



HC-KAR

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.9620 OF 2026 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI N. SATHISH SHINDE,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
S/O. NAMADEVA SHINDE,
PROPRIETOR, M/S. SRI. LAKSHMI METAL STORE,
VINAYAKA BLOCK,
BENGALURU ROAD,
CHALLAKERE TOWN, CHALLAKERE,
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT-577 522.
2. SRI. M. RAMAKRISHNA SETTY,
AGED ABOUT 77 YEARS,
S/O. MUDDURANGAIAH,
PROPRIETOR
M/S. SRI. RANGADHAMA PROVISION STORE,
KUBERA NAGARA, CHALLAKERE TOWN,
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT-577 522.
3. SRI. N. RAVI,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
S/O. NAMADEVA SHINDE,
PROPRIETOR
M/S. RAVI METAL STORE,
SHOP NO.01 (OLD NO.68/99),
BENGALURU ROAD, CHALLAKERE TOWN,
CHALLAKERE,
CHITRADURGA DISTRICT-577 522.

...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 W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE/QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER ISSUED BY THE 3RD RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONERS AS (a). NA.CHA/KAM.SHA/C.R./NO.01/2025-26 DATED 24-02-2026; ETC.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, 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 licence to the petitioners to carry on business in shops at Challakere Town. The period of 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 said 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:17095
WP No. 9620 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.: 1