



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. MURALIDHARA PAI

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 100011 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SHRI RAJU S/O MARUTI SURYAVANSHI,
AGE. 48 YEARS, OCC. BUSINESS,
R/O. BAGALKOT, NOW AT EWS 139,
JAYANAGAR, HUDCO COLONY,
VIJAYAPURA-560 041.

... COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI SUHAS K. HOSAMANI, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI HARISH S. MAIGUR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SHRI S.M. JAMDAR,
AGE. MAJOR, OCC. THE COMMISSIONER (R AND R),
UPPER KRISHNA PROJECT (UKP),
NAVANAGAR, BAGALKOT-587 101.

2. SHRI D. BASAVARAJ,
AGE. MAJOR, OCC. THE CHIEF ENGINEER,
BAGALKOT TOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(BTDA), NAVANAGAR, BAGALKOT-587 101.

3. SHRI NAVEENPRASAD B. KATTIMANI,
AGE. MAJOR, OCC. THE REHABILITATION OFFICER,
BAGALKOT TOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(BTDA), NAVANAGAR, BAGALKOT-587 101.

... ACCUSED

4. SHRI THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF SECRETARY.

... PROFORMA RESPONDENT

(BY SRI SHARAD V. MAGADUM, ADVOCATE FOR A1;
SRI SANJAY CHANNAL, ADVOCATE FOR A2 AND A3)





THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTION 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, R/W ARTICLE 215 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, 1950, PRAYING TO PUNISH THE ACCUSED HEREIN FOR DISOBEYING THE ORDER DATED 04.04.2025 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE OF THIS COURT IN W.P. NO.102102/2025 (LB-RES) AS PER ANNEXURE-B AND ETC.

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

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. MURALIDHARA PAI

ORAL ORDER

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN)

1. In W.P. No.102102/2025, the learned Single Judge passed the following order:

"5. A Mandamus is ordered directing respondents 2 and 3 to consider the representation dated:27.02.2024 vide Annexure-D in accordance with the law, within six weeks from the receipt of certified copy of this order, if not already considered.

6. Resultantly, the Writ Petition is **disposed of**.

This Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case."

2. The request of the complainant/petitioner has been considered by accused No.3 – the Rehabilitation Officer and an endorsement has been issued stating that, as the complainant



has not produced all the relevant documents, a favourable order cannot be passed in his favour. It is further stated that if all the necessary documents are produced, the case of the complainant would be considered.

3. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that the complainant will produce all the necessary documents and that the contempt petition may be dropped.

4. His submission is placed on record.

5. For the aforesaid reasons, the contempt petition is hereby dismissed.

6. It is needless to state that if the decision of accused No.3 is not acceptable to the complainant, he is at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law.

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

**Sd/-
(B. MURALIDHARA PAI)
JUDGE**