



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO.910 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

MR. ABDUL JALEEL PEEDIKAKANDY
S/O MAJEED ALAN,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
RESIDING AT: NO:
DARUSSABAH THANKEUNNU ROAD,
THAZHE CHOVVA KANNAUR,
KERALA - 670018.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. ANKUR TRIPATHI, ADVOCATE (ABSENT))

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.

...PRO FORMA RESPONDENT

2. SRI JAGADEESHA .G
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE CITY DISTRICT,
KANDAYA BHAVANA, K.G. ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 009.

...ACCUSED

(BY SMT. NAMITHA MAHESH B.G., AGA FOR PRO FORMA RESPONDENT
NO.1 & A-2;
SRI SENTHIL KUMAR D.V., ADVOCATE FOR IMPEADING APPLICANT IN
I.A.NO.1/2026)





THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, PRAYING TO TAKE ACTION AGAINST THE ACCUSED HEREIN FOR VIOLATING THE JUDGMENT OF THIS HON'BLE COURT IN W.P. NO.23202/2024 (GM-RES) DATED 22.11.2024 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. None appears for the complainant.
2. The complainant has filed the present complaint alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 22.11.2024 passed by this Court in W.P.No.23202/2024 [GM-RES] and connected matters.
3. The complainant had filed a complaint under Section 18 of the Real Estate [Regulation and Development] Act, 2016 [**the Act**] before the Karnataka Real Estate Regulatory Authority [**the KRERA**]. The said complaint [CMP/00130/2023] was disposed of by an order dated 13.11.2023. In terms of the said order, promoter [M/s. Aryan Homtec Pvt. Ltd.] was directed to refund an amount of ₹13,56,963/- with interest to the complainant within 60 days of the



said order; liberty was also reserved to the complainant to initiate recovery proceedings in accordance with law.

4. Pursuant thereto, the complainant approached the concerned authority for execution of the recovery certificate issued by the KRERA. As the amount due remained unpaid, the complainant approached this Court by filing W.P.No.23202/2024. By an order dated 22.11.2024, this Court had disposed of the said writ petition [which is also clubbed with two other similar petitions] directing the Deputy Commissioner of Bengaluru City District [**accused**] to take necessary steps to implement the recovery certificate.

5. In terms of the same, the accused has filed a compliance affidavit stating that the steps have been taken for implementing the said order. It is stated that part of the amount covered under the recovery certificate has been deposited by M/s. Aryan Homtec Pvt. Ltd before the KRERA.

6. M/s. Aryan Homtec Pvt. Ltd. has filed an application seeking impleadment in the present proceedings. The learned counsel appearing for the impleading applicant disputes the complainant's entitlement to the amount claimed. He submits that the KRERA had



HC-KAR

passed an *ex parte* order and therefore, the impleading applicant had no opportunity to present the correct facts. He submits that the complainant had financed a part of the consideration amount paid to the impleading applicant by availing a housing loan from India Bulls Housing Finance Limited. Therefore, a portion of the funds paid by the complainant is to be repaid to the said India Bulls Housing Finance Limited towards discharge of the outstanding housing loan.

7. He further submits that the impleading applicant and the complainant have arrived at a settlement, under which the complainant has agreed to accept a sum of ₹4 lakhs as full and final settlement. He states that efforts are underway to settle the outstanding dues payable to India Bulls Housing Finance Ltd.

8. The scope of the present proceedings is limited to examining whether the accused's conduct is contumacious and, if so, to initiating appropriate proceedings in that regard.

9. In this view, it is not necessary for this Court to examine the contentions advanced on behalf of M/s. Aryan Homtec Pvt. Ltd. [the applicant in I.A.No.1/2026].



10. It is apparent from the record that there is no willful disobedience on the part of the accused. Therefore, we consider it apposite to close the present complaint.

11. It is needless to state that M/s. Aryan Homtec Pvt. Ltd. is not precluded from approaching the KRERA in the event it seeks any modification of the order passed by the said authority or avail its other remedies in respect of the order passed by the KRERA.

12. With the aforesaid observations, the complaint is closed.

13. Pending application stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(K.S. HEMALEKHA)
JUDGE

AT
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 18