

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
[SRI B MAHESHA VS. THE MAINTENANCE AND WELFARE
OF PARENTS AND SENIOR CITIZENS TRIBUNAL AND
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER AND OTHERS]

18.03.2026

(VIDEO CONFERENCING / PHYSICAL HEARING)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

The service of notice to the second, fifth and sixth respondents, because notices are returned 'unclaimed', is held sufficient. The question that must be considered at this stage is in the light of this Court's order dated 26.02.2026 on the alleged participation by the incumbent jurisdictional Deputy Tahsildar, Mr. Deepak N, and this Court's order in this regard reads as under:

"5. The incumbent jurisdictional Deputy Tahsildar is called upon to file an explanation into this Court on the occasion for availing police help to recover possession in the manner that is seen in the photographs despite the advice on this Court's order. This explanation shall be filed within a week from today. The Registry is directed to furnish a copy of this order to Sri B Ravindranath so that he can furnish the jurisdictional Deputy Tahsildar [over E-mail].

This order shall constitute a notice to the Deputy Tahsildar on why this Court must not direct the concerned disciplinary authority to initiate proceedings for possible misconduct."

Mr. Deepak N is present in person and he is represented in his personal capacity by Mr Narayan M Naik. The learned counsel is permitted to appear because this Court, after extending an opportunity to offer explanation, could consider issuing directions for initiating disciplinary proceedings.

Mr. Narayan M Naik submits that Mr Deepak N tenders unconditional apology if there could be any impression of having acted in excess of his jurisdiction or in violation of this Court's order; and in elaboration, the learned counsel submits that **[a]** he was present at the premises because the Senior Citizen [*the second respondent*] voluntarily offered to handover the keys and requested for his presence stating that she would be constrained to take some drastic measure if he was not present and **[b]** the petitioner is in occupation of the second and third floors and

there was no effort to dispossess the petitioner from these premises.

In consideration of these submissions, the contemplated proceedings are closed. The interim order granted earlier to protect the petitioner's possession of the second and third floor premises in the subject property is continued to be in force until further orders but stipulating that the petitioner shall continue to pay the second respondent the monthly maintenance of Rs.10,000/- as directed earlier.

The office is directed to re-list this petition before the roster Bench on **06.04.2026** clarifying that this petition is no longer treated as part heard.

(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

AN/-
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 15