

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
[SLV ENTERPRISES VS. KARNATAKA STATE ELECTRONICS
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (KEONICS) AND OTHERS]

25.02.2026
(VIDEO CONFERENCING)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

Sri Purushothama J., the Additional Commissioner, Road Safety Authority, is present and he has also made his submissions.

Sri Nishanth A V, the learned counsel for the first respondent, inviting this Court's attention to the Affidavit filed, clarifies that the first respondent cannot assert any concluded contract with the second respondent as contemplated under the Work Orders issued by the second respondent.

Smt. Saritha Kulkarni, the learned Additional Government Advocate, relying upon the statements made in the objection statement, and on instructions from Sri Purushothama J, submits that no onus could be placed on the second respondent to answer the petitioner's claim, which is in excess of Rs. 2,45,00,000/- because the first

respondent has not ensured compliance with the requirements such as conclusion of agreement, securing the approval for the awareness content for which the work orders are issued and posting that content on the authority's Social Media.

This Court, *prima facie*, opines that there could be differences on non-compliances and these differences could even enable the second respondent to avoid its liability, but this Court will also have to decide on the adjunct question of calling upon the first respondent, which does not dispute the agreement with the petitioner or that the petitioner has executed the work to its satisfaction or the liability to pay the contracted amount, should be called upon to pay this amount.

The office is directed to re-list this petition on **02.03.2026.**

(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

NV

List No.: 1 Sl No.: 2