



CNR: KAHC010052452026

NC: 2026:KHC:37181-DB
WA No. 174 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 20TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

WRIT APPEAL NO. 174 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. ANDANAPPA,
S/O. LATE CHENNIGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
R/A NO.128, MACHOHALLI VILLAGE,
BAPAGRAMA POST,
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
BENGALURU - 560 091.
2. SRI. VEERACHANNAIAH,
S/O. LATE CHENNIGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
R/A NO.140, MACHOHALLI VILLAGE,
BAPAGRAMA POST,
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
BENGALURU - 560 091.

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. SIRI RAJASHEKAR., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. B.R.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
REPT. BY ITS SECRETARY

Digitally
signed by
REKHA R
Location:
High Court
of
Karnataka



CNR: KAHC010052452026

2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT,
BENGALURU - 560 009.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
BENGALURU NORTH SUB-DIVISION,
BENGALURU - 560 009.
4. THE TAHSILDAR,
BENGALURU NORTH SUB-DIVISION,
KANDAYA BHAVAN, K.G. ROAD,
BENGALURU - 560 009.
5. SMT. SIDDAMMA,
W/O. LATE GANGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 84 YEARS,
6. SMT. JAYALAKSHMAMMA,
W/O. LATE GANGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,

RESPONDENT NOS 5 AND 6 ARE
R/A NO.37, MACHOHALLI VILLAGE,
BAPAGRAMA POST,
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
BENGALURU - 560 091.

7. SMT. HEMAVATHI,
W/O. K. NAGARAJU,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
R/AT: CMC NO.4, 7TH CROSS,
KAMMAGONDANAHALLI, KALA ROAD,
K.G. HALLI, JALAHALLI NORTH,
BENGALURU - 560 091.
8. SMT. MANJULA,
W/O. NARASIMHAMURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
R/AT NO.442, 6TH CROSS, 5TH MAIN,



CNR: KAHC010052452026

NC: 2026:KHC:37181-DB
WA No. 174 of 2026

NEAR KALIKAMBA TEMPLE ROAD,
KAMAKSHIPALYA, RANGANATHPURA,
BENGALURU - 560 091.

9. SMT. YASHODHA,
W/O. NARASIMHAMURTHY,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
R/AT 'SHALINI' NO.3,
VEERANNAPALYA,
SREEGANDHADA KAVALU,
VISHWANEEDAM POST,
BENGALURU - 560 091.
10. SRI M. G. HANUMANTHARAJU
S/O. LATE GANGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
11. SRI M.G. CHENNAKESHAHA,
S/O. LATE GANGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
12. SRI M.G. NARASINHAMURTHY,
S/O. LATE GANGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS,

RESPONDENTS NOS. 10 TO 12 ARE
R/O MACHOHALLI GRAMA,
BAPAGRAMA POST,
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
BENGALURU - 560 091.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.B. RAVINDRANATH, AGA FOR R1 TO R4,
R8 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SECTION 4 OF THE
KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
ORDER DATED:11.12.2025 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE
JUDGE IN WP No.10544/2024 (KLR-RES), AND ETC.,



CNR: KAHC010052452026

THIS APPEAL, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING,
THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D K SINGH
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF)

This intra Court appeal by the unsuccessful petitioners in W.P.No.10544/2024, assailing the order dated 11.12.2025 passed by the Writ Court. The Writ Court by means of the impugned order dismissed the writ petition, declining to interfere with the orders impugned in the writ petition.

2. The parties are referred to as per their ranking before the Writ Court.

3. The facts germane to file the present appeal are as under:

3.1 The petitioners claim that the property in dispute that is, Sy.No.52/2 measuring 5 acres 4 guntas, including



CNR: KAHC010052452026

7 guntas karab, that is, total 4 acres 37 guntas belonging to one Late Chennigappa. The petitioners are children of Late Chennigappa. Late Chennigappa under a registered sale deed dated 01.05.1956, sold 2 acres of land in favour of Gangappa and Muddamma. The said Gangappa and Muddamma thereafter sold 1 acre 14 guntas out of 2 acres, which they have purchased under the registered sale deed dated 01.05.1956 in favour of Sri.Umapathi on 16.09.1988, retaining 26 guntas out of 2 acres. The legal representatives of Gangappa thereafter have noticed that the 26 guntas is wrongly shown in the revenue records in the name of legal representatives of Chennigappa, which they have called in question before the revenue authorities and the same has been rectified.

3.2 The legal representatives of Chennigappa claims that the Gangappa and Muddamma sold their entire property to Sri.Umapathi as per the sale deed,



CNR: KAHC010052452026

though it was stated as 1 acre 14 guntas, since they have stated in the sale deed that, it is the entire property which they have purchased from Chennigappa that means what they have purchased only 1 acre 14 guntas under the registered sale deed from Chennigappa and sought to set aside the order passed by the revenue authorities, retaining their name to the extent of 26 guntas in Sy.No.52/2.

- 3.3 They further submits that the proceedings before the Assistant Commissioner were initiated by the legal representatives of Gangappa only in the year 2015, calling in question the mutation entries which stood in the name of the petitioners in respect of 26 guntas after much delay. In that view of the matter the revenue authorities ought not to have interfered in the mutation entries after long period of time and altered the same, instead the revenue authorities ought to have relegated the legal representatives of



CNR: KAHC010052452026

Gangappa to the Civil Court, to claim right on 26 Guntas of Sy.No.52/2.

3.4 Before the Writ Court, it was contented by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners that the sale deed would indicate that the entire extent purchased by Gangappa, which was in his possession was sold which would mean that the extent of 1 acre 14 guntas was the only extent that was available and which was transferred to Umapathi. The revenue authorities failed to consider this aspect of the matter.

3.5 The Writ Court having considered the said submission, was of the opinion that, such a construction and interpretation cannot be made while adjudication in exercise of writ jurisdiction, as the legal position demands that the revenue authorities could not have themselves interpreted, the sale deed in favour of Umapathi to be construed as transfer of entire land purchased by Gangappa from



CNR: KAHC010052452026

**NC: 2026:KHC:37181-DB
WA No. 174 of 2026**

Chenningappa. As the revenue authorities are not enjoined with the power to adjudicate by way of such interpretation and construction of the documents, as the same is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Civil Court and formed an opinion that the contention on delay in approaching the Assistant Commissioner is untenable, as the mutation entries must be affected in terms of the documents of title and delay cannot defeat such rights. Accordingly, retaining the orders passed by the Assistant Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner, dismissed the writ petition. It is this order passed by the Writ Court is called question in this appeal.

4. Heard Ms. Siri Rajashekar, learned counsel for appellant, Sri.Shivaramu.H.C, learned counsel for Caveator respondent No.10, respondent Nos.5, 7, 9 to 12 and Sri.B.Ravindranath, learned Additional Government



CNR: KAHC010052452026

Advocate for respondent Nos.1 to 4. Respondent No.8 though served unrepresented.

5. Ms. Siri Rajashekar, reiterated the very same submission, interpreting and constructing the sale deed in favour of Umapathi by Gangappa, to contend that the averments made in the sale deed clearly shows that they have sold the entire property in favour of Umapathi, as per the sale deed would mean that the entire extent available with the Gangappa under the sale deed which he has purchased from Chennigappa is to the extent of 1 acre 14 guntas. In that view of the matter, the revenue entries in the name of legal representatives of Chennigappa is in accordance with law.

6. In contrast, Sri.Shivaramu.H.C, argued in support of the impugned judgment and order, put forth his contention that, any such interpretation would be against the settled principles of law that, since the revenue authorities are not enjoined with the power of



CNR: KAHC010052452026

interpreting any document which is the exclusive jurisdiction of the Civil Court as has been held by the Writ Court.

7. We having considered the rival submissions perused the entire writ appeal papers and the judgment passed by the Writ Court. We are of the considered opinion that the conclusion arrived at by the Writ Court after extensively considering the entire material on record and the interpretation put forwarded by the learned Senior, formed an opinion that the interpretation sought cannot be made while adjudication in exercise of the writ jurisdiction, as the settled legal position is that, the revenue authorities have no authority to interpret any title documents, as such jurisdiction is not enjoined with the revenue authorities. If such a construction is to be considered, it would be nothing but enjoining the revenue authorities with the jurisdiction which in law they are not permitted.



CNR: KAHC010052452026

NC: 2026:KHC:37181-DB
WA No. 174 of 2026

8. In that view of the matter, we find no infirmities in the order passed by the Writ Court. The writ appeal sans merit and accordingly, ***dismissed***.

In view of dismissal of the appeal, pending interlocutory application/s if any, does not survive for consideration and the same is/are disposed of.

**Sd/-
(D K SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(T.M.NADAF)
JUDGE**

RR
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 20
ct-vn