



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

WRIT PETITION NO. 37794 OF 2025 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. MUNIYAPPA. M.
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
ADVOCATE (MHLM 439)
2. RAGHU KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS
(MHLM 1749)
3. THIRTHA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
ADVOCATE (CCLM 8183)
4. SHRINIVAS J. M.
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
5. NAGARAJU T. L.
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
ADVOCATE (CCLM 15102)

OFFICE ADDRESS NO. 131,
'MATHRUSHREE NILAYA',
PATTANDUR AGRAHARA, WHITEFIELD,
BENGALURU 560066.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SHIVARAMU H.C.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
THROUGH ADVOCATE GENERAL,
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT BUILDING
BENGALURU 560001





2. BAR COUNCIL OF KARNATAKA
THROUGH SECRETARY, BAL BHAVAN,
BENGALURU - 560001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN
3. JOINT REGISTRAR OF CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES
MALLESHWARAM,
BENGALURU 560003.
4. ADVOCATES' ASSOCIATION,
BENGALURU
THROUGH PRESIDENT,
CITY CIVIL COURT COMPLEX,
BENGALURU 560001.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. D.R. RAVISHANKAR., SR. ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. H.V. PRAVEEN GOWDA., ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED SUSPENSION RESOLUTION DATED 06-12-2025, AS IT WAS PASSED WITHOUT NOTICE OR ENQUIRY IN VIOLATION OF ARTICLES 14 AND 21. THE RESOLUTION IS ARBITRARY AND ULTRA VIRES THE MANDATORY BYE-LAWS 33 AND 34. ANNEXURE-D AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURAJ GOVINDARAJ

ORAL ORDER

1. The petitioners are before this Court seeking for the following reliefs:

i) Issue a writ of Certiorari to quash the impugned suspension resolution dated 06-12-2025, as it was passed without notice or enquiry in violation of Articles 14 and 21. The resolution is arbitrary and ultra vires the mandatory Bye-Laws 33 and 34. Annexure-D



(ii) Direct Respondent No.4 to restore the Petitioners' membership along with all consequential benefits and access rights. Such restoration is necessary to prevent continuing professional hardship and irreparable prejudice.

(iii) Declare that the impugned action violates the mandatory procedure prescribed under Bye-Laws 33 and 34 of the Common Bye-Laws. Such a declaration is essential to uphold lawful governance and procedural fairness.

(iv) Direct Respondent No.2 to initiate disciplinary proceedings under Section 35 of the Advocates Act against Advocate Anjan Gowda for the caste-based misconduct recorded in FIR No. 0244/2025. His professional indiscipline to conduct amounts warranting statutory action.

(v) Direct Respondent Nos.1 and 3 to ensure fair and impartial investigation of FIR No. 0244/2025 and to provide protection to the Petitioners under the SC/ST (POA) Act. Such protection is necessary since the Petitioners are victims of caste-based abuse and retaliation.

(vi) Grant any other appropriate reliefs that this Hon'ble Court deems fit in the interest of justice. The Petitioners rely on the equitable jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court for suitable orders.

2. A memo dated 19.12.2025 has been filed on behalf of Respondent No.4 by the learned counsel for Respondent No.4, the President, Vice President, and the General Secretary of Respondent No.4, which reads as under:

"MEMO

The Respondent Advocates' Association, Bengaluru on an opinion taken from the Governing Council has



decided to withdraw the resolution suspending the petitioners and proceed with the Disciplinary Proceedings in accordance with the bye laws. The withdrawal will be notified to members."

3. The submission of Sri D. R. Ravishankar, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondents is that the suspension vide the resolution dated 06.12.2025 would be withdrawn and a copy of the said resolution would be filed with the Registry of this Court by 16.30 hours today.
4. In that view of the matter, I am of the considered opinion that prayer No.(i) sought for in the present matter does not survive for consideration; prayer No.(ii) to restore the petitioner's membership would also not survive since the suspension order has been revoked. As such, the membership, never having been terminated, would continue to be in force.
5. Insofar as prayer No.(iii) is concerned with the withdrawal of the suspension made vide resolution dated 06.12.2025, the said prayer at Sl.No.(iii) does not survive for consideration.
6. Insofar as the prayer sought for in Sl.No.(iv), liberty is reserved to the petitioner to file such complaint and/or



representation as the petitioners wish to before Respondent No.2, which shall be considered by Respondent No.2 and necessary orders passed thereon as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

7. Insofar as prayer No.5 is concerned, the same being subject made of FIR No.244/2025, the necessary procedure in relation thereto would have to be followed by the concerned Authorities.
8. With the above observations, the petition stands ***disposed.***

SD/-
(SURAJ GOVINDARAJ)
JUDGE

KTY
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 44