



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 1968 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. NARASAMMA
W/O- ALLAPPA
AGE 69 YEARS,
(SENIOR CITIZEN BENEFIT NOT CLAIMED)
OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O GOLLARAPALYA VILLAGE,
SHANUMANGALA,
BIDADI HOBLI,
TALUK AND DIST.RAMANGARA - 562 109.

2. SMT. REVAMMA
W/O SAMPANGI RAMAIAH
AGE 65 YEARS,
(SENIOR CITIZEN BENEFIT NOT CLAIMED)
OCC AGRICULTURE,
R/O- GOLLARAPALYA,
SHANUMANGALA,
BIDADI HOBLI,
TALUK AND DIST. RAMANGARA - 562 109.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SMT. GEETHA A., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY,

Digitally signed
by
SHARADAVANI
B
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

2. THE TAHSILDAR
RAMANAGARA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA - 562 159.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHAMANTH NAIK, ADVOCATE)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ENDORSEMENTS BEARING NO.LND/CR/965/1999-2000 DATED 27/10/2025 VIDE ANNEX-E1 TO E2 ISSUED BY R2 TO THE WRIT PETITION AND BY CONSIDERING THE REPRESENTATIONS DATED 06.09.2025, 11.08.2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-D1 AND D2 SAGUVALI CHIT MAY BE ISSUED IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned High Court Government Pleader takes notice for both the respondents.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the applications filed by the 1st petitioner and the husband



of 2nd petitioner in Form No.53 for regularisation of unauthorised occupation in the year 1998 have been rejected by the 2nd respondent-Tahsildar. The Tahsildar has issued the impugned endorsements dated 27.10.2025 at Annexures-E1 and E2, rejecting the applications on the ground that the lands in question are within the prohibited distance from the boundary of the Bruhat Bengaluru Mahangara Palike (BBMP). Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that at Annexure-C, which is the resolution passed by the Committee on 19.02.2018, regularizing the lands while considering the applications of several applicants and at serial number 14 the name of the petitioner No.1 is found and in Sl.No.9 and 10, the name of the 2nd petitioner's husband is found. The learned Counsel would therefore submit that the Committee has rightly taken a decision to regularise the lands in favour of the petitioners, since the applications were filed in the year 1998 and at that point of time the lands were not



within the prohibited distance from the boundary of the BBMP.

3. There is substance in the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and on perusing the petition papers, this Court is of the opinion that if a decision is already taken by the Committee as found at Annexure-C dated 19.02.2018, then it is not permissible for the Tahsildar to reject the applications. This Court has laid down the law that once a grant is made by the competent authority, then the Tahsildar has no other option than to question the grant before the Assistant Commissioner, invoking Rule 108K of the Karnataka Land Revenue Rules. This Court has also laid down the law that the application for regularisation of unauthorised occupation will have to be considered having regard to the date of the application and the boundaries of the local authority prevailing at that point of time.



Therefore, the Tahsildar cannot issue such endorsements rejecting the applications, when once the Committee has decided and resolved to grant the lands in favour of the petitioners.

5. In that view of the matter, the writ petition is ***allowed***. The impugned endorsements dated 27.10.2025 issued by the 2nd respondent-Tahsildar, Ramanagara Taluk at Annexures-E1 and E2 are hereby quashed and set aside. The respondent-Tahsildar is thereby directed to proceed to pass necessary orders confirming the grants made by the Committee for Regularization of Unauthorized Occupation. The respondent-Tahsildar shall comply with the directions issued by this Court as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

rv
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 22