



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

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

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. MURALIDHARA PAI

WRIT APPEAL NO. 100532 OF 2024 (GM-KSR)

BETWEEN:

1. THE MARATHA VIDYA PRASARAK MANDAL,
NIPPANI, GHATTE GALLI, NIPPANI,
TALUK NIPPANI,
DIST: BELAGAVI,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN,
ROHAN S/O. ANIL SALVE.
2. SRI. ROHAN,
S/O. ANIL SALVE,
AGE: 55, OCC: BUSINESS,
CHAIRMAN- MARATHA VIDYA PRASARAK
MANDAL NIPPANI,
GHATTE GALLI, NIPPANI, AT. NIPPANI,
TALUK. NIPPANI,
DIST. BELAGAVI.
3. SRI. RAVINDRA,
S/O. TUKARAM SHINDE,
AGE- 53, OCC: BUSINESS,
VICE-PRESIDENT- MARATHA VIDYA
PRASARAK MANDAL, NIPPANI,





GHATTE GALLI, NIPPANI, AT. NIPPANI,
TALUK: NIPPANI,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

4. SRI. VIJAY,
S/O. RAJARAM GHATAGE,
AGE- 70, OCC: BUSINESS,
SECRETARY- MARATHA
VIDYA PRASARAK MANDAL, NIPPANI,
GHATTE GALLI, NIPPANI, AT. NIPPANI,
TALUK: NIPPANI,
DIST: BELAGAVI.
5. SRI. VIJAY,
S/O. VISWAS SURYAVANSHI,
AGE-36, OCC: BUSINESS,
TREASURER- MARATHA
VIDYA PRASARAK MANDAL, NIPPANI,
GHATTE GALLI, NIPPANI, AT: NIPPANI,
TALUK: NIPPANI,
DIST: BELAGAVI.
6. SRI. VIJAY,
S/O. AMBAJIRAO DESAI,
AGE: 65 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS,
MEMBER- MARATHA VIDYA PRASARAK
MANDAL, NIPPANI, GHATTE GALLI,
NIPPANI, AT-NIPPANI,
TALUK-NIPPANI,
DIST-BELAGAVI.
7. SRI. CHANDRAKANT,
S/O. TUKARAM JASUD,
AGE- 63 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS,
MEMBER- MARATHA VIDYA PRASARAK
MANDAL, NIPPANI, GHATTE GALLI,



NIPPANI, AT: NIPPANI,
TALUK: NIPPANI,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

8. SRI. SUKUMAR,
S/O. MANOHAR BHAT,
AGE- 64 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS,
MEMBER-MARATHA VIDYA PRASARAK
MANDAL, NIPPANI, GHATTE GALLI,
NIPPANI, AT: NIPPANI,
TALUK: NIPPANI,
DIST: BELAGAVI.
9. SRI. DR. VINAYAK JANARDHAN NIRMALE,
AGE-45 , OCC: DOCTOR,
MEMBER- MARATHA VIDYA PRASARAK
MANDAL, NIPPANI,
GHATTE GALLI, NIPPANI, AT: NIPPANI,
TALUK: NIPPANI,
DIST. BELAGAVI.
10. RAJENDRA,
S/O. CHANRAO AMBALE,
AGE- 38, OCC: BUSINESS,
MEMBER- MARATHA
VIDYA PRASARAK MANDAL, NIPPANI,
GHATTE GALLI, NIPPANI, AT: NIPPANI,
TALUK: NIPPANI,
DIST: BELAGAVI.
11. SRI. SANYOJIT,
S/O. ASHOK PATIL,
AGE- 34, OCC: AGRICULTURE,
MEMBER-MARATHA VIDYA PRASARAK
MANDAL, NIPPANI,
GHATTE GALLI, NIPPANI,



AT: NIPPANI, TALUK: NIPPANI,
DIST. BELAGAVI.

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. MRUTYUNJAY TATA BANGI, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. S.S. YALIGAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
M S BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE DISTRICT REGISTRAR OF
SOCIETIES,
JAKKERI HOND,
BELAGAVI - 590 001.

... RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. SHARAD V. MAGADUM, AGA FOR R1 & R2)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, PRAYING TO, SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN W.P.NO.148810/2020 DATED 17.12.2021 AND ALLOW THE WRIT PETITION IN ENTIRETY WITH EXEMPLARY COSTS BY ALLOWING THE PRESENT WRIT APPEAL IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS WRIT APPEAL, ALONG WITH I.A. NO.1/2024 FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:



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

ORAL JUDGMENT

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

Aggrieved by the order, dated 17.12.2021, passed in
W.P. No.148810/2020, the present writ appeal is filed.

2. There is an inordinate delay of 1001 days in filing
the appeal. The reasons assigned for the delay in filing the
appeal are as follows:

"7. It is submitted that, after disposal of the writ petition the counsel for the appellants informed the appellants about the order passed by this Hon'ble Court. The Chairman is not keeping good health and he is intermittently being admitted to the hospital at Kolhapur. It is submitted that, the appellants where under the bona-fide impression as section 25 is applicable. It is submitted that, the appellants 2 to 11 being the members could not meet at a place and came to unanimous decision to file an appeal. It is submitted that many of the members being aged persons also not keeping good health. The decision to face enquiry or to file the appeal was getting postponed. In the mean while the appellants came to know that the enquiry officer has given the reports, without holding any enquiry then as advised by the counsel, and also took opinion from several counsels from Dharwad and Bangalore who advised the appellants to file an appeal before this Hon'ble Court. The appellants have challenged the enquiry report in separate writ petition. It is submitted that, the appellants contacted the counsel in the month of July 2024 and counsel without any further delay prepared



the appeal, hence there is delay in preferring the application and is because of the bona-fide reasons stated above, which is neither deliberate nor intentional and because of the bona-fide reasons stated above and hence it is just and equitable to condone the delay caused in filling this appeal.”

The respondents have objected to the same.

3. The explanation given by the appellants is not sufficient to condone the delay of 1001 days. The appellants are required to explain each and every day's delay satisfactorily, which they have failed to do so under the facts and circumstances of the case.

For the aforementioned reason, I.A. No.1/2024 is hereby rejected, and consequently, the appeal is also dismissed.

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

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