



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.NATARAJ

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO.200383 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

RAMESH
S/O DURGANNA,
AGE : 51 YEARS,
OCC : AGRICULTURE,
R/O: NAGADADINNI VILLAGE,
TQ: DEVADURGA,
DIST: RAICHUR – 584 111.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI HARSHAVARDHAN R.MALIPATIL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRIKANTH
THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
(KNNL) OFFICER NO.2,
CANAL DIVISION, YARAMARUS CAMP,
RAICHUR – 584 135.
2. GANJANAN BALE
THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,
RAICHUR – 584 135.

...ACCUSED / RESPONDENTS





3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY WATER RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT VIKASA SOUDHA,
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI, BENGALURU – 01.

.... PROFORMA PARTY

(BY SRI MALLIKARJUN C. BASAREDDY, GA)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTION 11 OF THE
CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, PRAYING TO INITIATE CONTEMPT
PROCEEDINGS AND SENTENCE THE ACCUSED FOR CONTEMPT
OF DIRECTION OF THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 01.04.2024 IN
W.P.NO.204841 OF 2014, ANNEXURE-A, IN THE INTEREST OF
JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY,
ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.NATARAJ
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.NATARAJ)

This contempt petition is filed alleging non-compliance of
the order dated 01.04.2024 passed by learned Single Judge in
W.P.No.204841/2014.



2. The complainant had filed W.P.No.204841/2014 seeking for a direction to consider the representation dated 29.12.2012. The petition was disposed off directing the respondent Nos.2 and 3 to consider the representation within three months. The complaint has approached this Court on the ground that the representation is not considered even after lapse of three months.

3. Learned Principal Government Advocate filed the affidavit of the respondent No.1 along with certain documents marked as Annexure-R1 to 5 wherein it is stated that the representation of the complainant is considered in accordance with law. It is stated that the land of the complainant is not acquired and to that effect an endorsement at Annexure-R5 is issued. He therefore submits that the grievance of the complainant is duly considered.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the above.

5. In that view of the matter, this contempt petition is closed. However, if the complainant is aggrieved by any order



NC: 2026:KHC-K:1936-DB
CCC No. 200383 of 2025

passed by the respondent, liberty is reserved to the complainant to challenge them in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(R.NATARAJ)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY)
JUDGE

BL
List No.: 1 SI No.: 5