



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM
WRIT PETITION NO. 1040 OF 2026 (GM-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. M/S. SNACHAYA LAND AND ESTATE PVT. LTD.,
COMPANY REGISTERED UNDER
COMPANIES REGISTRATION ACT, 1956

HAVING ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AT
NO.479, HMT LAYOUT,
NEAR R.T.NAGAR, BUS DEPOT,
R.T.NAGAR,
BANGALORE - 560 032.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY
MR. DASTAGIR SHARIFF (MANAGER)

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VINAY KUTTAPPA K S, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE OFFICE OF SUB REGISTRAR
ANEKAL
FIRST FLOOR, ABOVE HDFC BANK,
PRERANA COMPLEX ANEKAL TOWN,
BANGALORE - 562 106.
2. THE DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT
MINISTRY OF FINANCE,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
BENGALURU ZONAL OFFICE,



3RD FLOOR, BLOCK B, BMTC BUILDING,
SHANTINAGAR, BENGALURU,
KARNATAKA - 560 027.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ADITYA DIWAKAR, AGA FOR R1;
SRI. MADHU N RAO, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE MISLEADING ENTRIES IN THE ONLINE PORTAL KAVERI II, SUGGESTING THAT THE PETITIONERS PROPERTY BEARING CERTAIN SURVEY NUMBERS IS ATTACHED BY THE DIRECTORATE OF ENFORCEMENT (DOE) PRODUCED AS ANNEX-A 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

The captioned writ petition is instituted invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ of certiorari to quash the allegedly misleading and unauthorized entries reflected in the online portal Kaveri II, wherein the schedule property bearing the survey numbers detailed in the writ petition is shown as having been subjected to attachment at the instance of respondent No.2. Consequentially, the petitioner has



sought for a writ of mandamus directing respondent No.1

– Sub-Registrar to delete such entries and permit registration of documents in respect of the subject property in accordance with law.

2. The gist of the petitioner's case is that the impugned action of respondent No.1 – Sub-Registrar in reflecting the status of "attachment" in the online portal is ex facie illegal, arbitrary, and devoid of authority of law. It is specifically contended that no proceedings culminating in attachment of the petitioner's property have been initiated or concluded by respondent No.2. In the absence of any statutory order of attachment or coercive proceedings, the act of entering such encumbrance in the digital records amounts to a serious infraction of the petitioner's proprietary and statutory rights, thereby effectively disabling the petitioner from dealing with the property.



3. This Court, at an earlier point of time, deemed it appropriate to adjourn the matter so as to enable the learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 to obtain necessary instructions and clarify as to whether any attachment proceedings had, in fact, been initiated or orders passed in respect of the subject property.

4. Today, upon instructions, the learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 fairly submits and concedes that no order of attachment has been passed against the petitioner's property. It is further clarified that the communication produced at Annexure-D is merely a requisition addressed to the jurisdictional Sub-Registrar invoking Section 54 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, whereby certain information/details relating to the subject property were sought. It is thus evident that the said communication is purely preliminary in nature and cannot, by any stretch of interpretation, be construed as an order of attachment.



5. In that view of the matter, this Court finds considerable force in the submission of the petitioner that the jurisdictional Sub-Registrar has grossly misconstrued the communication issued by respondent No.2 and has mechanically proceeded to upload entries in the online portal Kaveri II indicating that the subject property stands attached. Such an action not only lacks legal foundation but also results in serious civil consequences by clouding the title and restricting the petitioner's lawful right to alienate or otherwise deal with the property. The impugned entries, therefore, are clearly unsustainable in the eye of law and are liable to be effaced.

6. For the foregoing reasons and in light of the categorical statement made by respondent No.2 that no attachment order exists, this Court is of the considered opinion that interference is warranted to undo the manifest illegality committed by respondent No.1 and proceeds to pass the following;



ORDER

- (i) The writ petition is hereby allowed.
- (ii) The entries reflected in the online portal Kaveri II indicating that the schedule property is subjected to attachment at the instance of respondent No.2 are hereby quashed and set aside.
- (iii) Respondent No.1 – Sub-Registrar is directed to forthwith delete/remove the impugned entries pertaining to the schedule property from the online portal and restore the status of the property records in accordance with law.
- (iv) Respondent No.1 shall also ensure that the petitioner is permitted to present and register documents in respect of the subject property, if otherwise in order and in compliance with the statutory requirements, without being impeded by the impugned entries.
- (v) The aforesaid exercise shall be completed within a period of four (4) weeks from the



**NC: 2026:KHC:23299
WP No. 1040 of 2026**

date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(vi) No order as to costs.

**Sd/-
(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)
JUDGE**