



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2025

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.9382 OF 2023 (GM-FOR)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. LAKSHMAMMA
W/O LATE SRINIVAS,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS.
2. GOPINATH
S/O LATE SRINIVAS,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS.

BOTH ARE R/AT:
C/O MAHADEVA,
K.M. BADAVANE,
PERIYAPATNA TOWN,
MYSURU - 571 107.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SMT. MANJULADEVI R. KAMADOLLI, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by
ARUNKUMAR M S
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
FOREST ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT,
M.S. BUILDING
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR
FOREST OFFICER,
ARANYA BHAVANA,
MALLESHWARAM,
BENGALURU - 03.



3. CONSERVATOR OF FOREST
ARANYA BHAVANA,
MYSURU DISTRICT,
MYSURU - 570 001.
4. DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FOREST
HUNSUR TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 105.
5. JAYALAKSHMI
W/O LATE KRISHNAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
R/AT SRINIVAS SAW MILL
AND WOOD INDUSTRY, ABBUR ROAD,
PERIYAPATNA TOWN AND TALUK
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 107.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MAHANTESH SHETTAR, AGA FOR R1 TO R4;
SRI. A. LOURDU MARIYAPPA, ADVOCATE FOR C/R5)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.4- DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FOREST, HUNSUR DIVISION, HUNSUR DATED 15TH MARCH, 2023 VIDE ANNEXURE-A; AND ETC.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

In this writ petition, petitioners are challenging the Notification dated 15th March, 2023 (Annexure-A) issued by the respondent No.4.



2. Heard Smt. Manjuladevi R. Kamadolli, learned counsel appearing for petitioners; Sri. Mahantesh Shettar, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondents 1 to 4; and Sri. A. Lourdu Mariyappa, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.5.

3. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on perusal of the finding recorded by the respondent No.4 in the impugned order dated 15th March, 2023 (Annexure-A), the same would indicate that, originally the licence in respect of running the Wood Industry at Rajapura, Periyapatna Taluk was issued in the name of one Srinivas, husband of the petitioner No.1. Thereafter, the husband of the petitioner No.1 died on 08th July, 1996 and as such, the licence was transferred in the name of V. Krishnappa, husband of the respondent No.5 at the instance of the petitioner No.1 and the said licence continuously stands in the name of V. Krishnappa. In that view of the matter, in view of the internal dispute between the petitioners and the respondent No.5 being the family dispute, the respondent No.4 had passed the impugned order directing to maintain status-quo in respect of the licence. Therefore as there is a civil dispute between the family of



**NC: 2025:KHC:41392
WP NO.9382 OF 2023**

petitioners and the respondent No.5, I am of the view that, there is no infirmity in the impugned order passed by the respondent No.4. Accordingly, writ petition is ***dismissed.***

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

ARK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 3