



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 2<sup>ND</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 9400 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)**

**BETWEEN:**

1. M/S. STRIDES PHARMA SCIENCE LIMITED  
A COMPANY INCORPORATED UNDER THE  
COMPANIES ACT, 1956,  
HAVING ITS CORPORATE OFFICE AT STRIDES  
HOUSE, BILEKAHALLI,  
BANNERGHATTA ROAD,  
BENGALURU 560 076.  
REPRESENTED BY ITS  
AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY.  
MR VARUN SHASHIDHAR JATTI,  
SON OF S.B. JATTI,  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ABHIJIT ATUR, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA  
REPRESENTED BY  
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,  
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,  
M S BUILDING,  
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER  
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT,





KEMPEGOWDA ROAD,  
BEHIND KANDAYA BHAVANA,  
BENGALURU - 560 009.

3. THE TAHSILDAR  
TALUK OFFICE,  
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT,  
AT ANEKAL - 562106.
  
4. THE TALUK SURVEYOR  
TALUK OFFICE, ANEKAL,  
BANGALORE DISTRICT,  
ANEKAL - 562106.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP )

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE ORDER / LETTER DATED 20.01.2026 BEARING NO. JD/BA/(A)C R 167/2025-26 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO. 2 (ANNEXURE A) IN SO FOR AS PETITIONER CONCERNED; AND ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH



**ORAL ORDER**

Heard Sri. Abhijith Atur, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Sporthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for the respondent-State.

2. In the present writ petition, the petitioner has called in question the letter dated 20.01.2026 produced at Annexure-A, issued by respondent No.2, and the Communication dated 31.01.2024 produced at Annexure-B, issued by respondent No.3. The petitioner has, inter-alia, sought for issuance of a writ of prohibition restraining the respondents from taking any further steps or actions to demolish the access road adjoining the schedule property without following due process of law.

3. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, it is noticed that the petitioner is essentially challenging internal communications exchanged between the authorities. However, the Division Bench of this Court in W.A. No.949 of 2026, while considering an identical issue, has observed in paragraphs 7 to 10 as follows:



*"7. We are not sure that who laid this road over Rajanukunte, whether it was the Government Authorities or some private individuals. Even if Government Authorities laid the road, the road cannot be contracted over the Rajanukunte, the water channels are to be restored.*

*8. Be that as it may, Section 68 of the Act contemplates inquiry. We direct the Deputy Commissioner to hold an inquiry involving the appellants/ petitioners and others. The Deputy Commissioner is directed to issue a notice to the appellants/ petitioners and others for hearing regarding their objections to the removal of the road laid over the Rajanukunte. Even if Section 68 is not applicable, a hearing must be given to the appellants/ petitioners and other affected parties, after which a decision has to be taken.*

*9. The Deputy Commissioner must complete the inquiry within a period of 6 weeks and pass a reasoned order in accordance with law.*

*10. The parties are directed to maintain status quo in respect of existing road."*

4. Taking into consideration the law laid down by the Division Bench of this Court and the scope of Section 68 of the



Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, this Court is of the considered opinion that respondent No.2 shall take an appropriate decision in the matter after affording an opportunity of hearing to all concerned parties, including the petitioner herein, before taking any coercive action in respect of the alleged Rajakaluve.

5. Accordingly, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the claim of the petitioner and all other stakeholders and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law after providing reasonable opportunity of hearing to them.

6. It is made clear that, until such decision is taken by respondent No.2, no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner in relation to the subject matter of the writ petition.

With the above observations and directions, the writ petition stands *disposed of*.

**SD/-  
(E.S.INDIRESH)  
JUDGE**

SB  
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 62