



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 28TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM
WRIT PETITION NO. 12812 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. M/S SUVARNA HYBRID SEEDS PVT. LTD.,
A PRIVATE LIMITED COMPANY,
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT
NO.113, 10TH MAIN ROAD,
ATTUR LAYOUT, YELAHANKA NEW TOWN,
BENGALURU - 560 064.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR
SRI. NARAYAN V. PATIL
2. M/S. ANKITH AGRO FARM SEEDS
HAVING ITS OFFICE
NO.460, 8TH CROSS,
NEAR VASAVI TEMPLE,
MAHALAKSHMI LAYOUT,
BENGALURU - 560 086.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR
SRI. PRASANNA KUMARA K M
3. M/S. INDU SEEDS,
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT
NO.31, GROUND FLOOR,
SHIVA NILAYA, 4TH CROSS,
MANJUNATHA LAYOUT, R T NAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 032.
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
SRI. I C PATIL





4. M/S. MRITYUNJAYA SEEDS CORPORATION
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT
MRITYUNJAYA MAHAL, SAVADTTI ROAD,
DHARWAD - 580 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
SRI. SIDDHARAM GANGAPPA NADAKATTI

5. M/S. HANUMAN ASSOCIATES,
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT
NO.75, SANGOLLI RAYANNA CIRCLE,
NISARGA LAYOUT ROAD,
MV EXTENSION, HOSAKOTE,
BENGALURU RURAL,
BENGALURU - 562 114.

REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
SRI. SHARANABASAPPA TUPPAD

6. M/S. KARNATAKA SEEDS CORPORATION,
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT NO.109,
1ST MAIN, 7TH CROSS, AV ROAD
CHAMARAJPET,
BENGALURU - 560 018.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR
SRI. ABHISHEK B M

7. M/S. BHALSAR SEEDS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED.,
SAHUKAR COMPLEX, SURADHENUPURA,
DODDABALLAPURA YELAHANKA MAIN ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 064.
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
SRI. BRAJESH KISHOR TRIPATHI.

8. M/S. KARNATAKA HYBRID SEEDS,
NO. 122, 4TH CROSS,
HANUMANTHNAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 019.
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR



SRI. K S JAGADEESHA

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. D PRABHAKAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. UNION OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND CO-OPERATION,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CO-OPERATION
F/212, SHASTRI BHAVAN,
NEW DELHI - 110 001.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
2. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
MS BUILDING, AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
3. THE DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SESHADRI ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
4. THE DIRECTOR OF HORTICULTURE,
DEPARTMENT OF HORTICULTURE,
LALBAGH PARK,
BENGALURU - 560 004.
5. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURE COMPLEX,
BANGALORE URBAN, BANASHANKARI,
BENGALURU - 560 050.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. VINAY V, ADVOCATE CGSC FOR R1;
SRI. ADITHYA DIWAKAR, AGA FOR R2 TO R5)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE



RESPONDENTS NOT TO INSIST UPON THE PETITIONERS TO SECURE LICENSE UNDER THE HEAD PRINCIPLE CERTIFICATE OR STATE SEEDS LICENSE UNDER THE UN-NOTIFIED STATUTE CALLED THE SEEDS ACT 2025 IN SO FAR AS IT RELATES TO THE PETITIONERS AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

ORAL ORDER

Pursuant to the direction issued by this Court, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the Union of India has secured instructions and submits that the proposed Bill, which is sought to be relied upon by the State authorities, has not yet been enacted into law by the competent legislature and is still at a nascent stage of consideration.

2. The gist of the grievance ventilated by the petitioners is that, notwithstanding their undisputed possession of a valid licence issued under the Seeds (Control) Order, 1983, respondent Nos.2 to 4 are allegedly insisting that the petitioners obtain a fresh licence under



the proposed legislation, which has not yet attained statutory force.

3. Learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent Nos.2 to 5, while opposing the petition, fairly submits on instructions that the proposed Bill has not been passed and, therefore, there exists no enforceable mandate requiring the petitioners to obtain any licence thereunder. In view of the said unequivocal stand taken both by the Union of India and the State, any insistence by the field-level authorities to compel compliance under a non-existent statutory regime would be wholly untenable in law.

4. This Court cannot countenance a situation where executive authorities seek to enforce obligations founded on a proposed legislation which has not ripened into law. Such an action would be ex facie arbitrary and dehors the statutory framework governing the field. Though the learned Additional Government Advocate has



contended that no material is placed on record to substantiate the alleged insistence by the authorities, having regard to the apprehension expressed by the petitioners and the statements now made across the Bar, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition with a protective direction. Accordingly, respondent Nos.2 to 5 are hereby directed not to insist upon the petitioners to obtain any licence under the proposed Bill, which is yet to be enacted, and to confine their regulatory action strictly in accordance with the extant provisions governing the field, including the licence contemplated under the Seeds (Control) Order, 1983.

5. For the foregoing reasons, this Court proceeds to pass following:

ORDER

- (i) The writ petition is disposed of.
- (ii) Respondent Nos.2 to 5 are directed not to insist upon the petitioners to obtain any



licence under the proposed Bill, which is yet to be enacted and has not attained statutory force.

(iii) It is further directed that the respondents shall regulate the activities of the petitioners strictly in accordance with the existing statutory framework, including the licence granted under the Seeds (Control) Order, 1983, and shall not take any coercive action on the basis of the proposed legislation.

(iv) In the facts and circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE

CA
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 88