



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

WRIT PETITION NO. 9109 OF 2026 (CS-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. DR. M.S. MAHADEVSWAMY
S/O M. SHIVAPPA,
AGED 57 YEARS,
2. MAMATHA K.
W/O PRADEEP,
AGED 35 YEARS,
3. SRI GNANA MURTHY M.
S/O MALLIKARJUNA,
AGED 36 YEARS,
4. DR. P. SRINIVAS
S/O PARASHIVAMURTHY,
AGED 50 YEARS,
5. MANJUNATH N.
S/O NATARAJU,
AGED 40 YEARS,
6. SMT. PREMA S.
W/O RAJASHEKARA,
AGED 36 YEARS,
7. PARASHIVAMURTHY M.
S/O MAHADEVIAH,
AGED 52 YEARS,
8. SHIVAKUMAR G.
S/O GOVINDRAJU,





AGED 50 YEARS,

9. DR. P. MANI
S/O PONNAAN,
AGED 50 YEARS,
10. SOMASHEKAR NAYAK
S/O JAVARAIAH,
AGED 55 YEARS,
11. SMT. ABHILASHA K.S.
W/O KIRAN,
AGED 26 YEARS,
12. PRAJWAL R.
S/O RAVISHANKAR,
AGED 28 YEARS,
13. KUMARI N. AKHILA
D/O NAGARAJU
AGED 26 YEARS,

(ALL THE PETITIONERS ARE ALL DIRECTORS OF
KARNATAKA STATE COLLEGE LECTURERS AND
SCHOOL TEACHER HOUSE BUILDING
CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY LTD.
NO.55/1, 3RD CROSS GURUKULA LAYOUT,
J.P.NAGAR, KUPPULRU,
MYSURU - 570 031.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. DEVIPRASAD SHETTY, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF CO-OPERATION,
M.S.BUILDING, AMBEDKAR VEEDI,
BANGALORE - 560 001,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.



2. ADDITIONAL REGISTRAR OF COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES (H & M)
NO.1, ALI ASKER ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 052.
3. KARNATAKA STATE COLLEGE LECTURERS AND SCHOOL TEACHERS HOUSE BUILDING CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY LTD.
NO.55/1, 3RD CROSS GURUKULA LAYOUT,
J.P.NAGAR, KUPPULRU,
MYSURU - 570 031,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY/CEO
(SOCIETY REGISTERED UNDER KARNATAKA CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES ACT, 1959)
4. SRI PRAVEEN KUMAR B.N.
S/O NAGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
R/AT NO.1300, 1ST FLOOR,
21ST 'B' MAIN, HSR LAYOUT, SECTOR 1,
BENGALURU - 560 102.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. YOGESH D. NAIK, AGA FOR R1 & R2;
SRI. KALYAN BASAVARAJ, ADVOCATE FOR R3;
SRI. C. DEVARAJ, ADOVCATE FOR CAVEATOR/R4)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 IN VIDE SL NO.HSG 1/160/HHS/2024-25 DATED 09-01-2026 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE - D AND ETC.

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

In this Writ Petition, the petitioners are assailing the order dated 09.01.2026 at Annexures - D Series.

2. Sri. Deviprasad Shetty, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners contended that the application filed by the impleading applicants before the authority has been allowed, whereas the presence of such respondents is not required for the adjudication of the dispute by the respondent authority under Section 29-C of the Karnataka Co-operative Societies Act, 1959 (for short 'the Act'). Accordingly, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners places reliance on the judgment of this Court in Writ Petition Nos.54844-849/2013 disposed of on 04.03.2014 and submitted that the presence of the private respondents to assist the authority in the impugned proceedings under Section 29-C of the Act is not necessary.



3. Per contra, Sri. C. Devaraj, learned counsel appearing for caveator/respondent No.4 submitted that there is no prejudice for the petitioners herein insofar as challenging the presence of the private respondents in the proceedings.

4. Learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent Nos.1 and 2 submitted that, the order impugned is only an interim measure and therefore the presence of the impleading applicants does not come in way for the resolution of the dispute by the respondent-Authority.

5. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsels appearing for the parties and on careful consideration of the reasons assigned by the respondent authority at paragraph No.3 of the impugned order, I am of the view that, even if the impleading applicants are allowed to participate in the proceedings, the same shall not prejudice the rights of the petitioners herein, despite



the fact that the respondent No.3-Society is a party before the respondent-Authority.

6. In that view of the matter, I find no merit in the writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***dismissed.***

**SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE**

KLV
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 25