



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M
WRIT PETITION NO. 106714 OF 2018 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. S. S. V. ENTERPRISES
SUVIDHA ANNEXE,
OPPOSITE TO SACRED HEART,
CONVENT SCHOOL,
KESHWAPUR, HUBBALLI,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PARTNER,
SRI.VIJAYKUMAR
S/O KRISHNANATHSA KABADI,
AGED ABOUT: 49 YEARS,
OCC: ARCHITECT,
R/O: NO.105, OLD BADAMI NAGAR,
KESHWAPUR, HUBBALLI.
2. SRI.VIJAYKUMAR
S/O KRISHNANATHSA KABADI,
AGED ABOUT: 49 YEARS,
OCC: ARCHITECT,
R/O: NO.105, OLD BADAMI NAGAR,
KESHWAPUR, HUBBALLI.
3. H.V. SARANASWAMY
S/O LATE H. VRUSHABENDRASWAMY,
AGED ABOUT: 57 YEARS,
OCC: BUSINESS,
R/O: HOUSE NO.40-B,
KOTTURESHWAR NILAYA,
2ND MAIN, BASAVESHWARA BADAVANE,
HOSAPETE, DIST: BALLARI.
4. M.V. VENKATAREDDY
S/O LATE M. NARAYANAREDDY,
AGED ABOUT: 64 YEARS,
OCC: RETIRED OFFICIAL,
R/O: HOUSE N.S.-1C,
OFFICIAL COLONY,



TUNGABHADRA ROAD,
HOSAPETE,
DIST: BALLARI.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. VEERESH BUDHIHAL, ADVOCATE [ABSENT])

AND:

1. HUBBALLI-DHARWAD MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER,
LAMINGTON ROAD,
HUBBALLI.
2. DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF TOWN PLANNING
HUBBALLI-DHARWAD CORPORATION OFFICE,
HUBBALLI.
3. THE PRESIDENT,
STANDING COMMITTEE OF
HUBBALLI-DHARWAD MUNICIPAL CORPORATION,
HUBBALLI
DHARWAD DISTRICT-580 001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. BHUSHAN.B.KULKARNI, ADVOCATE FOR R1 TO R3;
SRI. IRANAGOUDA.K.KABBUR, ADVOCATE FOR R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227
OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, SEEKING CERTAIN RELIEFS.

THIS WRIT PETITION IS LISTED FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN
'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS UNDER:

ORAL ORDER

Though matter called twice, there is no representation on
behalf of the petitioners, either personally or through video
conferencing.



2. As could be seen from the daily order sheet, the petition was listed on 05.03.2026, on that day, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioners. Hence, for appearance of counsel for the petitioners, it was ordered to be listed on 24.03.2026.

3. The petition is listed today. As already noted above, though matter called twice, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioners, either personally or through video conferencing. It appears that the petitioners are not interested in prosecuting the petition. Hence, the Writ Petition is ***dismissed for non-prosecution.***

Because of dismissal of the petition, interim order granted if any stands discharged and pending interlocutory applications if any are disposed of.

**Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE**

AM/-
List No.: 1 SI No.: 20