



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 18384 OF 2026 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

M/S BHARATHI EDUCATION SOCIETY TRUST
BHARATHI NAGAR (KM DODDI)
MANDYA DISTRICT-571422
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI.K.B. MOUNESH., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY THE SECRETARY
RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND
PANCHAYAT RAJ DEPT.
KALIDASA MARGA, GANDHI NAGAR
BENGALURU 560 009.

2. PANCHAYAT DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
GRAMA PANCHAYAT, BHARATHINAGARA
MADDUR TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT-571422.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.BOPPANNA BELLIAPPA., AGA FOR R1)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND
227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO





QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 02.06.2026
VIDE NO. BHARATHI NAGAR GRAMA
PANCHAYAT//2026-27 ISSUED BY THE R-2 PRODUCED
AS ANNEX-E; DIRECTIONS IN THE MANDAMUS TO THE
R-2 TO CONSIDER THE REPLY OF THE PETITIONER
SOCIETY DATED 10.06.2026 PRODUCED AS ANNEX-F
AND FURTHER ACT UPON THE SAME.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner is a Society registered under the
Karnataka Societies Registration Act, 1960 [for short,
'*the Act*'] and it has established multiple educational
institutions in Maddur Taluk, Mandya District. The
petitioner has also commenced a Law Degree Course.
The petitioner's grievance is with the second
respondent's Communication dated 02.06.2026
[*Annexure-E*]. The second respondent, *vide* this
impugned Communication, has called upon the
petitioner to remove *buntings* which are put up with
the image of a person *lest* action be taken to remove
those *buntings*. This Communication also reads that



the petitioner is permitted to put up such *buntings* but not with the image of a person, and that though the petitioner has been served with notice for removal of the *buntings*, the petitioner has failed to remove such *buntings*.

2. Sri K. B. Monesh Kumar, the learned counsel for the petitioner, is heard in the light of the petitioner's possible response to such notice. The petitioner has referred to the permission accorded by the Bar Council of India for commencement of a law degree course from the academic year 2026-27 asserting that the *buntings* put up are in accordance with the permission covered under an agreement between the petitioner and second respondent dated 29.08.2023 and that if the petitioner is informed about the parts of the *buntings* which are offensive, those would be removed.

3. The photographs of the *buntings* are produced in the Annexure -C series, and it is seen



that these *buntings* have the image of a person in what could be the attire prescribed for Advocates. The Bar Council of India Rules would be against any advertisement of an individual, and when this is put to Sri K.B. Monesh Kumar, the learned counsel submits that this Court may grant some time to the petitioner to replace the *buntings* with the image of a person [*even a student*] so that the petitioner's right is not jeopardized when the petitioner is willing to ensure that there is no possible violation of the relevant Rules.

4. Sri Bopanna Belliappa, the learned Additional Government Advocate, who is called upon to accept notice for the first respondent, is heard in the light of the circumstances. The second respondent must be called upon to defer the proposed action for a reasonable time within which the petitioner will have to replace all images of any person from its *buntings* and ensure that the



buntings relate to the Law Degree Course and the details of the Institution without emphasis on person/ persons. If the petitioner replaces the image of a person in the attire which is prescribed for an Advocate in the *buntings* in due deference of the Bar Council of India Rules against advertisement for individuals and ensures that the *buntings* are about the Law Degree Course/details of the Institution, the second respondent cannot be precipitous in bringing about a termination of the petitioner's right. Therefore, this Court must intervene on terms. Hence, the following:

ORDER

The petition stands disposed of on the following terms.

[a] The second respondent is directed to defer action under the impugned Communication dated 02.06.2026 for a period eight [8] weeks from today.



[b] The petitioner is reserved with liberty to replace the *buntings* with the *buntings* that have details of the Law Degree Course and Institution and file an affidavit in this regard with the second respondent.

[c] The second respondent, who shall defer action as aforesaid for the next eight [8] weeks, shall consider the issue once again in the light of such replacement without hindering the Bar Council's permission/recognition in favour of the petitioner's institution or the agreement concluded with the petitioner.

**Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE**

SA
Ct:sr