



CNR: KAHC010496502026

NC: 2026:KHC:38963-DB
WP No. 22330 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 28TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 22330 OF 2026 (GM-RES-PIL)

BETWEEN:

1. DEVANURA MAHADEVA
AGED ABOUT 78 YEARS
S/O SHRI LATE C. NANJIAH
R/O NO. 53, 11TH CROSS
NAVILU ROAD, KUVEMPUNAGAR
MYSURU
KARNATAKA - 570 023
2. RAMACHANDRA GUHA
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS
S/O SHRI LATE S.R.D. GUHA
R/O NO. 22-A, BRUNTON ROAD
BANGALORE NORTH, MUSEUM ROAD
BENGALURU
KARNATAKA - 560 025
3. MAJOR GENERAL (RETD.)
S.G. VOMBATKERE
AGED ABOUT 85 YEARS
S/O SHRI LATE GURUNANDAN
ROW VOMBATKERE
R/O NO. 410, ASPEN
SANKALP CENTRAL PARK
YADAVAGIRI, MYSURU
KARNATAKA - 570 020





**NC: 2026:KHC:38963-DB
WP No. 22330 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010496502026

4. SABIHA BHOOMIGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS
D/O M.R. GAJENDRAGAD
R/O #1/131, PULINCHANDY ROAD KONAJE
KONAJE, MANGALAGANGOTHRI
DAKSHINA KANNADA
KARNATAKA - 574 199

ALSO AT INCHARA
NO. 22, GREENCOUNTY LAYOUT
BANNURU MAIN ROAD
NADANAHALLI
ALANAHALLI POST
MYSURU, KARNATAKA - 570 028

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI VIKRAM HUILGOL, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
MS. SHRIYA CHAKRAVARTHY, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA
NIRVACHAN SADAN, ASHOKA ROAD
NEW DELHI - 110 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS
CHIEF ELECTION COMMISSIONER
2. CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER, KARNATAKA
NIRVACHANA NILAYA
CENTRAL COLLEGE
SESHADRI RD, AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU - 560 001
3. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS
CHIEF SECRETARY
ROOM NO. 320, 3RD FLOOR
VIDHANA SOUDHA
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU - 560 001

...RESPONDENTS

(SRI S.R. DODEAD, ADVOCATE FOR R-1 & R-2
SRI SHASHIKIRAN SHETTY K., ADVOCATE GENERAL A/W
SMT. NILOUFER AKBAR, AGA FOR R-3)



CNR: KAHC010496502026

NC: 2026:KHC:38963-DB
WP No. 22330 of 2026

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS, OR A DIRECTION IN THE NATURE THEREOF, DIRECTING RESPONDENT NO.1 TO EXTEND THE TIMELINE PRESENTLY NOTIFIED FOR EACH PHASE OF THE SPECIAL INTENSIVE REVISION IN THE STATE OF KARNATAKA, AS REVISED BY THE ORDER NO.23/2026-ERS (VOL.II) DATED 15/07/2026 (ANNEXURE-A1) FROM ONE TO THREE MONTHS & ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

ORAL ORDER

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

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition as a public interest litigation, *inter alia*, praying as under:

"a. Issue a writ of mandamus, or a direction in the nature thereof, directing Respondent No. 1 to extend the timeline presently notified for each phase of the Special Intensive Revision in the State of Karnataka, as revised by the Order No. 23/2026-ERS (Vol. II) dated 15.07.2026 (Annexure A1) from one to three months;

b. Issue a writ of mandamus or a direction to the Respondent No.3 not to withdraw any social welfare schemes from persons who are not included in the voter rolls post SIR;

c. Issue a writ of mandamus or a direction in the nature thereof, directing Respondents No.1 and 2 to establish and operationalise functional Voter Facilitation Centres at every polling booth in the State of Karnataka;



CNR: KAHC010496502026

d. Issue a writ of mandamus or a direction in the nature thereof, directing Respondent No.1 to clarify what falls within the "Others" sub-category of the Absentee/Shifted/Dead/Duplicate classification, and to direct that no elector's name be excluded from the draft electoral roll under that sub-category without disclosed and specific reasons recorded and communicated to the elector;

e. Issue a writ of mandamus or a direction in the nature thereof, directing Respondent No.1 to publish, in clear and accessible written form, the complete set of criteria that will result in an elector's name being flagged as a "logical discrepancy", and to further direct that no such flag be applied to any elector's name without prior notice to the elector and a reasonable opportunity to respond, in accordance with the principles of natural justice, before the name is excluded from the draft electoral roll;

f. Issue a writ of mandamus or a direction in the nature thereof, directing Respondent No. 1 to consider the specific concerns raised in the letter of the Government of Karnataka dated 15.06.2026 bearing DO No. CS/455/2026 (Annexure - AD), and to issue written guidelines in relation to the conduct of the SIR in the State of Karnataka addressing the same, in a time-bound manner;

g. Issue any other directions in the interest of justice and equity."

2. Mr.Vikram Huilgol, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted, at the outset, that the petitioners are not challenging the Special Intensive Revision [**SIR**] of electoral rolls and the present petition is mainly confined to the feasibility of the timelines of the procedure as evolved in implementation of the SIR process. He submits that the timelines, as now fixed, may not be



CNR: KAHC010496502026

feasible. He points out that the timelines provide only 10 days for training persons conducting the SIR, which, according to him, may not be sufficient. He submits that the persons who would be conducting the SIR are Anganwadi workers and teachers, and a ten-day training module may not be sufficient to adequately equip them for completing the task. Second, he submits that the SIR process involves house-to-house collection of data and the persons conducting the SIR are required to assist them in filling up the said forms. Thereafter, the forms have to be collected, and that would form the basis of the draft electoral roll. He submits that there may be many discrepancies which may result in the names of citizens being left out of the draft electoral rolls. He submits that there is neither any procedure for giving them notice if they are not being mapped to the earlier electoral rolls nor any objective criteria set out for the said purpose.

3. Mr. Huilgol also referred to paragraphs 135 and 136 of the decision in **Association for Democratic Reforms and Others vs. Election Commission of India and Others**¹. He submitted that a

¹ 2026 SCC OnLine SC 990



CNR: KAH010496502026

statement was made before the Supreme Court to the effect that the ERO shall scrutinise the eligibility of electors in accordance with the constitutional and statutory requirements before initiation of any *suo motu* enquiry. And, the guidelines also contemplate issuance of notice to the concerned elector, calling upon them to show cause if there are any doubts regarding the eligibility as an elector. He submits that the said requirement may not be fulfilled in case of certain discrepancies and he is, therefore, concerned that the said procedural safeguard may not be followed. He also drew the attention of this Court to the timelines as fixed and submitted that the time period would be insufficient to complete the exercises, as contemplated.

4. Mr K.Shashi Kiran Shetty, learned Advocate General appearing for the State, submitted that the State has also furnished a detailed representation dated 15.06.2026 flagging certain issues that are now raised in the present petition. He also submits that sufficient time has not been provided to complete the exercises provided.



CNR: KAHC010496502026

5. The learned counsel appearing for the Election Commission of India countered the said submissions on three fronts. First, he submits that the present petition may not be entertained as the Supreme Court is in seisin of similar matters. He submits that the Hon'ble Sikkim High Court as well as the Delhi High Court have declined to entertain the writ petitions even though they do not concern the challenge to the SIR. He submits that although the Supreme Court had passed an order not to take up the writ petitions concerning the validity of the SIR, however, the High Courts have also refrained from entertaining the writ petitions which do not concern the validity of the SIR. Second, he submits that the Election Commission is conscious of the timelines as fixed and if it is found that there is any glitch or hindrance in completing the same in time, the Election Commission would take necessary decision as and when required. Third, he submits that the contention that notices must be issued before publishing of the draft electoral roll is erroneous. He submits that the required notices would be issued after the draft electoral roll is published.



CNR: KAHC010496502026

6. As it is apparent from the above, the present petition relates to the procedure being adopted for conduct of the SIR. The Election Commission of India, which is tasked with the conduct of SIR, is a specialised body. We find no reason to proceed on the basis that the Election Commission of India would not be able to address any of the procedural issues that it may encounter during the conduct of SIR. The question whether the timelines are sufficient to complete the task is within the specialised domain of the Election Commission of India, and it would not be apposite for the court to determine this issue at this stage. As noted above, the State has already made a representation in this regard, and we find no ground to assume that the Election Commission of India would not give it the consideration it deserves.

7. We find that the present petition is largely premature and therefore, decline to entertain the same.

8. We also note the contention advanced by the Election Commission of India that the petitions arising from similar issues are pending consideration before the Supreme Court. For this



**NC: 2026:KHC:38963-DB
WP No. 22330 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010496502026

reason also, it would not be necessary for this Court to examine the issues raised at the present stage.

9. The petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

**Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
(K.S. HEMALEKHA)
JUDGE**

AHB
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 12