



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN

WRIT PETITION NO.9672 OF 2026 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. MANJUNATHA A.,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
S/O. ANJANAPPA,
PROPRIETOR, M/S. DARJI TAILORS,
SHOP NO.47, 1ST FLOOR,
INDIRA COMPLEX, BENGALURU ROAD,
CHALLAKERE,
CHALLAKERE - 577 522
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT.
2. SRI. N. SRINIVASA,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
S/O. LATE SATYANARAYANA,
PROPRIETOR, M/S. SRINIVAS BANGLE STORES,
SHOP NO.16 (OLD NO.53/85),
VINAYAKA COMPLEX, BENGALURU ROAD,
CHALLAKERE,
CHALLAKERE - 577 522
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. K. RAMA BHAT, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REP. BY ITS UNDER SECRETARY TO GOVT.,





TOWN PLANNING DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

2. THE ASST. EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
PWD DEPARTMENT (SUB-DIVISION),
CHALLAKERE - 577 522,
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT.
3. THE COMMISSIONER,
CHALLAKERE MUNICIPALITY,
CHALLAKERE TOWN,
CHITRADURGA - 577 522.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. BOPANNA B., AGA FOR R.1 & R.2;
SMT. G.K. BHAVANA, ADVOCATE FOR R.3.)

THIS PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE/QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 TO THE PETITIONERS AS (a) NA.CHA/KAM.SHA/C.R/NO.1/2025-26 DATED 02.03.2026; ETC.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THROUGH PHYSICAL HEARING/VIDEO CONFERENCING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN



ORAL ORDER

1. Respondent No.3 had granted a licence to the petitioners to carry on business in shops at Challakere Town. The period of the licence has long expired. The petitioners have no right to occupy the said premises. In fact, an obligation is cast on respondent No.3 to auction the said shops to the highest bidder and collect maximum licence fee. The petitioners in the instant writ petition are challenging the action of respondent No.3 to have them vacated from the premises.

2. As the petitioners are having no right, title or interest over the property concerned, respondent No.3 is at liberty to have them vacated from the premises in the manner known to law and that is what they have sought to do.

3. When the petitioners were asked a pointed question as to what is the time required for them to vacate the premises, they are unable to answer the same.



**NC: 2026:KHC:17097
WP No. 9672 of 2026**

4. As the petitioners are not having any right in the premises, the writ petition is dismissed.

**Sd/-
(M.I.ARUN)
JUDGE**

hkh.
List No.: 3 Sl No.: 5