



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M
WRIT PETITION NO. 103689 OF 2022 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

SHRI. S. NANJUNDA S/O. NARASAPPA SHETTY
AGE: 83 YEARS, OCC: RETIRED,
R/O. NEAR USHA NURSING HOME,
1ST CROSS, VINAYAK NAGAR,
SHIVAMOGGA,
TQ AND DIST. SHIVAMOGGA-577201.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. AKSHAY.R.MENASINKAI, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. SHIVRAJ.S.BALLOLI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE COMMISSIONER,
CITY CORPORATION OF BELAGAVI,
BELAGAVI-590016.
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
M.S.BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.P.N.HATTI, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI.VINAY.S.KOUJALAGI, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

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

Sri.Akshay R.Menasinkai., counsel on behalf of Sri.Shivraj S.Balloli., for the petitioner, Sri.P.N.Hatti., HCGP for respondent No.1 and Sri.Vinay S.Koujalagi., counsel for respondent No.2 have appeared in person.

2. The present Writ Petition is filed seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing Respondent No.2 to accord approval to Respondent No.1 for allotment of an alternative site to the petitioner, in terms of the requisition made by Respondent No.1 vide letter dated 06.12.2021, produced as Annexure-F.

3. Counsel appearing for the respective parties have advanced their arguments at length. The Court has carefully considered the submissions made and perused the material available on record.

4. Counsel for Respondent No.2 submits that Respondent No.2 has already forwarded a proposal to the Government seeking necessary permission for allotment of the site in favor of the petitioner. However, it is submitted that, as on date, the Government has not accorded its approval.



5. In view of the grievance expressed by the petitioner and taking into consideration the submission made on behalf of Respondent No.2, this Court deems it appropriate to direct the Government to consider the proposal forwarded by Respondent No.2.

6. Accordingly, the Government is directed to consider the proposal sent by Respondent No.2 and take an appropriate decision in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, and in any event, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

7. With the above observations and directions, the Writ Petition stands ***disposed of***.

Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE

MRP
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 39