

ITEM NO.20

COURT NO.12

SECTION IV-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 28735/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 17-07-2026 in WP No. 13983/2026(GM-RES) passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bengaluru]

SATISH SHETTY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION BANK OF INDIA &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 244030/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF I/JUDGMENT

Date : 31-08-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Rakesh Khanna, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Barun Kumar Sinha, Adv.  
Mrs. Pratibha Sinha, Adv.  
Mr. Sneh Vardhan, Adv.  
Mr. Aditya P. Khanna, Adv.  
Mr. Vaibhav Singh, Adv.  
Ms. Aarushi Jindal, Adv.  
Mr. Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. P P Hegde, Sr. Adv.(through VC)  
Mr. Pramod Mallur, Adv.  
Mr. Sudip Patra, Adv.  
Mr. M. Babu, Adv.  
Mr. Yogesh Sham Sonawane, Adv.  
Mr. Anil Kumar, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. Heard Mr. Rakesh Khanna, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner(s) and Mr. P.P. Hegde, learned Senior Counsel

appearing on caveat for respondent no.5.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not just aggrieved by the order dated 09.07.2025 of the Lokpal of India but pointing to prayer in the writ petition, submits that petitioner is also aggrieved by the order dated 11.03.2025 closing the matter after receipt of report of the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC).

3. When it is pointed out to learned Senior Counsel that no such argument was raised in the impugned order and the only point raised was that the order under Section 46 of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013, was erroneous, learned senior Counsel, on instructions, submits that the point was indeed argued.

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on caveat for respondent no.5 disputes this and submits that no such point was canvassed.

5. At this stage, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would like to withdraw the present petition and prefer a review petition before the High Court concerned.

6. The Special Leave Petition is disposed of as withdrawn with the liberty, as indicated above.

7. We also observe that in the event there being any adverse order, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the original order as well as the order passed in the review by the High Court.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(NIRMALA NEGI)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(NIDHI WASON)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR