

Prakash vs the State of Karnataka

Prakash vs the State of Karnataka

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1745974

Court : Karnataka Orders

Decided On : Jul-30-2025

Judge : R. Nataraj

Appeal No. : WP/23333/2021

Appellant : Prakash

Respondent : The State of Karnataka

Judgement :

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF JULY, 2025 BEFORE THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ WRIT PETITION NO. 23333 OF 2021 (GM-RES) BETWEEN: PRAKASH S/O LANKAPPA, AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS, RESIDING AT YELLAMA TEMPLE ROAD, NAGAMANGALA TOWN, MANDYA DISTRICT-571432 PETITIONER (BY SRI. AJIT P.B., ADVOCATE (ABSENT)) AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA

REPRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY AND FISHERIES, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, Digitally NO.405, IV FLOOR,

VIKASA SOUDHA, signed by BENGALURU-560001 SUMA Location: Email: prsahf@gmail.com HIGH COURT OF 2. KARNATAKA DIRECTORATE OF FISHERIES 3RD FLOOR, PODIUM BLOCK, VISVESVARAYA CENTRE, DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI, BENGALURU-01, REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR,

3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES, NEAR TALUK OFFICE, MANDYA. Email: sadfmandya2011@gmail.com -2-

4. PALAGRAHARA GRAMA PANCHAYAT KASABA HOBLI, MANDYA-571432 REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT AMENDMENT OF IMPLEADMENT CARRIED OUT VIDE ORDER DATED 18.12.2021 RESPONDENTS (BY SRI. M. SRINIVAS KUMAR, HIGH COURT GOVERNMENT PLEADER FOR RESPONDENT NOS.1 TO 3; NOTICE SERVED ON RESPONDENT NO.4) THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE

CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS TO EXTEND THE BENEFIT OF ORDER DATED 29.06.2021 BEARING NO.PSM/E-62/MEE 2021 PASSED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT AND THE

ORDER DATED 29.06.2021 BEARING NO.DOF-TECH0ALL2/81/2021

E-502845 PASSED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER AS WELL, VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ANNEXURE-B AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER

WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER: CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. NATARAJ

ORAL ORDER

The learned counsel for the petitioner has filed a memo seeking permission of this Court to withdraw this writ petition, as it has become infructuous. -3-

2. The memo is taken on record. In view of the memo, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn, as it has become infructuous. Sd/- (R. NATARAJ)
JUDGE HJ List No.: 1 SI No.: 13

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com