



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

WRIT APPEAL NO. 980 OF 2025 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

M/S. ANURADHA PROPERTY AND
TOWNSHIPS PVT. LTD.,
NO.603, 15TH CROSS J.P. NAGAR,
6TH PHASE OPP. TO LAST BUS STOP,
BANGALORE - 560 078.

REPRESENTED BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR
SRI. M. RAMACHANDRA REDDY,
S/O M. SUBBA REDDY.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. ROOPESHA B., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF TOWN AND
COUNTRY PLANNING,
M.S.BUILDING,
BANGALORE - 560 001.





2. THE JOINT DIRECTOR AND
MEMBER SECRETARY,
ANEKAL PLANNING AUTHORITY,
ANEKAL - 560 099.
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT.
3. SRI. SUBBANNA,
S/O NYATAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
R/AT HARAGADDE VILLAGE,
JIGANI HOBLI, ANEKAL TALUK,
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT,
BENGALURU - 560 105.
4. SRI. M. VENKATESH,
S/O LATE MUNIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
R/O VENUS COUNTY LAYOUT,
JIGANI HOBLI, ANEKAL TALUK,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU - 560 105.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.M.N.SUDEV HEGDE, AGA FOR R1;
SRI.YOGESH NAIK, ADVOCATE FOR R2;
SRI.RAVI SHANKAR A., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI.T.N.VISWANATHA, ADVOCATE FOR C/R3;
SRI.B.M.UMASHANKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R4)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S 4 OF THE KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT PRAYING TO ALLOW THIS APPEAL AND SET
ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 22.04.2025 PASSED BY THE
HONBLE SINGLE JUDGE IN WP No-45224/2015 (LB-RES).

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING,
THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH)

Heard Sri. Roopesh, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri. A Ravishankar, learned eminent counsel appearing on behalf of Sri. T N Vishwanatha, learned counsel on record for Caveator/respondent No.3.

2. This intra-Court appeal has been filed impugning the judgment and order dated 22.04.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.45224/2015 (L-RES). The parties are referred to as per their rank before the writ Court for the sake of convenience.

3. The petitioner filed writ petition challenging the plans approved by the Anekal Planning Authority for formation of residential layouts in respect of the lands bearing Sy. Nos. 65/4. 66/1, 66/2 and 66/3 of Haragadde Village, Jigani Hobli, Anekal Taluk, Bengaluru Urban



District. The petitioner has also challenged the notice issued by the Planning Authority calling upon the petitioner to produce the documents relating to the order of conversion which he had obtained in respect of the lands in the aforesaid survey numbers from agricultural use to non-agricultural use. The fourth respondent - M/s Anuradha Property and Townships Pvt. Ltd., had made an application on 04.08.2008 for sanctioning the plans for formation of residential layout in respect of the lands mentioned hereinabove on the basis of Joint Development Agreement. The plans were sanctioned by the Planning Authority and the petitioner had even executed the Relinquishment Deed for formation of the roads and parks, etc., The petitioner by filing the writ petition had challenged the very order whereby the Planning Authority had approved the plans for formation of the residential layout contending that the Joint Development Agreement was not executed by him neither he had executed any Power of Attorney in favour of Mr. Ramachahadra Reddy,



Managing Director of M/s Anuradha Property and Townships Pvt. Ltd., nor he had made any application for approval of the layout plan. The learned Single Judge considering these submissions has quashed the approved Layout Plan dated 30.06.2009 and also the Relinquishment Deed executed by the petitioner in respect of the aforesaid lands.

4. The learned counsel for the appellant as well as learned counsel appearing for Anekal Planning Authority would submit that the petitioner has put his signatures on the application for approved plan and after the plans are approved, then only the petitioner has executed the Relinquishment Deed in terms of the order approving the plans. Therefore the petitioner cannot turn around and say that the plans were approved without his consent and he has not executed the Joint Development Agreement or the Power of Attorney.

5. On the other hand, Mr. A Ravishankar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/respondent No.3



herein submitted that he has not put his signatures on the Joint Development Agreement or on the Power of Attorney and his signatures are forged on the application and approved plan.

6. The assertion of learned counsel Mr. A Ravishankar appearing for the petitioner has been completely doubted by the appellant/fourth respondent and the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent - Anekal Planning Authority. Thus, these questions would not have been decided in the writ petition, they being disputed question of facts. Further the dispute between the petitioner and M/s. Anuradha Property and Townships Pvt. Ltd., is in the form of private dispute, the public law remedy would not be available for settling a private dispute. Therefore, the writ petition itself was not maintainable under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Hence, we are of the considered view that the learned Single Judge has wrongly entertained the writ petition and granted the relief. We



therefore, allow the writ appeal and set aside the impugned judgment and order passed by the learned Single Judge. However, the parties would be at liberty to settle their dispute/s in appropriate civil law remedy that may be available to them.

With the aforesaid observations, this appeal is ***allowed*** and the writ petition stands dismissed.

The pending applications if any, also stand dismissed.

The parties are directed to maintain *status quo* for a period of one month in respect of the possession and ownership of the property in question.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(T.M.NADAF)
JUDGE**

Bsv
List No.: 1 SI No.: 20