT)  
AND ETC.

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT  
and  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

**ORAL ORDER**

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT)

This review petition is filed under Order XLVII Rule 1 read with Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to review the order dated 29.04.2025 in W.P.No.26016/2024.

2. Heard learned AAG Sri.Reuben Jacob, for petitioner-State as well as learned counsel Sri.Subramanya Bhat M., for respondent.

3. Learned counsel Sri.Subramanya Bhat M., would also submit that respondent i.e., petitioner in W.P.No.26016/2024 has also filed an application in I.A.No.1/2025 for clarification clarifying that the petitioner is entitled for regularization of his services with all consequential monetary benefits as has been granted in W.P.No.6238/2020.

4. Parties are referred to as per their ranking before the Writ Court.

5. The petitioner was before this Court questioning the order dated 08.11.2023 in Application No.1114/2023 passed by



the Karnataka State Administrative Tribunal, Bengaluru whereunder the prayer of the petitioner for regularization of his services was rejected. This Court by impugned order dated 29.04.2025 in W.P.No.26016/2024 allowed the writ petition in terms of ***P.Junjappa vs. The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests and others*** in W.P.No.6238/2020.

6. Learned AAG would submit that, the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court disposed of the writ petition without advertng to any factual aspects of the case. According to him, the factual matrix of ***P.Junjappa's*** case stated *supra* is entirely different from that of the present case, in respect of the appointment and service rendered by the respondent i.e., petitioner in the writ petition. As such, the Co-ordinate Bench ought not to have relied on ***P.Junjappa's*** case stated *supra* and allowed the writ petition applying the principle that like cases should be decided alike.

7. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the review petition as well as I.A.No.1/2025 filed in W.P.No.26016/2024, we are of the view that, order under review suffers from error apparent on the face of the record that no factual aspects are taken into consideration while



disposing the writ petition. The Co-ordinate Bench solely relying on ***P. Junjappa's*** case allowed the writ petition, without advertent to the nature of appointment, service and the period of employment of the respondent. Therefore, we are of the considered opinion that the writ petition is required to be re-considered on its merit. In that view of the matter, we are of the view that there is apparent error on the face of the record, as such the review petition succeeds. In the result we pass the following:

ORDER

- i) Review Petition is ***allowed***.
- ii) Order dated 29.04.2025 passed in W.P.No.26016/2024 is set aside and writ petition is restored to its original file.

**SD/-  
(S.G.PANDIT)  
JUDGE**

**SD/-  
(RAJESH RAI K)  
JUDGE**