

Reserved on : 03.03.2026
Pronounced on : 25.03.2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. NAGAPRASANNA

WRIT PETITION No.143 OF 2026 (GM -RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI SRI RAVI SHANKAR
S/O LATE R.S.V RATHNAM
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS
R/AT PANCHAGIRI ASHRAM
VEDA VIGNAM MAHA VIDYA PEETA
(VVMP), UDAYAPURA HALLI
BENGALURU SOUTH TALUK
BENGALURU – 560 082
SHOWN IN FIR AS SRI RAVI SHANKAR
ART OF LIVING ASHRAM

... PETITIONER

(BY SRI S.SRIRANGA, SR.ADVOCATE A/W
SRI P.PRASANNA KUMAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1 . STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY BENGALURU METROPOLITAN
TASK FORCE POLICE STATION (BMTF)
BENGALURU CITY

REPRESENTED BY ITS
STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT BUILDING
BENGALURU – 560 001.

2 . LAKSHMAN GOWDA S.,
S/O SHIVANNA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
INSPECTOR OF POLICE
BENGALURU OFFICE OF BENGALURU
METROPOLITAN TASK FORCE
POLICE STATION (BMTFF)
BENGALURU CITY
BBMP HEAD OFFICE BUILDING
BENGALURU - 560 002.

... RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI B.A.BELLIAPPA, SPP-I A/W
SRI THEJESH P, HCGP)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA READ WITH SECTION 528 OF BNSS, 2023 PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR AND COMPLAINT IN CRIME NO.201/2025 DATED 19.09.2025 THE RESPONDENTS/BMTF POLICE, FOR THE ALLEGED OFFENCE UNDER SECTION 192A OF KARNATAKA LAND REVENUE ACT, 1964 INsofar AS THE PTITIONER HEREIN/1ST ACCUSED IS CONCERNED (PRODUCED VIDE ANNEXURE 'E AND E1' TO THE WRIT PETITION.

THIS WRIT PETITION HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS ON 03.03.2026, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:-

CORAM: **THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.NAGAPRASANNA**

CAV ORDER

The petitioner is before the Court calling in question registration of a crime in Crime No.201 of 2025 registered for offences punishable under Section 192-A of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 ('the Act' for short).

2. Heard Sri S. Sriranga, learned senior counsel along with Sri P. Prasanna Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri B.A.Belliappa, learned State Public Prosecutor-I appearing for the respondents.

3. Facts, in brief, germane are as follows: -

3.1. The petitioner claims to be the founder of Art of Living Foundation and a renowned spiritual leader propagating human

values through several yogic procedures such as meditation, Sudarshan Kriya and also known as peace ambassador in India and worldwide. The genesis of the present petition emerges from a petition filed by one Chandrasekaran N and others in Writ Petition No.15264 of 2023, a petition filed in public interest with a prayer to direct the State to consider the representations of the petitioners therein and to demolish the apartments constructed allegedly encroaching Government land. The petitioner was arrayed as party respondent No.5 in the said petition. The petitioner then is said to have filed an application seeking to dismiss the petition, at least insofar as the petitioner is concerned, on the score that he did not own any piece of land in the survey numbers that were alleged to be encroached. The Division Bench considering the fact that the writ petition was only for a direction to respondent/State to consider the representation, took note of the memo filed by the learned Government Advocate and disposed of the petition on 09-09-2005 directing the State to take action against the encroachers, if situation warrants. Proceedings on the very same subject matter was brought up before the Court constituted to tackle land

grabbing, in LGC(P) No. 23 of 2024 against Sri Sumeru Realty Private Limited.

3.2. When things stood thus, the Inspector of Police of the Bengaluru Metropolitan Task Force ('BMTF') registered a *suo-motu* complaint on 19-09-2025, allegedly based on the report of the Tahsildar, Bangalore South Taluk. It is alleged in the aforesaid First Information Report that the petitioner and 4 others have encroached Government land, lake and Rajakaluve in Sy.Nos. 160, 164/1, 164/2, 150, 137, 135 and 46 situated at Kaggalipura Village, Uttarahalli Hobli, Bangalore South Taluk. Except naming the petitioner in the complaint there is no other indication of any wrong doing on the part of the petitioner that would become ingredients of Section 192-A of the Act. Pursuant to registration of crime in Crime No.201 of 2025, a notice comes to be issued by the Police on 18-12-2025, in exercise of power under Section 35(3) of the BNSS. The said police notice is addressed to the 2nd accused against whom the allegation of encroachment has been made. The issuance of notice has driven the present petitioner to this Court in the subject petition.

4. The learned senior counsel Sri S.Sriranga and the learned counsel Sri P.Prasanna Kumar appearing for the petitioner would in unison vehemently contend that on a reading of the entire complaint it can be noticed that not even a word is mentioned about role of the petitioner in the alleged encroachment of Government land which would become the ingredient of Section 192-A. The only reason for adding the name of the petitioner as accused No.1 appears to be on the fact that the petitioner was arrayed as a respondent in a public interest petition filed by three individuals, which comes to be disposed on 09-09-2025. Even in the LGC proceedings instituted before the Land Grabbing Court, the entire allegation is against one Sri Sumeru Realty. Therefore, without any reason or rhyme and without there being any ingredient of the offence under Section 192-A of the Act, the petitioner is dragged into the web of crime. The FIR, therefore, is based solely on the proceedings before the Special Court for land grabbing. The genesis of the entire proceedings is on a report filed by the Tahsildar before the Court hearing the case of land grabbing. Therefore, the learned counsel would submit that if the complaint is

permitted to be investigated into, it would become an abuse of the process of law.

5. Per contra, the learned State Public Prosecutor-I Sri B A Belliappa appearing for the State, would vehemently refute the submissions by taking this Court through the detailed statement of objections filed, contending that the petitioner is the face of everything. Therefore, it is a matter to be investigated into, as to whether the petitioner is involved in the act of encroachment of the land. He would seek to place reliance on the judgment rendered by the coordinate Bench, which is affirmed by the Apex Court, to contend that the petitioner is the face of everything in the foundation. He would contend that the matter is still at the stage of investigation. During the investigation it may emerge that the role of the petitioner is larger than what is found now. The investigation thus must be permitted to be continued. He would submit that the Division Bench was clear in directing that the matter must be looked into/enquired into. If interference would come about by the hands of this Court at this juncture, it would run foul of the judgment of the Division Bench. He would, therefore, seek dismissal of the petition leaving open all remedies available to the

petitioner to avail of, at the relevant point in time. He would seek to place reliance on the judgments of the Apex Court in the cases of (i) **SOMJEET MALLICK v. STATE OF JHARKHAND [(2024) 10 SCC 527]** (ii) **GULAM MUSTAFA v. STATE OF KARNATAKA [(2023) 18 SCC 265]** and (iii) **NEEHARIKA INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED v. STATE OF MAHARASHTRA**¹.

6. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the respective learned counsel and have perused the material on record.

7. The afore-narrated facts are not in dispute. A public interest petition was preferred by three persons in Writ Petition No.15264 of 2023. In the said writ petition, the petitioner is arrayed as respondent No.5. The cause title is as follows:

"Between:

1. Sri. Chandrashekar N,
S/O Late Narayanappa,
Aged about 43 years,
R/a.no.25/1, Udipalya Village and Post,
Bangalore South Taluk,
Bangalore-560 082.

¹ **(2021) 19 SCC 401**

2. Sri. Mahesh. B,
S/O. Late Bettegowda,
Aged about 39 years,
R/a.Udipalya Village,
Udayapura Post,
Bangalore South Taluk,
Bangalore-560 082.
3. Sri. Muniraju.H.S.
S/o late. Hanumanthappa,
Aged about 45 years,
R/a.Salunse Village,
Udayapura Post,
Bangalore South Taluk
Bangalore - 560 082,

.. PETITIONERS

AND:

1.

5. **Sri Ravi Shankar Guruji,
Art of Living Ashram,
Aged About 43 Years,
Udayapura Village & post,
Bangalore South Taluk,
Bangalore-560 082.**

... ..

... RESPONDENTS"

(Emphasis added)

The petition comes to be disposed of by the Division Bench by the following order:

"ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

- "1. The petitioners have filed the present petition as a Public Interest Litigation petition, inter-alia, praying as below:

"Wherefore, the Petitioners most respectfully pray that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to :

i) Issue directions to the Respondents No.1 to 4 consider the Annexure-'A' representation/notice dated 21.02.2023 and Annexure-'E' dated 08.10.2022 by way of Writ of Mandamus;

ii) Issue directions to the respondents No.1 to 3 to demolish the Apartments in Government Lands, Lake, Rajakaluve in Sy.No.160, 164/1, 164/2, 150 and 137, situated at Kaggalipura Village, Uttarahalli Hobli, Bangalore South Taluk, Bangalore- 560082, constructed by the respondent No.5 to 9 by way of writ of mandamus;

iii) To pass such other order/orders as this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the circumstances of the case, in the interests of justice and equity."

2. Learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondents-State has filed a memo enclosing therewith a Map which supports the petitioners' contention that certain unauthorized constructions have been raised by encroaching public land which also comprises Raja Kaluve. The Map indicates that certain constructions have been raised in Sy.No.164/2; 163/3,161/7 and 160 of Kaggalipura Village, Uttarahalli Hobli, Bengaluru South Taluk. Additionally, a large part of Survey No. 150 which is indicated to be a tank has also been encroached.

3. In view of the Government's stance that in fact there has been encroachment on public lands, we consider it apposite to dispose of the present petition by directing respondent Nos.1 to 3 to take such action against encroachers as is warranted, albeit in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

...."

The Division Bench records a memo enclosing a map which is said to have supported the petitioners' contention that unauthorized

constructions have been raised by encroaching upon public land which also includes Rajakaluve. The Division Bench directs that in view of the Government's stance that in fact there has been encroachment on public road, the Bench would consider it appropriate to dispose of the petition by directing the respondents 1 to 3 to take such action against encroachers as is warranted in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible. The petition is disposed of on 9th September, 2025. By then, projecting the same allegations, one Mr. Manjunath M., had preferred a complaint before the Special Court constituted to tackle land grabbing under the Karnataka Land Grabbing Prohibition Act, 2011. The facts and the prayer before the Land Grabbing Court including the schedule is as follows:

"...."

1. FACTS OF THE CASE:

The Land bearing Sy.No.164/1, measuring, Rajakaluve, situated at Udipalya village, Kaggalipura village panchayathi, Udipura, Bengaluru as per the RTC and mutation issued by the concerned authority which is belongs to the Opposite party. The said Rajakaluve was left by the Government for the use of general public in between Sy.No.161 to 164 and the same is reflecting in Dishank and also in the village map, but the opposite party by encroaching the same and constructing the Sowdamini Apartment illegally in the said Rajakaluve by putting up apartment illegally without obtaining any documentary

evidence. The said act of the opposite parties is against to the law and the opposite parties are liable to be punished under the act. In the said Rajakaluve was the use of general public for the use of drainage water and the same was cleaned and constructing the Badminton Court illegally by the opposite parties.

2(a) **LAND VALUE:** Present market value is more than One Crore Rupees.

2(b) Whether is there any house or building on the land, they belongs to whom, How they have acquired and the value of the land:

The Opposite parties acquired the said land illegally and constructing the Sowdamini Apartment on the land – put up already a shed and sheet wall.

3. REASON FOR DISPUTE:

The Sy.No.164/1, Rajaklaluve, situated at Udipalya village, Kaggalipura village panchayathi, Udipura, Bengaluru. Out of the said Rajakaluve as per the RTC and mutation issued by the concerned authority which clearly establishes Rajakaluve which was left by the Government for the use of general public, but the opposite party constructing the Sowdamini Apartment illegally and already constructed the apartment without obtaining any documentary evident. The said act of the opposite parties is against to the law and the opposite parties are liable to be punished under the act. In the said Rajakaluve is the use of drainage water channel and the same was cleaned and constructing the Sowdamini apartment illegally by the opposite parties. This was the cause and reason for dispute.

4. JURISDICTION:

The property is situated at situated at Thurahalli village, Udipalya village, Kaggalipura village panchayathi, Udipalya, 5.K.m. far from BBMP limits Bengaluru is having ample jurisdiction to try the above case.

5. COURT FEE:

The requisite court fee is paid on the complaint as per valuation slip annexed to the complaint.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the Complainant humbly pray that this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to register the Complaint, secure the presence of the opposite party and stringent action to be taken against the opposite party and direct the opposite party to remove Sowdamini Apartment and direct not to construct any building since the same left for use of general public by the Government which has been illegally occupied and constructing and to leave the same for general public as Rajakaluve and grant permanent injunction restraining the opposite parties not to put up any constructions and to demolish the existing constructions already put up by the opposite party by encroaching the Rajakaluve on the schedule property, in the interest of justice.

SCHEDULE PROPERTY

All that piece and parcel of the Sy.No.164/1, Rajakaluve, situated at Udipalya village, Kaggalipura village panchayathi, Udipura, Bengaluru

East by : Property of Sabakhan

West by : Road and property of Uttam Bhandari

North by : Road

South by : Property of Sandeep

Sd/-
Advocate for Applicant

Sd/-
Applicant"

The proceedings are subsisting and continued before the Land Grabbing Court. Therefore, the complainant before the Land

Grabbing Court projects pendency of the case before the Division Bench on the same cause of action. Since the Division Bench has granted permission to take action against the alleged encroachers, a *suo motu* complaint comes to be registered by the Inspector attached to the BMTF. The complaint reads as follows:

“ರವರಿಗೆ,

ರಾಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು,
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮಹಾನಗರ ಕಾರ್ಯಚರಣೆ ಪಡೆ,
(ಗ್ರೇಟರ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರ) ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ,
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

ಇಂದ,
ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣಗೌಡ.ಎಸ್.
ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್,
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮಹಾನಗರ ಕಾರ್ಯಚರಣೆ ಪಡೆ,
(ಗ್ರೇಟರ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರ) ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ,
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

ವಿಷಯ:- ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ರವರ ಕಛೇರಿ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ,
ಎನ್ ಸಿ ಆರ್ (ಉ)ಸಿ.ಆರ್/93/21-22 ದಿ:14-03-2025 ರವರು ನೀಡಿರುವ
ವರದಿ ಆಧಾರಿತ ಮತ್ತು ಭೂ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು
ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ರವರು ನೀಡಿರುವ ಸರ್ವೆ ಸ್ಕೆಚ್ ಅನ್ವಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ದಾಖಲಿಸುವಂತೆ
ಕೋರಿ,

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಪರ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಮಹಾನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು ರವರ ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದ ಟಪಾಲ್‌ನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಉತ್ತರಹಳ್ಳಿ ಹೋಬಳಿ, ಕಗ್ಗಲೀಪುರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್‌ಗಳಾದ 160, 164/1, 164/2, 150, 137, 135 ಮತ್ತು 46 ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಾಗ, ಕೆರೆ, ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ, ನೀರು ಹರಿಯುವ ಹಳ್ಳ ಹಾಗೂ ಇತರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಾಗವನ್ನು ಒತ್ತುವರಿ

ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ವಸತಿ ಸಮುಚ್ಚಯ ಹಾಗೂ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿರುವ 1). ಶ್ರೀ. ರವಿಶಂಕರ್ ಗುರೂಜಿ, ಆಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಲೀವಿಂಗ್ 2) ಶ್ರೀ. ರಘು ಅವಧಾನಿ 3). ಶ್ರೀ. ದ್ವಿಗಜಯ ಚೌಧರಿ, 4). ಉತ್ತಮ್ ಚಂದ್ ಭಂಡಾರಿ 5). ಮೆ| ಸುಮೇರು ಗ್ಲೋಬಲ್ ಸರ್ವೋಟ್ ಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ರವರುಗಳ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತಿಯ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೀಡಿದ ದೂರು ಬಿ.ಎಂ.ಟಿ.ಎಫ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಂ.ಎಡಿಜಿಪಿ/ಬಿಎಂಟಿಎಫ್/ಪಿಟಿಷನ್/138/2022 ರಂತೆ ದಾಖಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ:29-03-2022 ರಂದು ಶ್ರೀ. ಉತ್ತಮ್ ಚಂದ್ ಭಂಡಾರಿ ಬಿನ್ ಅನರಾಜ್ ಭಂಡಾರಿ ಕೇ/ಆಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಲೀವಿಂಗ್ ಇಂಟರ್‌ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಸೆಂಟರ್ ಸುಮೇರು ರಿಯಾಲಿಟಿ ಪ್ರೈ.ಲಿ. ಉದಯಪುರ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಕನಕಪುರ ಮೈನ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ರಘು ಅವಧಾನಿ ಕೇ/ಆಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಲೀವಿಂಗ್ ಇಂಟರ್‌ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಸೆಂಟರ್ ಉದಯಪುರ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಕನಕಪುರ ಮೈನ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ಮತ್ತು ಮೆ|| ಸುಮೇರು ಗ್ಲೋಬಲ್ ಸರ್ವೋಟ್ ಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಪ್ರೈ.ಲಿ. ತುಳಸಿ ಹಾಲ್ ಗೇಟ್, ನಂ.2 ಎದುರುಗಡೆ ಕೇ/ಆಟ್ ಲೀವಿಂಗ್ ಇಂಟರ್‌ನ್ಯಾಷನಲ್ ಸೆಂಟರ್ ಉದಯಪುರ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಕನಕಪುರ ಮೈನ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ರವರಿಗೆ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ದೃಢೀಕೃತ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಂತೆ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಜಾರಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ

ದಿನಾಂಕ:30-05-2022, 14-09-2022, 08-10-2022, 08-10-2022, 21-12-2022, 27-12-2023, 04-12-2024 ಮತ್ತು 20-12-2024 ರಂದು ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ, ರವರಿಗೆ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಾಗ, ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಕೆರೆ ಜಾಗ ಒತ್ತುವರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ? ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ? ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ದೃಢೀಕೃತ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಂತೆ ಪತ್ರ ರವಾನೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಭೂ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ರವರಿಗೆ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಾಗ, ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಕೆರೆ ಜಾಗ ಒತ್ತುವರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ? ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ? ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ಸ್ಕೇಚ್‌ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ವರದಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಕೂಲಕಂಷವಾಗಿ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿ, ಅಟಾಸ್, ಆಕಾರ್‌ಬಂದ್, ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನಿತರ ದೃಢೀಕೃತ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಂತೆ ಪತ್ರ ರವಾನೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಶ್ರೀ. ಸುಮೇರು ರಿಯಾಲಿಟಿ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕಂಪನಿಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರ್‌ರವರು ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಕ್ರಯಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರತಿ, ಖಾತ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರತಿ, ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಋಣಭಾರರಾಹಿತ್ಯ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಪತ್ರ ಪ್ರತಿ, ಗ್ರಾಮ ನಕಾಷೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿ, ಮುಖ್ಯೇಷನ್‌ಪ್ರತಿ, ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ರವರಿಂದ ಪಡೆದಿರುವ ಪರಿವರ್ತನೆಯಾಗಿರುವ ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿ, ಆರ್.ಟಿ.ಸಿ. ಪ್ರತಿಗಳು, ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಕ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಪತ್ರದ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಜರು ಪಡಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ **ನಂ.ಬಿಎಂಟಿಎಫ್ /ಎಡಿಜಿಪಿ/ಪಿಟಿಷನ್/503/2019** ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ. ಪ್ರಕಾಶ ರೆಡ್ಡಿ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ರವರು ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡು ಸದರಿ ದೂರು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ದೂರು ಅರ್ಜಿಗೆ ಮೇಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಪಡೆದು ಅಡಕಗೊಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ನಂ.ಬಿಎಂಟಿಎಫ್/ಎಡಿಜಿಪಿ/ಪಿಟಿಷನ್/93/2021 ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ.ಯೋಗೇಶ್ ಖಾನಗೌಡ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಸಬ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ರವರು ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡು ಸದರಿ ದೂರು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ದೂರು ಅರ್ಜಿಗೆ ಮೇಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಪಡೆದು ಅಡಕಗೊಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ನಂ.ಬಿಎಂಟಿಎಫ್/ಎಡಿಜಿಪಿ/ಪಿಟಿಷನ್/809/2023 ರ ಅಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಉಪಾಧೀಕ್ಷಕರವರು ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡು ಸದರಿ ದೂರು ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ದೂರು ಅರ್ಜಿಗೆ ಮೇಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಅನುಮೋದನೆ ಪಡೆದು ಅಡಕಗೊಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ:15-04-2025 ರಂದು ಸ್ಪೀಡ್ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ **ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ರವರ ಕಛೇರಿ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ, ಎನ್ ಸಿ ಆರ್ (ಉ)ಸಿ.ಆರ್/93/21-22 ದಿ:14-03-2025** ರಂತೆ ನೀಡಿರುವ ವರದಿ ಮತ್ತು ಭೂ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ರವರು ನೀಡಿರುವ ಸರ್ವೆ ಸ್ವೀಚ್ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಾದ ಕಗ್ಗಲೀಪುರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.46, 150 ಹಾಗೂ ಬಿ.ಎಂ.ಕಾವಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆಗಳ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಂಡಂತೆ ಇರುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಘನ ಭೂ ಕಬಳಿಕೆ ನಿಷೇಧ ವಿಶೇಷ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. ಎಲ್.ಜಿ.ಸಿ.ನಂ.23/2024 ರಂತೆ ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್‌ರವರ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. ಎನ್.ಸಿ.ಆರ್. ನಂ.23/2004 ರಂತೆ ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. ಎನ್.ಸಿ.ಆರ್.(ಉ)/ಸಿಆರ್/213/23-24 ಹಾಗೂ ಭೂ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ರವರ ಕಛೇರಿ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಭೂಸನಿ/ಪಿಆರ್/ಇ-105554/2024-25 ರ ದಿ:29-01-2024 ರಂತೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ರೀಸ.ನಂ.164/1, 164/2, 163/3, 161/7, 160, ಮತ್ತು 166ನ್ನು ಅಳತೆ ಕೆಲಸ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿ ನಕ್ಷೆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿದೆ.

ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164/2 ಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮೇರು ರಿಯಾಲಿಟಿ ಪ್ರೈ. ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯವರು ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ.1 ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ.2. ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ.3 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 0-8 1/4 ಗುಂಟೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವಸತಿ ಸಮುಚ್ಚಯವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.163/3 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬಾನುಮತಿ ಬಿನ್ ಆರ್.ಎಸ್. ರತ್ನಂ ರವರು 0-02 ಗುಂಟೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ.4 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.160 ರ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರರು ಶ್ರೀ.ರಘು ಆರ್. ಬಿನ್ ಜಿ.ಎಸ್.ರಾಜಣ್ಣ ಎಂಬುವವರು ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164/2, 163/3, 161/7, 160 ಮತ್ತು 166 ರ ಮಧ್ಯ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾದು ಹೋಗುವ ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆಯನ್ನು ಸುಮೇರು ರಿಯಾಲಿಟಿ ಪ್ರೈ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯವರು ಹಾಗೂ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164ರ

ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರರು ವಸತಿ ಸಮುಚ್ಚಯ ಕಾಪಾಡಿನ ಒಳಗೆ 2 ರಿಂದ 3.00 ಮೀಟರ್ ಅಗಲದ ಕಾಲುವೆಯನ್ನು
ವೃಷ್ಟತ ಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಹಳದಿ ಬಣ್ಣ ದಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶವು ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸುಮಾರು 1-05 ಗುಂಟೆ -
ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣವಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಆರ್.ಟಿ.ಸಿದಾರರಾದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164/2ರ, 163/3, 161/7 ರ ಮತ್ತು
166 ರ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರರು (ಆರ್.ಟಿ.ಸಿದಾರರು) ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಅಳತೆ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡು
ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಾರೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164/2 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0-35 ಗುಂಟೆ, ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.163 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0-02 ಗುಂಟೆ ಸರ್ವೆ
ನಂ.161/7 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0-06 ಗುಂಟೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.160 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0-02 ಗುಂಟೆ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ.
ಎಂದು ಸರ್ವೆ ಸ್ವೇಚ್ಛನೊಂದಿಗೆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ರವರ ಕಛೇರಿ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.
ಎನ್.ಸಿ.ಆರ್.(ಉ)ಸಿಆರ್/93/21-22 ದಿ:14-03-2025 ರವರು ನೀಡಿರುವ ವರದಿ ಆಧಾರಿತ ಮೆಲ್ಕಂಡ
ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ಒತ್ತುವರಿದಾರರಾದ 1). ಶ್ರೀ. ರವಿಶಂಕರ್ ಗುರೂಜಿ, ಆಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಲಿವಿಂಗ್ 2) ಶ್ರೀ
ರಘು ಅವಧಾನಿ 3).ಶ್ರೀ. ದ್ವಿಗಜಯ ಚೌಧರಿ. 4). ಉತ್ತಮ್ ಚಂದ್ ಭಂಡಾರಿ 5). ಮ|| ಸುಮೇರು ಗ್ಲೋಬಲ್
ಸರ್ವೋರ್ಡ್ ಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ರವರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತಿಯ ಕ್ರಮ ಜರುಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು
ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸಹಿ/-

ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣಗೌಡ ಎಸ್

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಇನ್ಸ್ ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್

ಬಿ.ಎಂ.ಟಿ.ಎಫ್. ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು,"

This becomes a crime in Crime No.201 of 2025 for the offence
punishable under Section 192-A of the Act. The crime is registered
on 19-09-2025. No action is taken. For the first time a notice comes
to be issued by the Police against accused No.2 under Section 35(3)
of the BNSS. The notice reads as follows:

“ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮಹಾನಗರ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆ ಪಡೆ

ಜಿ.ಬಿ.ಎ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ, ಎನ್.ಆರ್.ವೃತ್ತ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-2, ದೂ.ಸಂ.080-22975589.

ನಂ:ಎಡಿಜಿಪಿ/ಬಿಎಂಟಿಎಫ್/ಮೊ.ಸಂ/201/2025

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್,

ಬಿ.ಎಂ.ಟಿ.ಎಫ್ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ

ಜಿ.ಬಿ.ಎ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಕಛೇರಿ,

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ : 18.12.2025

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ನೋಟೀಸ್

(ಕಲಂ : 35(3) ಭಾರತೀಯ ನಾಗರೀಕ ಸುರಕ್ಷಾ ಸಂಹಿತೆ-2023)

ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ನಿಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯಪಡಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರಜಿಲ್ಲೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಉತ್ತರಹಳ್ಳಿ ಹೋಬಳಿ, ಕಗ್ಗಲೀಪುರಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್‌ಗಳಾದ 160, 164/1, 164/2, 150, 137, 135 ಮತ್ತು 46 ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿಜಾಗ, ಕೆರೆ, ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ, ನೀರು ಹರಿಯುವ ಹಳ್ಳ ಹಾಗೂ ಇತರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಾಗವನ್ನು ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ವಸತಿ ಸಮುಚ್ಚಯ ಹಾಗೂ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿರುವ 1). ಶ್ರೀ.ರವಿಶಂಕರ್ ಗುರೂಜಿ, ಆಟ್‌ಆಫ್ ಲಿವಿಂಗ್ 2) ಶ್ರೀ. ರಘು ಅವಧಾನಿ 3).ಶ್ರೀ. ದ್ವಿಗಜಯ ಚೌಧರಿ, 4).ಉತ್ತಮ್‌ಚಂದ್ ಭಂಡಾರಿ 5). ಮೆ|| ಸುಮೇರು ಗ್ಲೋಬಲ್ ಸರ್ವೋರ್ಡ್ ಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ರವರುಗಳ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತಿಯ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೀಡಿದ ದೂರು ಬಿ.ಎಂ.ಟಿ.ಎಫ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಂ.ಎಡಿಜಿಪಿ/ಬಿಎಂಟಿಎಫ್/ಪಿಟಿಷನ್/138/2022 ರಂತೆ ದಾಖಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ದೂರಿನ ವಿಚಾರಣಾ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಮತ್ತು ಭೂದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ರವರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ ರವಾನೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದ್ದು, ದಿನಾಂಕ;15-04-2025 ರಂದು ಸ್ಟೀಡ್ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಬಂದ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲಾಗಿ **ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ರವರ ಕಛೇರಿ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ, ಎನ್.ಸಿ.ಆರ್.(ಉ)ಸಿ.ಆರ್/93/21-22 ದಿ:14-03-2025** ರಂತೆ ನೀಡಿರುವ ವರದಿ ಮತ್ತು ಭೂ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ರವರು ನೀಡಿರುವ ಸರ್ವೆ ಸ್ಕೇಚ್ ಸದರಿ ಸ್ವತ್ತಾದ ಕಗ್ಗಲೀಪುರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.46, 150 ಹಾಗೂ ಬಿ.ಎಂ.ಕಾವಲ್ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆಗಳ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಂಡಂತೆ ಇರುವ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದು, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಘನ ಭೂ ಕಬಳಿಕೆ ನಿಷೇಧ ವಿಶೇಷ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. ಎಲ್.ಜಿ.ಸಿ.ನಂ.23/2024 ರಂತೆ ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್‌ರವರ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.ಎನ್.ಸಿ.ಆರ್.ನಂ.23/2004 ರಂತೆ ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ. ಎನ್.ಸಿ.ಆರ್.(ಉ)/ಸಿಆರ್/213/23-24 ಹಾಗೂ ಭೂ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ರವರ ಕಛೇರಿ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಭೂಸಾನಿ/ಪಿ ಆರ್/ಇ-505554/2024-25 ರ ದಿ:29-01-2024 ರಂತೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ರೀನಂ.164/1, 164/2, 163/3, 161/7, 160, ಮತ್ತು 166ನ್ನು ಅಳತೆ ಕೆಲಸ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿ ನಕ್ಷೆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿದೆ.

ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164/2 ಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮೇರು ರಿಯಾಲಿಟಿ ಪ್ರೈ. ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯವರು ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ.1 ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ.2, ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ.3 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 0-8 1/4 ಗುಂಟೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವಸತಿ ಸಮುಚ್ಚಯವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.163/3 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಬಾನುಮತಿ ಬಿನ್ ಆರ್.ಎಸ್. ರತ್ನಂರವರು 0-02 ಗುಂಟೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದರಂತೆ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ.4 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.160 ರ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರರು ಶ್ರೀ.ರಘು ಆರ್. ಬಿನ್ ಜಿ.ಎಸ್.ರಾಜಣ್ಣ ಎಂಬುವವರು ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164/2, 163/3, 161/7, 160 ಮತ್ತು 166 ರ ಮಧ್ಯ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾದು ಹೋಗುವ ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆಯನ್ನು ಸುಮೇರು ರಿಯಾಲಿಟಿ ಪ್ರೈ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯವರು ಹಾಗೂ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164ರ ಹಕ್ಕುದಾರರು ವಸತಿ ಸಮುಚ್ಚಯ ಕಾಪಾಡಿನ ಒಳಗೆ 2 ರಿಂದ 3.00 ಮೀಟರ್ ಅಗಲದ ಕಾಲುವೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಹಳದಿ ಬಣ್ಣದಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರದೇಶವು ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ಸುಮಾರು 1-05 ಗುಂಟೆ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣವಿದ್ದು, ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಆರ್.ಟಿ.ಸಿದಾರರಾದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164/2ರ, 163/3, 161/7 ರ ಮತ್ತು 166 ರ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರರು (ಆರ್.ಟಿ.ಸಿದಾರರು) ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಅಳತೆ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಟ್ಟಾರೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.164/2 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0-35 ಗುಂಟೆ, ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.163 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0-02 ಗುಂಟೆ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.161/7 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0-06 ಗುಂಟೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ.160 ರಲ್ಲಿ 0-02 ಗುಂಟೆ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಂದು ಸರ್ವೆ ಸ್ಪೆಷ್‌ನೊಂದಿಗೆ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರ್ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ರವರಕಛೇರಿ ಪತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ, ಎನ್.ಸಿ.ಆರ್.(ಉ)ಸಿ.ಆರ್/93/21-22 ದಿ:14-03-2025 ರವರು ನೀಡಿರುವ ವರದಿ ಆಧಾರಿತ ಮತ್ತು ಭೂದಾಖಲೆಗಳ ಸಹಾಯಕ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರು, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ದಕ್ಷಿಣತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ರವರು ನೀಡಿರುವ ಸರ್ವೆ ಸ್ಪೆಷ್ ಅನ್ವಯ ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ದೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ಒತ್ತುವರಿದಾರರಾದ 1). ಶ್ರೀ. ರವಿಶಂಕರ್‌ಗುರೂಜಿ, ಆಟ್‌ಆಫ್ ಲಿವಿಂಗ್ 2) ಶ್ರೀ. ರಘು ಅವಧಾನಿ 3).ಶ್ರೀ.ದ್ವಿಗಜಯ ಚೌಧರಿ, 4).ಉತ್ತಮ್‌ಚಂದ್ ಭಂಡಾರಿ 5).ಮ|| ಸುಮೇರು ಗ್ಲೋಬಲ್ ಸರ್ವೋಟ್ ಸಲ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್‌ರವರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತಿಯ ಕ್ರಮಜರುಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೊಟ್‌ಟ ದೂರಿನ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಬಿ.ಎಂ.ಟಿ.ಎಫ್ ರಾಣಿಯ ಮೊ.ಸಂ.201/2025, ಕಲಂ:192(A) KLR Act 1964 ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಪ್ರಕರಣ ದಾಖಲು ಮಾಡಿ ತನಿಖೆ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಕ್ರ.ಸಂ	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ/ ಬ್ಲಾಕ್	ಆರೋಪಿತ ಒತ್ತುವರಿದಾರರ ವಿವರ	ಒತ್ತುವರಿಯ ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ	ಒತ್ತುವರಿಯ ವಿಧ
01	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 164/2 ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ 01, 02,03	ಮೆ ಸುಮೇರು ರಿಯಾಲಿಟಿ- ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ, ಶುಳಸಿ ಹಾಲ್, 2 ನೇ ಗೇಟ್ ಎದುರು, ಹಾರ್ಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಲಿವಿಂಗ್, ಉದಯಪುರ, ಕಗ್ಗಲಿಪುರ ಗ್ರಾಮ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು-82	0.8 ಗುಂಟೆ	ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ
02	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 162/3 ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ. 04	ಬಾನುಮತಿ ಬಿನ್ ಆರ್.ಎಸ್ ರತ್ನಂ, ವೇದ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನ ಮಹಾವಿದ್ಯಾಪೀಠ ಉದಯಪುರ, ಉತ್ತರಹಳ್ಳಿ ಹೋಬಳಿ, ಬೆಂ.	0.02 ಗುಂಟೆ	ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ
	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 163/3		0-02	ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ
	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 161/7		0-06	ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ
03	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 160 ಬ್ಲಾಕ್ ನಂ. 05	ರಘು ಆರ್ ಬಿನ್ ಜಿ.ಎಸ್ ರಾಜಣ್ಣ ವೇದ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನ ಮಹಾವಿದ್ಯಾಪೀಠ, ಪಂಚಗಿರಿ ಆಶ್ರಮ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್, ಉದಯಪುರ, ಉತ್ತರಹಳ್ಳಿ ಹೋಬಳಿ, ಬೆಂ.	0.03 ಗುಂಟೆ	ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ
	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 160		0-2	ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ
04	ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 164/2	ಉತ್ತಮಚಂದ್ ಭಂಡಾರಿ ಬಿನ್ ಹನ್ನರಾಜ್ ಭಂಡಾರಿ	0-35	ರಾಜಕಾಲುವೆ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ

ಈ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ತನಿಖಾ ಸಂಬಂಧ, ನೀವು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸ್ವತ್ತಿನ ದಾಖಲಾತಿಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ:29.12.2025 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 11-30 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ತನಿಖಾಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ.

ಸಹಿ/-

(ದೊಡ್ಡಪ್ಪ ಜೆ)

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮಹಾನಗರ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆ ಪಡೆ

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಠಾಣೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

ರವರಿಗೆ,

ರಘು ಆರ್ ಬಿನ್ ಜಿ.ಎಸ್ ರಾಜಣ್ಣ
ವೇದ ವಿಜ್ಞಾನ ಮಹಾವಿದ್ಯಾಪೀಠ,
ಪಂಚಗಿರಿ ಆಶ್ರಮ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್,
ಉದಯಪುರ, ಉತ್ತರಹಳ್ಳಿ ಹೋಬಳಿ,
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.”

Several survey numbers are indicated as was found in the memorandum of public interest petition and before the Land Grabbing Court. The name of the petitioner does find place in the narration of the notice, but the notice by itself is not issued to the petitioner. Notice being issued to accused No.2 drives the petitioner/accused No.1 before this Court.

8. A perusal at the contents of the complaint would clearly indicate that there is no allegation against the petitioner for land grabbing or encroachment of Government land. Merely because he was arrayed as respondent No.5 in the public interest petition, proceedings are drawn against him by dragging him into the web of proceedings. It is trite law that registration of a crime is a serious matter against any citizen. Therefore, it cannot be registered without there being any prima facie material. Prima facie material cannot be gathered during investigation. It must exist in the complaint. The narration in the complaint is based upon three factors viz., (i) PIL, (ii) the proceedings before the Land Grabbing Court and (iii) the investigation/report by the Tahsildar which is produced before the Land Grabbing Court. BMTF then after

following the procedure stipulated or elucidated by Benches of this Court with regard to issuance of notice to the accused and then registering the crime under Section 192-A of the Act has scrupulously followed the procedure. There is no procedural aberration committed by the BMTF in the case at hand. There is no allegation against the petitioner that can become the offence under Section 192-A of the Act.

9. Section 192-A of the Act reads as follows:

“192-A. Offences and Penalties.—Notwithstanding anything contained in the Act or the rules made thereunder whoever commits any of the offence specified in column (2) of the Table below, shall on conviction by a Judicial Magistrate of first class for each of such offence be punishable with the sentence indicated in column (3) thereof,—

TABLE

Sl. No. (1)	Offence (2)	Punishment (3)
(1)	Unlawfully enters or occupies on any Government land with the intention of holding that Government land:	Imprisonment for one year and fine of rupees five thousand.
	Provided that it shall not apply to cases of <i>Jamma</i> , Bane lands in Coorg District or encroached government lands regularised or pending for regularization	

before the Committee constituted under Sections 94-A, 94-B and 94-C of the Act.

(2) **Cheats and thereby dishonestly creates documents for the purpose of selling, mortgaging or transferring by gift or otherwise of any Government land. Imprisonment for three years and fine of rupees ten thousand.**

(3) Creates a forged document regarding Government lands with an intention to use it for that purpose or to grab such land. Imprisonment for three years and fine of rupees five thousand

(4) Being a Revenue Officer entrusted with the responsibility of reporting unlawful occupation of Government land or initiating action to remove such unauthorised occupiers fails to report or take action to remove such unlawful occupants: Imprisonment for three years and fine of rupees ten thousand.

Provided that it shall not apply to cases of Jamma, Bane lands in Coorg District or encroached government lands regularised or pending for regularization before the Committee constituted under Sections 94-A, 94-B and 94-C of the Act:

²⁹⁹[(5) Sells any agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes without getting such land converted or without obtaining prior approval of the competent authority: The penalty of rupees one lakh.]

Provided that it shall not apply to cases which are regularized by the Government by formulating a special scheme in this behalf.

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| (6) | Creates a forged document, regarding conversion of agricultural land for non-agricultural use or authorising the holder of agricultural land to use for non-agricultural purpose. | Imprisonment for one year and fine of rupees five thousand. |
| (7) | Being a public servant entrusted with the responsibility of maintaining records or entrusted with the responsibility of reporting unlawful conversion to the competent authority fails to report to the competent authority or to initiate action against unlawful conversion of revenue lands for non-agricultural purposes:

Provided that it shall not apply to cases which are regularized by the government by formulating a special scheme in this behalf. | Imprisonment for three years and fine of rupees ten thousand. |
| (8) | Contravenes any lawful order passed under this Act. | With fine which may extend to five thousand rupees for the first offence and five times the fine for the second and subsequent offences." |

(Emphasis supplied)

Section 192-A mandates that notwithstanding anything contained in any Act or the Rules, whoever commits any offence specified in column No.2 of the table appended to Section 192-A would become punishable. Srl.No.2 of the table observes that whoever cheats and thereby dishonestly creates documents for the purpose of selling,

mortgaging or transferring by gift or otherwise of any Government land would become open for proceedings and consequent punishment. If the complaint is noticed on the touchstone of ingredients necessary to be present for an offence under Section 192-A what would unmistakably emerge is that, they are completely lacking even to their semblance in the case at hand. Therefore, while recording that no procedural aberration has happened in the case at hand by the BMTF, interference is warranted on the score that, even if the complaint is taken on its face value it does not make out an offence against the petitioner, as there is not even an iota of allegation against the petitioner in encroachment of Government land. While it may be against others or others would be required to defend the action, insofar as the present petitioner is concerned, there is nothing worth the name, to permit investigation even in the case at hand.

10. The learned State Public Prosecutor-I has strenuously contended that a coordinate Bench of this Court has recognized the manner or modus operandi of the foundation in Civil Revision Petition No.539 of 2015 which comes to be disposed of on

17-08-2023 and would paraphrase those observations to the case at hand, to contend that the foundation is guilty of land grabbing. The said judgment would not become applicable to the facts obtaining the case at hand. There, the challenge was to an auction sale. All the findings rendered by the learned single Judge revolves round the auction sale. Therefore, the auction sale dated 19-04-2003 which was the fulcrum of the *lis* was set aside and the parties were directed to maintain *status quo*. The said judgment was challenged before the Apex Court and the Apex Court confirmed the said judgment. The judgment of the learned single Judge or the judgment of the Apex court would in no way become applicable to the facts obtaining or the fulcrum of the subject *lis*. This Court is presently examining registration of a crime against the petitioner. If there is no allegation in the complaint that would permit investigation, the investigation cannot be permitted.

11. The learned State Public Prosecutor-I has placed reliance upon three judgments quoted *supra*. There can be no qualm about the principles so laid down by the Apex Court in all the aforesaid judgments. All the three judgments, on which the learned State

Public Prosecutor places reliance upon, would hold that at the stage of registration of crime normally the Court should not interfere in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., or 528 of the BNSS. But, nevertheless, they would also observe that if it would not amount to an allegation that would not become an ingredient of any offence, such crimes must be obliterated by following the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **STATE OF HARYANA v. BHAJAN LAL** in **1992 Supp (1) SCC 335**. In **NEEHARIKA INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATE LIMITED** *supra*, the Apex Court follows **BHAJAN LAL** and observes as follows:

“ ”

10.3. Then comes the celebrated decision of this Court in *Bhajan Lal [State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335 : 1992 SCC (Cri) 426]*. In the said decision, this Court considered in detail the scope of the High Court powers under Section 482CrPC and/or Article 226 of the Constitution of India to quash the FIR and referred to several judicial precedents and held that the High Court should not embark upon an inquiry into the merits and demerits of the allegations and quash the proceedings without allowing the investigating agency to complete its task. At the same time, this Court identified the following cases in which FIR/complaint can be quashed:

“102. (1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.

(2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

(4) Where the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the Act concerned (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the Act concerned, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fides and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge."

The Apex Court in the aforesaid case also lays down 15 postulates of interference and non-interference. Paragraph 13 reads as follows:

13. From the aforesaid decisions of this Court, right from the decision of the Privy Council in *Khwaja Nazir Ahmad* [*King Emperor v. Khwaja Nazir Ahmad*, 1944 SCC OnLine PC 29 : (1943-44) 71 IA 203 : AIR 1945 PC 18] , the following principles of law emerge:

13.1. Police has the statutory right and duty under the relevant provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure contained in Chapter XIV of the Code to investigate into cognizable offences.

13.2. Courts would not thwart any investigation into the cognizable offences.

13.3. However, in cases where no cognizable offence or offence of any kind is disclosed in the first information report the Court will not permit an investigation to go on.

13.4. The power of quashing should be exercised sparingly with circumspection, in the "rarest of rare cases". (The rarest of rare cases standard in its application for quashing under Section 482CrPC is not to be confused with the norm which has been formulated in the context of the death penalty, as explained previously by this Court.)

13.5. While examining an FIR/complaint, quashing of which is sought, the Court cannot embark upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the FIR/complaint.

13.6. Criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage.

13.7. Quashing of a complaint/FIR should be an exception and a rarity than an ordinary rule.

13.8. Ordinarily, the courts are barred from usurping the jurisdiction of the police, since the two organs of the State operate in two specific spheres of

activities. The inherent power of the court is, however, recognised to secure the ends of justice or prevent the abuse of the process by Section 482CrPC.

13.9. The functions of the judiciary and the police are complementary, not overlapping.

13.10. Save in exceptional cases where non-interference would result in miscarriage of justice, the Court and the judicial process should not interfere at the stage of investigation of offences.

13.11. Extraordinary and inherent powers of the Court do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the Court to act according to its whims or caprice.

13.12. The first information report is not an encyclopaedia which must disclose all facts and details relating to the offence reported. Therefore, when the investigation by the police is in progress, the court should not go into the merits of the allegations in the FIR. Police must be permitted to complete the investigation. It would be premature to pronounce the conclusion based on hazy facts that the complaint/FIR does not deserve to be investigated or that it amounts to abuse of process of law. During or after investigation, if the investigating officer finds that there is no substance in the application made by the complainant, the investigating officer may file an appropriate report/summary before the learned Magistrate which may be considered by the learned Magistrate in accordance with the known procedure.

13.13. The power under Section 482CrPC is very wide, but conferment of wide power requires the Court to be cautious. It casts an onerous and more diligent duty on the Court.

13.14. However, at the same time, the Court, if it thinks fit, regard being had to the parameters of quashing and the self-restraint imposed by law, more particularly the parameters laid down by this Court in *R.P. Kapur* [*R.P. Kapur v. State of Punjab*, 1960 SCC OnLine SC 21 : AIR 1960 SC 866] and *Bhajan Lal* [*State of Haryana v. Bhajan Lal*, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335 : 1992 SCC (Cri) 426] , has the jurisdiction to quash the FIR/complaint.

13.15. When a prayer for quashing the FIR is made by the alleged accused, the Court when it exercises the power under Section 482CrPC, only has to consider whether or not the allegations in the FIR disclose the commission of a cognizable offence and is not required to consider on merits whether the allegations make out a cognizable offence or not and the court has to permit the investigating agency/police to investigate the allegations in the FIR.”

(Emphasis supplied)

The Apex Court holds, in exceptional cases where non-interference would result in miscarriage of justice, the Court and the judicial process should not interfere with investigation. At clause 13.3 the Apex Court clearly observes that however, in cases where no cognizable offence or offence of any kind is disclosed in the First Information Report, the Court will not permit an investigation to go on. The subject petition falls squarely within the parameters of paragraph 13.3. As observed, the Apex Court follows the judgment in the case of **BHAJAN LAL** and lays down parameters of interference/non-interference. In the light of the fact that there is no iota of allegation against the petitioner and him being dragged into the web of proceedings only on the score that he is named as respondent No.5 in a public interest petition, the proceedings if

permitted to continue, would become an abuse of the process of law against the petitioner and result in miscarriage of justice.

12. In the light of the unequivocal facts and the judgments rendered by the Apex Court, all quoted *supra*, I deem it appropriate to obliterate the crime against the petitioner.

13. For the aforesaid reasons, the following:

ORDER

- (i) Writ Petition is **allowed**.
- (ii) Complaint in Crime No.201 of 2025 dated 19-09-2025 registered by the 2nd respondent/BMTF Police stands quashed *qua* the petitioner.
- (iii) It is made clear that the observations made in the course of the order are only for the purpose of consideration of the case of the petitioner under Section 528 of the BNSS and it would not become applicable to any other accused in the subject crime.

**Sd/-
(M.NAGAPRASANNA)
JUDGE**