



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 32435 OF 2025 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

MANASA CHANDRA MAYANNA SANABAGHATTA
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
S/O.LATE. MAYANNA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS GPA HOLDER
SMT. K V SHANTHA,
AGED ABOUT 83 YEARS
W/O. LATE S M MAYANNA,
R/AT NO.47, 5TH MAIN ROAD,
R.P.C. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR 2ND STAGE,
HAMPINAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 040

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. B.S. JEEVAN KUMAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT NANDA JAGADEESH
W/O. JAGDEESH,
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
R/AT NO.49, 5TH MAIN ROAD,
R.P.C. LAYOUT, VIJAYANAGAR,
2ND STAGE, HAMPINAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 040
2. THE COMMISSIONER,
BRUHATH BENGALURU MAHANAGARA PALIKE,



N.R.SQUARE,
BENGALURU-01

3. THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER
GREATER BENGALURU AUTHORITY,
B.B.M.P OFFICE,
BENGALURU-01
 4. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
VIJAYANAGAR SUB-DIVISION,
BENGALURU WEST NAGARA PALIKE WARD-2
OFFICE AT SHASAKARA BHAVANA,
2ND FLOOR, 3RD MAIN ROAD,
VIJAYANAGAR,
BENGALURU-560 040.
 5. GREATER BENGALURU AUTHORITY
NO.1, ALI ASKAR ROAD,
LRDE BUILDING,
BANGALORE-560 052
- ...RESPONDENTS
- (BY SRI. VIVEK S. REDDY, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. HEGDE M. MAHABALESHWAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1
SMT. M.R. SINCHANA, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO R5)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT TO THE RESPONDENTS A. TO THE SECONDS RESPONDENTS TO INITIATE FURTHER ACTION PURSUANT TO THE NOTICE ISSUED TO R1 NO. 22.09.2025 OF BBMP ACT ANNEXURE-K AND ETC.

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



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

ORAL ORDER

On the allegation that respondent No.1 has put up construction in violation of building bye-laws and sanction plan, the petitioner made a complaint to the Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike now Greater Bengaluru Authority. However, on the ground that adequate action has not been initiated against respondent No.1, the present writ petition is filed. The grievance of the petitioner is that the construction put up by respondent No.1 is in violation of building bye-laws and sanction plan is required to be removed.

2. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 submits that in the light of the amended bye-laws, much of the construction being put up by respondent No.1 can be saved. However, he submits that after due inspection, he is agreeable to demolition of that portion of the constructed property, which is in the violation of building bye-laws.



3. Learned counsel for the Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike/Greater Bengaluru Authority, upon instructions, submits that the matter between the petitioner and respondent No.1 is also being heard by Joint Commissioner and a decision will be taken on the construction being put up by respondent No.1 immediately thereafter. Hence, the following:

ORDER

- i) Liberty is granted to respondent No.1 to apply for modified sanction plan.
- ii) Greater Bengaluru Authority shall consider the request of respondent No.1 and also hear the petitioner and inspect the property and thereafter take a decision as to what extent of building being constructed by respondent No.1 is in violation of the present building bye-laws and pass an order for demolition of the same.



- iii) In the event, any of the construction being put up by respondent No.1 is found to be violation of present building bye-laws, the same shall be demolished by the respondents.
- iv) Till such a decision is taken by Greater Bengaluru Authority, respondent No.1 shall not put up any additional construction on the property and respondent Nos.2 to 4 shall not precipitate the matter against respondent No.1.
- v) The entire aforementioned exercise will be completed by respondent Nos.2 to 4 within a period of three months from today.

The writ petition is accordingly ***disposed of.***

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