Karnataka High Court

The City Municipal Council Nipani vs Rajendra Shivaputrappa Wali on 5 December, 2008 Author: N.Kumar

is THE H163 corner ms' KARKATAKA c1RcU;T._B.;E'mcH AT Bi-IARWAI) Dated this the SW day of Deccmber", @()£i 8 ' ' ' M BI3i"+'ORE THE :~wx*BLE ism. Jଢfrie□N'. éuixvzaa " Writ Pctittian No. s9§':3%»of 2695 ' ¢<:§:~;=1~«'::«:5C;::%'% Between: _ The City Municipal Cc-xzixcil . V" "

Nipani H 33? its Commissim1.e:r V Taluka Chikocii ' - ' Bclgaum [}1s\frac{1}{3}t.V-' =: A ' ,...P'e:t.it:ion.er _ .: ' Advecaie\} RajenCitja"Shiva;3u.t1:appa;' s/o shivaputmppa\frac{1}{3}w*a:i\frac{1}{3}w Aged about <\int\frac{1}{3}i3yE:'ar's"\sigma.

C'{£'f311}§€3l.11i€}11 B1:,:sines\$ 'R'--e:'ei<i3,i11g"~:=;t' P:ran'B3;"Naga;r " _C§hi1;.c:1iTa11_1k...

~. B§1ga'u3é_z;.§)if.§i1*ict ... R&.3pon,d€:nt " " This Wrij; Petition is filed under ☐rticrles 226 anci 227 of " n the Cons ☐mtion of India, praying to quash the impugned ()I'd6I' V' _ passed by the icaxvatzd Civil Judge (Sr. D11), Chikodi in MA "'1'€<3. 14»/2005 dated 19»~1()-200353 Vida Annexure~El confummg; the oxtier of the ieaxned Civil Judge (Jr.E)n.) Nippani on IA No. 1? in OS No.37] 2005 dated £23 -2005 vide {3§.I111€X11?."E':-D. Centending that the Licence granteci has " w:£thout foilowing the procedure]j3I'f)SCI'I:'iZ3fi(f1"".:f%_:;:1}'1§;41:.tl%VV plaintiff □ed the prfzsent suit I-:f'c'>'i' '-.3 AV injunciion restraining the the consuuction activity. x¢x--;§.a."1;'e 'te}}npor£ii3} injuncଢon was granfgd. 'aଢlerii appearance ଢled objectioxm and séugଢt, arder. The ttiai Court on eonsid::'rat£01;_ heir} that, when the licence ifs work has to be put up wi£}:1i11 Viaezmission is not granted the :_z t}V,é:3"'~'}¢ 1:0' 1&1: up the censfzuc on within the s □ the censfzuc of within the s □ the censfzuc of "Dexwsfbze, granted an order of izljunction." the said order, the Muixicipa Dy 'V" an A.appc§VsiIK£?}i□th came to be dismissed. Aggrieved by th:=«:\$&' the present Writ Petition is filed. uzxfbrtunate that the Courts below ham fa cd to 'izGti{:e they should have considered whether they had the _ '_'§Lv1V)f'i»'3{§ii!C□()I1 to entertaixl the suits and pass mticrs which they .._If1E€§f6 passed. when the plain: avarmelzts ciisciosrs: that the licence granted by the de:; E'endant~municipaiity is canceilsé and E/, the piainti□ was asked not to proceed with the C{.')Z1Sti'11CTi{)I."}., the Karnataka Mnnicipa ☐ties Act, 1964 and the I"g}s:':_\$ frwned thereunder provide remedi⊡s by way of appeal . su<:h orders. At the sajnc tim□E§e<:.i:ie::m Z2813 affine against its officers, szscrvamts, et(_:,,....fQ_1f faith. it categorically states sf "

anything in gco□faith donc";oi:_Vjn:c§'x:z3§§q~ {Q '.é:3,§'3i:eVVv:¥'i1W¢x\.§r€§.is Act against any munjcipai pr committee. constituted undm" _Q□<:er or servant of a municipal council or 1{3é::"s<j'n_"21"c'i::1'ng tmder and in accefdanc□iiviih Ci«;i_1féC.'Q'uIxf:s of any such municipal coumril, commifmé, .oi□Cer" §:'>r, or of a Magistrate. F1::.rther, §3e<.;'£:io1; 284- for a previous statutory notice. It " . fiat, no shall be instituted against any municipal V cc-21fn::i£;..§i1'f3¢::;€~serva11t or any person acfing u1}<:ie:r the ozgtier or di1_"e::cti<:m_é:.af such municipal Council, officer or servani in I'espEe.:;f{ 'of any act done or puzparting to have berm done in '.;31.i£§3uancc of this Act or any rule or bye-iaw made there und □ Tiuntij the expiration of sixty days next after natice in writing, stating the cause of action, the naiture of the relief: sought, the . \./