

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, BANGALORE**

**DATED THIS THE 23<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF JULY, 2014**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAM MOHAN REDDY**

**WRIT PETITION NO.23364/2014 C/W**  
**W.P.Nos.23365/2014 & 23366/2014 [GM-RES]**

**BETWEEN:**

**IN W.P.No.23364/2014:**

MR.RAMESH K.N.,  
S/O NINGE GOWDA,  
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,  
262, 2<sup>ND</sup> MAIN, 6<sup>TH</sup> CROSS,  
NEW KAVIKA LAYOUT, BAPUJI NAGAR,  
BANGALORE – 26.

**IN W.P.No.23365/2014:**

MR.KUMARESHAN D.,  
S/O DHARMALINGAM,  
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,  
No.1091, PEER PLAZA,  
7<sup>TH</sup> MAIN ROAD, NAGAPPA BLOCK,  
SRIRAMPURAM, BANGALORE-21.

**IN W.P.No.23366/2014:**

A.S.NAGENDRA KUMAR,  
S/O SIDDAPPAJI,  
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,  
No.334/3, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR, 8<sup>TH</sup> CROSS,  
NEW KAVIKA LAYOUT, BAPUJI NAGAR,  
BANGALORE-26.

... PETITIONERS

(BY SRI P.N.HEGDE, ADV.)

**AND:**

1. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,  
KARNATAKA STATE TOURISM,  
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD.,  
# 49, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR, KHANIJA BHAVAN,  
WEST ENTRANCE, RACE COURSE ROAD,  
BANGALORE – 01.
2. THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,  
BANGALORE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LTD.,  
ALPHA-2, KEMPEGOWDA  
INTERNATIOANL AIRPORT,  
BANGALORE – 560300.

... RESPONDENTS  
(COMMON)

(BY SRI M.I.ARUN, ADV. FOR R-1;  
MS.NALINA MAYEGOWDA JOSEPH A., ADV. FOR R-2.)

WRIT PETITION No.23364/2014 IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT AT ANNEX-A DATED 26.03.2014 ISSUED BY THE R-1.

WRIT PETITION No.23365/2014 IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT AT ANNEX-A DATED 26.03.2014 IN No.KSTDC:VENI.SA:2705:2013-14 ISSUED BY THE R-1.

WRIT PETITION No.23366/2014 IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT AT ANNEX-A DATED 26.03.2014 ISSUED BY THE R-1.

THESE WRIT PETITIONS COMING ON FOR PRL.HEARING IN 'B' GROUP THIS DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

**ORDER**

Parties have entered into an agreement governing their respective rights and obligations including terms relating to termination of the said agreement. In that view of the matter, the endorsement issued by the KSTDC Ltd., terminating the contract with the petitioner is said to be in accordance with the agreement. If that is so, then petitioners must be relegated to have their grievance redressed before a competent court.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have an oral agreement with KSTDC and if that is so, the dispute over terms of the oral agreement cannot be adjudicated in a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, by directing parties to file their respective affidavits. On that score too petitioners are required to be relegated to a competent court for redressal of their grievance.

3. Regard being had to the decision of the Apex Court in **'HINDUSTAN PETROLEUM CORPORATION LIMITED & ANOTHER v. DOLLY DAS'**<sup>1</sup>, petitions are rejected.

**Sd/-  
JUDGE**

AN/-

---

<sup>1</sup> 1999 [4] SCC 450