



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

AND

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT APPEAL NO.200036 OF 2026 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. MANJUNATH S/O BHEEMARAYA,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
OCC: EMPLOYEE,
R/O #142, WARD NO.4,
NEAR HANUMAN TEMPLE,
HUTTI VILLAGE, TQ. LINGASUGUR,
DIST. RAICHUR-584 115.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. ARUNKUMAR AMARGUNDAPPA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI. YANKOB
S/O BASANNA @ BASAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, OCC: NIL,
R/O HUTTI VILLAGE, TQ. LINGASUGUR,
DIST. RAICHUR-584 115.
2. SRI. BABU
S/O BASANNA @ BASAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS, OCC: NIL,
R/O HUTTI VILLAGE, TQ. LINGASUGUR,
DIST. RAICHUR-584 115.
3. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,
HUTTI GOLD MINES COMPANY LTD.,
HUTTI, TQ. LINGASUGUR,
DIST. RAICHUR-584 115.

Digitally signed
by LUGY GRACE
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



4. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
RAICHUR, DIST. RAICHUR-584 101.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SUDHIRSINGH R. VIJAPUR, ADVOCATE FOR R1 & R2;
SRI. VEERANAGOUDA MALIPATIL, ADVOCATE FOR R3;
SMT. MAYA T.R., HCGP FOR R4)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, 1961, PRAYING TO ALLOW THIS WRIT APPEAL AND SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 01.04.2022 PASSED IN W.P.NO.200573/2017 (S-RES) BY LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE OF THIS COURT, CONSEQUENTLY DISMISS THE WRIT PETITION FILED BY THE PETITIONER/RESPONDENT NO.1 AND 2 AND ETC.

THIS APPEAL COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ
and
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)

1. The above appeal has been filed challenging the order dated 01.04.2022 in W.P.No.200573/2017 by the appellant, who was not a party to the said proceedings.
2. By way of the impugned order, the learned Single Judge 3-5of this Court directed Hutti Gold Mines



Limited to consider the applications submitted by the petitioners therein seeking employment under the scheme applicable to land losers' families.

3. The present appeal is preferred by a third party, who claims to be another member of the same land loser's family and is already in receipt of employment under the very scheme in question. The grievance sought to be projected is that respondent Nos.1 and 2 herein (petitioners before the learned Single Judge) were not entitled to maintain the writ petition or seek consideration for employment.
4. At the outset, this Court is of the considered view that the appellant lacks the requisite locus standi to maintain the present appeal. The impugned order merely directs consideration of the applications of respondent Nos.1 and 2 in accordance with law and does not, in any manner, adversely affect the service conditions or rights of the appellant, who is already a beneficiary under the scheme. The appellant, having



secured employment under the land loser rehabilitation framework, cannot be permitted to interdict the consideration of claims of other eligible members of the family, particularly when no enforceable legal right of the appellant is shown to be infringed.

5. It is well settled that an appeal is maintainable only at the instance of a person who is aggrieved in the legal sense, that is, one whose rights are directly and substantially affected by the order impugned. A mere apprehension of potential prejudice or an attempt to exclude other claimants from consideration does not confer standing. The present appeal, being devoid of any demonstrable legal injury, is therefore not maintainable.
6. In that view of the matter, the appeal stands dismissed at the stage of admission itself.
7. It is, however, clarified that respondent Nos.3 and 4 shall consider the applications submitted by



respondent Nos.1 and 2 strictly in accordance with law and the applicable scheme governing employment to land losers, without being influenced by the observations made herein.

8. It is further observed that in the event the appellant suffers cessation of service for any legally sustainable reason, it would be open to him to avail such remedies as are available in law, including approaching this Court, if so advised.
9. In view of dismissal of the main appeal, all pending interlocutory applications, if any, stand dismissed.

**Sd/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE**

LG
List No.: 2 SI No.: 22
CT:SI