

The Commissioner vs the Department of Urban Development

The Commissioner vs the Department of Urban Development

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1522821

Court : Karnataka Orders

Decided On : Feb-03-2026

Judge : Suraj Govindaraj

Appeal No. : WP/16079/2019

Appellant : The Commissioner

Respondent : The Department of Urban Development

Judgement :

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026 BEFORE THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ WRIT PETITION NO. 16079 OF 2019 (LB-RES) BETWEEN: THE COMMISSIONER CHIKKABALLAPUR URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, PETITIONER (BY SRI. AJAY KUMAR M., ADVOCATE) AND:

1. THE DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA, M.S. BUILDING, Digitally signed by SHWETHA DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR VEEDI, RAGHAVENDRA Location: HIGH BENGALURU-560 001, COURT OF REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

KARNATAKA

2. THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE AND THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER CHIKKABALLAPUR DISTRICT, RESPONDENTS (BY SMT. CHANDINI SINGH, HCGP FOR R1 TO R2) -2- THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226

AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH / SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 19.02.2019 AND ALSO ORDER DATED 26.02.2019 PASSED BY THE R-2 HEREIN VIDE ANNEXURE-A & A1 AS THE SAME BEING TOTALLY ARBITRARY, ERRONEOUS AND NOT THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER: CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. The Petitioner is before this Court seeking for the following reliefs: i. Issue a writ of certiorari or any other writ or an

order or direction in the like nature quashing /

setting aside the order dtd. 19.02.2019 made in

No.MAG/001/19.02.2019 also order

dtd.26.02.2019 made and in No.MAG/001/19.02.2019 passed by the 2nd Respondent herein vide Annexure-A and A1 as the same being totally arbitrary, erroneous and not ii. Grant such other and further reliefs as are just even including the costs of this petition in the interest of the justice and equity.

2. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the petition may be dismissed as withdrawn. -3-

3. In view of the submission made by the learned counsel for the Petitioner, the Writ Petition stands dismissed as withdrawn. SD/- (SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE PRS List No.: 1 SI No.: 43

