



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M

WRIT PETITION NO. 102497 OF 2026 (APMC)

BETWEEN:

SRI. NARAYANADRI RICE INDUSTRIES,
SITE NO.15, APMC YARD KAMPLI,
BY ITS PARTNER SRI. KEDARESHWARA RAO,
S/O. SUBBARAYUDU, AGE: 60 YEARS,
OCC: PARTNER AND BUSINESS,
R/O. OPPOSITE AGRI FORM BY-PASS ROAD,
KAMPLI, DIST. BALLARI-583132.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HANUMANTHAREDDY SAHUKAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE JOINT DIRECTOR (PLANNING),
AGRICULTURE MARKETING DEPARTMENT,
NO.II, RAJBHAVAN ROAD,
BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE AGRICULTURE MARKETING COMMITTEE
(APMC) HOSAPETE,
DIST. VIJAYANAGARA-583201,
BY ITS SECRETARY.
3. THE AGRICULTURE MARKETING COMMITTEE
(APMC) KOTTAL ROAD KAMPLI,
DIST. BALARI-583132,
BY ITS SECRETARY.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. MALA.B.BHUTE, AGA FOR R1;
SRI.P.N.HATTI, ADVOCATE FOR R2 TO 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,
THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS UNDER:



ORAL ORDER

Sri.Hanumanthareddy Sahukar., counsel for the petitioner,
Smt.Mala B.Bhute., AGA for respondent No.1 and Sri.P.N.Hatti.,
counsel for respondents 2 to 3 have appeared in person.

2. The petition is filed seeking following reliefs:

- A. A writ in the nature of certiorari or any other writ or order or direction quashing the order dated 25.04.2025 bearing No.Kra Sum/Kra U Ma Sa/Kampli/Niveshana/27-31/2025-26 passed by the respondent No.3, produced as Annexure-B.
- B. Such other writ or order or direction as deemed fit under the facts and circumstances of the case including an order for cost may kindly be passed, in the interest of justice and equity.

3. Petitioner was allotted with Site No.15 measuring 30 feet x 70 feet in Kampli sub-market yard on lease-cum-sale agreement dated 30.05.2012 and one of the conditions stipulated in the lease-cum-sale agreement was that the petitioner was required to put up construction on the site allotted to him within one year. However, the petitioner did not put up the construction within one year as specified in the lease-cum-sale agreement and as such respondent No.3-Committee passed an order forfeiting the site in question in favor of the committee. Hence, this writ petition.



4. Counsel appearing for the respective parties jointly submits that the issue involved in this present writ petition is squarely covered by the order passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in W.P. Nos.61847-61850 of 2009, disposed of on 12.03.2009. Hence, this writ petition also requires to be disposed of in terms of the order passed in the aforesaid writ petitions.

5. Taking note of the said submission the Writ Petition is disposed of in terms of order passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in W.P. Nos.61847-61850 of 2009, disposed of on 12.03.2009.

6. Accordingly, I pass the following:

ORDER

- i. Impugned order of forfeiture dated 25.04.2025 passed by respondent No.3 is kept in abeyance for a period of one year from today.
- ii. The petitioner shall make application for sanction of the plan for putting up the construction on the said plot within six weeks from today.



- iii. The 2nd and 3rd respondent shall consider the anticipated application for the plan sanctioned within five weeks thereafter in accordance with law.
- iv. The petitioner shall put up the building within an outer limit of nine months from the date of receipt of sanctioned plan.
- v. If the petitioner defaults in adhering to the time schedule stipulated hereinabove, the impugned forfeiture order shall stand automatically revived.
- vi. Writ petition is **disposed of** in the above terms. However, the petitioner shall pay costs of Rs.15,000/- as compensation to respondent No.3-Committee for having defaulted in completing the construction within the time specified in lease-cum-sale agreement.

Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE