

**Case Name:-** C.S. Gangadhara v. District Registrar of Co-operative Societies

**Citation:-** 2013 SCC OnLine Kar 2795

**Link:-** <http://www.sconline.com/DocumentLink/X6YI350W>

**Judgement;-** <https://share.google/7EEF9Bni7VXzgVs6I>

### **Summary and Conclusion:-**

The background of C.S. Gangadhara and Others v. District Registrar of Co-operative Societies (Review Petition Nos. 77/2013 & 96-97/2013) centers on a dispute over the management and election process of an educational society in Hassan District.

#### **1. The Entities Involved**

The case primarily involves the Ranganatha Education Society, located in Chikkahalli, Channarayapatna Taluk. The petitioners were members of this society who were dissatisfied with the administrative oversight provided by the cooperative authorities.

#### **2. The Original Dispute (WP Nos. 38356-358/2012)**

The underlying writ petitions were filed to challenge actions taken by:

The District Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Hassan.

The Returning Officer appointed to oversee the society's internal elections.

The core of the grievance typically involved the validity of the electoral college (the list of members eligible to vote) and the conduct of the Srinivas Returning Officer. In many similar cooperative disputes in Karnataka, the primary contention is whether the Registrar or the appointed election officer followed the proper statutory procedures under the Karnataka Co-operative Societies Act or the Societies Registration Act.

#### **3. The Review Petition**

After the High Court passed its initial judgment in the 2012 Writ Petitions, the petitioners (C.S. Gangadhara, H.S. Mahalingappa, and H.A. Ramegowda) felt that certain facts were overlooked or that there was an "error apparent on the face of the record."

#### **They sought a Review to:-**

Re-examine the legality of the election process.

Challenge the authority of the District Registrar's intervention in the society's private management.

#### **4. Final Standing**

The Court, presided over by Justice Mohan M. Shantanagoudar, ultimately found that the petitioners were simply trying to re-argue the case rather than pointing out a specific legal error that would justify a review. Consequently, the background remains one of a failed attempt to overturn an existing judicial decision regarding the administration of the Ranganatha Education Society.

The conclusion of the case in the final screenshot (C.S. Gangadhara and Others v. District Registrar of Co-operative Societies and Others, 2013 SCC OnLine Kar 2795) is a summary dismissal of the review request.

### **The Ruling**

The High Court of Karnataka dismissed the Review Petitions.

### **Key Details of the Order:-**

**Nature of the Petition:** This was a Review Petition (Nos. 77/2013 & 96-97/2013), where the petitioners were asking the Court to reconsider an earlier order passed in Writ Petition Nos. 38356-358 of 2012.

**The Court's Finding:** After hearing the matter, the Court stated that there were no grounds to review the original order passed in the writ petitions.

**Effect:** The dismissal means the previous decision of the Court stands as originally ruled, and the attempt to have it re-examined or modified was unsuccessful.

In practical terms, a Review Petition is only successful if there is a clear error on the face of the record or new evidence is discovered. Here, the Court found neither, bringing this specific legal challenge to an end.

**Case Name:-** Chidanand v. Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies

**Citation:-** 2019 SCC OnLine Kar 3181

**Link:-** <http://www.sconline.com/DocumentLink/Y0F0Byw9>

**Judgement:-** <https://share.google/t9qHkGSZUgvGo8jby>

### **Summary and Conclusion:-**

The background of the case Chidanand v. Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies and Others (Writ Petition No. 103117/2014), as detailed in the provided document, is as follows:

### **Legal Context**

The petitioner (Chidanand) filed this Writ Petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India. These articles grant High Courts the power to issue directions or writs to subordinate courts, tribunals, or authorities to ensure justice and the proper application of the law.

### **The Challenged Orders**

#### **The petition was filed to "quash" (legally void) two specific prior legal actions:-**

**The Karnataka Appellate Tribunal Order:** An order dated January 30, 2014, passed in Appeal No. 19/2014. This appeal was likely a challenge to a lower administrative decision.

**The Original Judgment and Award:** An earlier judgment and award dated December 30, 2008, passed by the Assistant Registrar of Co-operative Societies (Respondent No. 1) in case No. AR-11/ABN/KSSA/108/2008-09.

### **Core Dispute**

While the specific factual details of the dispute (such as the exact nature of the debt or administrative disagreement) are not fully detailed in this short dismissal order, the case originated from proceedings under the Karnataka Co-operative Societies Act.

The petitioner sought to have the High Court overturn the findings of the Co-operative Society's Registrar and the subsequent confirmation of those findings by the Appellate Tribunal. However, before the High Court could rule on these issues, the petitioner's counsel filed a memo to withdraw the case, leading to its dismissal on March 1, 2019.

### **Case Conclusion**

The case ended in a withdrawal of the petition by the petitioner.

The court passed a brief order noting that the counsel for the petitioner submitted a memo requesting permission to withdraw the Writ Petition. The Court accepted this request, placed the memo on record, and officially dismissed the petition as withdrawn.