



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 5TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO.1989 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI RENUKAPPA
S/O. REVANNA
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
OCCUPATION: AGRICULTURE
R/O. SHESHAGIRIHALLI,
BIDADI HOBLI
TALUK AND DISTRICT:
RAMANGARA-562 109
2. R. NARSIMAIAH
S/O. RANGASWAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
OCCUPATION: AGRICULTURE
R/O. PERSONAPALYA, SHANUMANGALA
BIDADI HOBLI
TALUK AND DISTRICT:
RAMANGARA-562 109
3. SMT. THIMMAHANUMAKKA
W/O. GOWDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
OCCUPATION: AGRICULTURE
R/O. GOLLAHARAPALYA
SHESHAGIRIHALLI,
BIDADI HOBLI
TALUK AND DISTRICT:
RAMANGARA-562 109

...PETITIONERS

(BY SMT. GEETHA A., ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed
by JUANITA
THEJESWINI
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
M. S. BUILDING
BENGALURU-560 001
2. THE TAHSILDAR
RAMANAGARA TALUK
RAMANAGARA-562 159

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI SESHU V., H.C.G.P.)

THIS WRIT PETITION 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 ANNEXURE-E TO E2 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT NO.2 TO THE WRIT PETITION AND BY CONSIDERING THE REPRESENTATIONS DATED 11-8-2025, VIDE ANNEXURE-D, D1, D2, SAGUVALI CHIT MAY BE ISSUED IN ACCORDANCE WITH LAW.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, 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. The grievance of the petitioners is that they had filed applications in Form No.53 for regularization of unauthorized occupation of land. The Tahsildar has issued



the impugned endorsements dated 27.10.2025 at Annexures-E to 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 application of several applicants and the names of the petitioners is found therein. 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. This aspect of the matter was also not brought to the notice of this Court when the previous writ petition was filed.

3. There is substance in the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the petitioner.



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 application. 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-E to E2 is 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 2 (Two) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

KLY
CT:VC