



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD**

**DATED THIS THE 5<sup>TH</sup> 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. 100648 OF 2025 (EDN-RES)**

**BETWEEN:**

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,  
REPRESENTED BY ITS  
PRINCIPLE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,  
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION  
AND LITERACY PRE UNIVERSITY,  
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU – 560 001.
2. THE DIRECTOR DEPARTMENT OF  
SCHOOL EDUCATION,  
PRE UNIVERSITY AND LITERACY,  
18<sup>TH</sup> CROSS, MALLESHWARAM,  
BENGALURU – 560 012.
3. THE JOINT DIRECTOR,  
DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL EDUCATION  
PRE UNIVERSITY AND LITERACY,  
18<sup>TH</sup> CROSS, MALLESHWAEAM,  
BENGALURU – 560 012.
4. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR,  
THE OFFICE PF THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF  
PRE UNIVERSITY EDUCATION CHIKKODI,  
TQ: CHIKKODI, DIST: BELAGAVI – 591 201

... APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. SHARAD V. MAGADUM, AGA)





**AND:**

SHRI. ANNAPPA TERADAL GRAMEEN ABHIVRUDDI  
SHIKSHANA SANSTHES TERADAL SCIENCE  
PU COLLEGE ATHANI,  
R/BY ITS SECRETARY  
DR. NANDISH S/O. ANNAPPA TERDAL,  
AGE: 44 YEARS, OCC: DOCTOR AND  
SECRETARY OF SHRI. ANNAPPA TERDAL  
GRAMEEN ABHIVRUDDI SHIKSHANA  
SANSTHE, ATHANI, R/O: 353, SHIVAGANGA  
HOSPITAL, ATHANI, TQ: ATHANI,  
DIST: BELAGAVI, KARNATAKA – 591 304.

... RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. MANOJ N. BIKKANNAVAR, ADV.)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF  
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, 1961, PRAYING TO, ALLOW THE  
WRIT APPEAL AND SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 10.09.2025 IN  
W.P.NO.106573/2025, PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE  
IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY AND ETC.,

THIS WRIT 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)

1. Aggrieved by the interim order dated 10.09.2025 passed in Writ Petition No.106573 of 2025, the respondent-State therein has preferred the present writ appeal.

2. The respondent-College was granted the necessary recognition to start a Pre-University College in the year 2019 and has been functioning since then. However, on 23.05.2025, on the ground that the respondent-College had obtained the necessary permission by playing fraud on the authorities concerned and that there were certain lacunae in the respondent-College, the recognition granted in its favour was withdrawn. Notwithstanding the said withdrawal, the respondent-College admitted 157 students for the academic year 2025-26 subsequent to the order of cancellation. Thereafter, having failed to obtain a favourable order from the authorities concerned restoring its recognition, the respondent-College has preferred Writ petition No.106573 of 2025. The learned Single Judge after hearing the parties concerned, passed the following interim order:



- "i. Respondent Nos.2 to 4 are directed to open the SATS portal to enable the petitioner to enter the details of 157 students admitted for the additional 2 courses for which the application dated 30.05.2025 had been made.*
- ii. The said opening of the SATS portal and the registration of the students shall be subject to the result of this writ petition and subject to the result of the enquiry to be made by respondent No.1.*
- iii. The SATS portal shall be opened within 4 days from now, to enable such registration.*
- iv. The enquiry report to be filed on or before 06.11.2025.*
- v. Relist on 06.11.2025."*

3. Aggrieved by the same, the State has preferred this writ appeal.

4. The case of the State is that once recognition is withdrawn from the respondent-College, it is not entitled to admit students, and if any admission made thereafter is at its own peril. However, in the course of arguments, learned AGA, upon instructions, fairly submits that all necessary steps would be taken to safeguard the interest of the students concerned. He further submits that the State is ready and willing to shift the students to a Government College, if required. The grievance of the State is that once recognition granted to the respondent-College is withdrawn, it could not have admitted students, and it



is not possible for the State to consider them as students of the respondent-College and conduct examinations in the respondent-College.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent-College submits that it has all necessary infrastructure and that, by mistake, certain false information was furnished at the time of obtaining recognition. He submits that, considering the present infrastructure, the respondent-College ought to be continued with the recognition granted. It is further submitted that the appellant-State authorities are unnecessarily harassing the respondent-College by not conducting the necessary enquiry into its affairs and delaying by taking decision in respect of the same.

6. Whether the recognition granted to the respondent-College has been rightly withdrawn or not is the subject matter of proceedings before the concerned authorities, and whether the State rightly rejected the request of respondent-College to start additional sections for Pre-University Course is the subject matter of the writ petition.

7. Be that as it may, it is important to protect the interest of the students admitted by the respondent-College, who



are not even before this Court. No doubt, the respondent-College could not have admitted the students without due recognition. If the recognition is withdrawn, it is entitled to challenge the same in the manner known to law and should admit students only if permitted in law to do so. The respondent-College clearly erred in admitting 157 students for the academic year 2025-26. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the respondent-College that the said students have attended classes during the academic year 2025-26. It is not the case of the State that it intends to deny the students the opportunity to write the examination for the first year PUC, said to commence from 10.02.2026. Under these circumstances, we do not find any error in the interim order passed by the learned Single Judge, and the same is hereby upheld.

8. However, under the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the opinion that the respondent-College should not admit students for the coming academic year 2026-27 without obtaining necessary permissions. If the respondent-College fails to obtain the necessary permission to continue the 157 students for second year PUC, the State shall be at liberty to transfer them to some other Institution.



Ordered Accordingly.

Liberty is also reserved to the students to sue the respondent-College, if they are put to any loss or injury due to fault on the part of the respondent-College.

In light of the above, pending applications, if any, do not survive for consideration and are accordingly disposed of.

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

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