



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 9<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 2524 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)**

**BETWEEN:**

1. VASANTH KUMAR T  
S/O UMA, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,  
R/A 42, BDA LAYOUT, JAMBUSAVARIDINNE,  
JP NAGAR 8<sup>TH</sup> PHASE, GOTTIGERE,  
BANGALORE-560076.
2. SMT. V. UMA  
W/O T. VEERASWAMY,  
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,  
42, JAMBUSAVARIDINNE, GOTTIGERE,  
BANGALORE-560076.
3. SELVA KUMAR V  
S/O T. VEERASWAMY  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,  
42, JAMBUSAVARIDINNE,  
JP NAGAR 8<sup>TH</sup> PHASE, GOTTIGERE,  
BANGALORE – 560076.
4. SMT. HAMSAVALLI  
W/O VEERASWAMY,  
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,  
R/A 42, JAMBUSAVARIDINNE,  
JP NAGAR 8<sup>TH</sup> PHASE, GOTTIGERE,  
BANGALORE – 560076.

Digitally signed  
by JUANITA  
THEJESWINI  
Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SRIKANTH N.V., ADVOCATE)



**AND:**

1. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER  
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT,  
K.G. ROAD, BANGALORE-560009.
2. THE TAHASILDAR  
BANGALORE SOUTH TALUK,  
BANGALORE-560009.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.V.SESHU., HCGP)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDERS DATED.13.01.2026 BEARING NO. 94CC(U)CR241/22-23, NO.94CC(U)CR66/22-23, NO. 94CC(U)CR250/22-23 AND NO. 94CC(U)CR39/21-22 PASSED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT AS PER ANNEXURE - A TO A3 AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

**ORAL ORDER**

The petitioners are aggrieved of the impugned notices issued by the respondent-Tahsildar at Annexures A, A1, A2 and A3, invoking Rule 108-Z of the Karnataka Land Revenue Rules, 1966.



2. On the previous occasion, the learned counsel for petitioners had submitted that the Tahsildar has no jurisdiction to have issued the impugned notices for cancellation of the house sites.

3. However, learned High Court Government Pleader submits on instructions that the Rule invoked is Rule 108-Z of the Karnataka Land Revenue Rules, which provision emanates from Chapter XIII-C of the Karnataka Land Revenue Rules, 1966. This power conferred under Rule 108-Z is pertaining to grant of land in case of construction of dwelling houses occupied on Government lands in urban areas lying within the specified limits of the Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike and other cities.

4. Learned High Court Government Pleader points out to Rule 108-U, where it is clearly provided that the authority for the purpose of Section 94-CC is the jurisdictional Tahsildar, Grade I, within whose jurisdiction the land is situated.



5. Learned High Court Government Pleader further submits that it is found that the petitioners are all members of the same family and they have all filed applications seeking regularisation of unauthorised occupation of lands for dwelling houses in urban areas, within the limits of BBMP, in terms of sub-clause (4) of Section 94-CC of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964. It is not permissible for members of the family to file more than one application. Moreover, only those persons who had put up construction of a dwelling house prior to 1<sup>st</sup> day of January 2015 were eligible for making the application. It is now found that the petitioners had not put up any construction even at the time of the application and now photographs are produced along with the writ petition which also shows that the construction is underway.

6. Learned High Court Government Pleader would therefore submit that the petitioners may be relegated to the Tahsildar and the Tahsildar should be permitted to proceed in accordance with law.



7. Having regard to the contentions of the learned High Court Government Pleader and the learned counsel for petitioners, this Court is of the considered opinion that the Tahsildar has the authority to issue the notice and he has accordingly issued notice. The petitioners are required to participate in the proceedings/enquiry that is conducted by the Tahsildar.

8. Accordingly, the petition stands ***disposed of*** permitting the second respondent-Tahsildar, Bangalore South Taluk, to proceed against the petitioners in accordance with law.

**Sd/-  
(R DEVDAS)  
JUDGE**

JT/-  
CT: JL