



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 44 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI V RAVI KUMAR

S/O LATE G.K.VEERABHADRAPPA

AGED 42 YEARS, ADVOCATE

SURYA LAW CHAMBER

NO.51, K.T.STREET

OPP MANDI MOHALLA POLICE STATION

MYSORE - 570 021.

...PETITIONER

(BY SMT. SANDHYA U. PRABHU.,ADVOCATE)





AND:

KARNATAKA STATE BAR COUNCIL

REP. BY ITS SECRETARY

OLD KGID BUILDING

DR.AMBEDKAR ROAD

BENGALURU - 560 001.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI.CHAITANYA S G., ADVOCATE FOR C/R ;

SRI. S. BASAVARAJU., BAR COUNCIL OF
KARNATAKA COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN -APPER IN
PERSON)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO
DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT TO FURNISH THE
COPY OF THE ALLEGED RESOLUTION OR ORDER
OF SUSPENSION PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT
ON 06/12/2025 AS SOUGHT FOR UNDER
APPLICATION UNDER RTI DATED 26/12/2025
PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-G.



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, a member enrolled with the
Karnataka State Bar Council [*the KSBC*], is aggrieved
by Show Cause Notice dated 30.12.2025 issued by
the KSBC, the respondent. This Notice reads thus:

*"With reference to the above, you are
called upon to appear before the Karnataka
State Bar Council Meeting on 10th January,
2026 at 11.30 a.m. at the KSBC premises.
Please note that your failure to appear will
result in unilateral approval of the
recommendation from the
Screening/Mediation Committee."*

2. Smt Sandhya U Prabhu, the learned
counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner
is called upon to appear to answer a recommendation
by a Screening-Mediation Committee [*'the Committee'*]



but the petitioner has not even been furnished with the copies of the recommendation though an application is filed under the Right to Information Act, 2005, and the learned counsel proposes to elaborate on the petitioner's cause with reference to a complaint lodged against Sri S Basavaraju, a learned Senior Counsel and a member of the KSBC.

3. Sri S Basavaraju seeks leave to make submissions as an intervener, and when Court permitted, limited to the extent of understanding the context, he submits that he was the Chairman of the Committee constituted by the KSBC to look into complaints of certain members enrolled with the KSBC publishing reels and video clips that could tantamount to advertisement; that many of the learned Members have taken out their reels and video clips but because some members [such as the petitioner have not taken out the reels], the Committee has gone ahead and filed its



recommendations; and that the petitioner, despite opportunity, has not appeared before the Committee.

4. Mr. S Basavaraju also seeks to elaborate on what he describes as a vicious campaign against him and his family members only because he, as the Chairperson of the Committee, has taken the initiative to ensure that the practice of publishing reels and video clips as advertisements are curbed. Smt Sandhya U Prabhu, in rejoinder, not only denies the allegations of vicious campaign against Mr. S Basavaraju she also submits that the Committee's recommendations are despite the petitioner's participation in the Committee's proceedings.

5. The impugned notice dated 30.12.2025 [Annexure-H] requires the petitioner to appear before the KSBC on 10.01.2026 and, undisputedly, it is in the context of the recommendations by the Committee. Mr. S G Chaitanya, the learned counsel



who has entered caveat for the KSBC, when queried, submits that the Committee's recommendations may not have been handed over to the petitioner. If the petitioner has to participate in any meeting because of the recommendation that could be against him, this Court opines that for such participation, to be meaningful, the petitioner must be furnished with a copy of the Committee's recommendation; otherwise the opportunity to participate in the Meeting would be an empty formality.

6. Therefore there must be interference in the light of the afore, and this Court must also, while interfering in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, ensure that the petitioner does not come across as being inequitable in his conduct. As such, this Court opines that the petitioner must not give room for any allegation of fronting or leading a campaign either against the Chairman or the



members of the Committee or against the other Members of the KSBC. This Court must observe that this would be the least that is expected of a member who is part of a profession which even today must be recognized for its nobility. As such, the following:

ORDER

- [a] The petition stands disposed of calling upon the respondent to furnish a copy of the Committee's recommendations to the petitioner and extend him a due opportunity to participate in the proposed meeting with a reasonable time to show cause, if required, against any recommendation.
- [b] The petitioner will be at liberty to approach the KSBC for a copy of the Resolution with a certified copy of this order, and he shall in exercise of this liberty, approach the KSBC for a copy



within one week from the date of receipt of
a certified copy of this order.

- [c] The meeting scheduled on 10.01.2026
shall stand deferred subject to the afore
conditions with liberty to the KSBC to
issue fresh notice of the proposed meeting
based on the Committee's
recommendation.

Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

AN/-