



CNR: KAHC010064182026

NC: 2026:KHC:45500
WP No. 3311 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

WRIT PETITION NO.3311 OF 2026 (LR)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. PUTTASWAMY
S/O LATE NADAKERIGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 81 YEARS
R/O. CHIKKAGANGAVAADI VILLAGE,
DUDDA HOBLI, MANDYA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571405.

SANNEGOWDA
SINCE DEAD BY HIS LRS

2. SMT. LAKSHMAMMA,
W/O LATE SANNEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 82 YEARS,
R/O. CHIKKAGANGAVAADI VILLAGE,
DUDDA HOBLI, MANDYA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571405.

3. SRI. RAMESH.,
S/O LATE SANNEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS,
R/O. CHIKKAGANGAVAADI VILLAGE,
DUDDA HOBLI, MANDYA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571405.

4. SRI. DEVARAJU.,
S/O LATE SANNEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
R/O. CHIKKAGANGAVAADI VILLAGE,
DUDDA HOBLI, MANDYA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571405.

Digitally signed by
CHAYA S A
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



CNR: KAHC010064182026

NC: 2026:KHC:45500
WP No. 3311 of 2026

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. HARISCHANDRA M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF LAND REVENUE,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU- 560001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
MANDYA DISTRICT,
MANDYA-571401.
3. SRI. ANJENEYA SWAMY AND
SRI. KRISHNA DEVARU,
INNAM LAND HONNEGOWDA VILLAGE,
REPRESENTED BY TAHSILDAR
MANDYA TALUK, AND
MUZARAI OFFICER
MANDYA TALUK.
4. SRI. C.K. GIRISH.,
S/O. SRI. PATEL KENGEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
5. SRI. DASEGOWDA.,
S/O. SRI. DODDAPUTTEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,



NC: 2026:KHC:45500
WP No. 3311 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010064182026

6. SRI. PUTTASWAMY,
S/O. SRI. LINGEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
7. SRI. SURESH,
S/O. SRI. LINGEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
R/O. CHIKKAGANGAVAADI VILLAGE,
DUDDA HOBLI, MANDYA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571405.
8. SRI. RAMEGOWDA.,
S/O. SRI. DEVEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
R/O. CHIKKAGANGAVAADI VILLAGE,
DUDDA HOBLI, MANDYA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571405.
9. SRI. DHANANJAYA,
S/O. SRI. DODDEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS.
10. SRI. BOREGOWDA.,
S/O. SRI. LINGEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS.
11. SRI. B. JAVAREGOWDA,
S/O. SRI. BETTEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 69 YEARS.
12. SRI. NAGASHETTY,
S/O. SRI. VENKATASHETTY,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS.



**NC: 2026:KHC:45500
WP No. 3311 of 2026**

CNR: KAHC010064182026

13. SRI. KUMARA,
S/O. SRI. DEVEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS.
14. SRI. BASAVARAJU,
S/O. SRI. LINGEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS.
15. SRI. SHIVALINGEGOWDA.,
S/O. SRI. ANDANIGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS.
16. SRI. MARIGOWDA.,
S/O. SRI. KARIGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 72 YEARS.
17. SRI. C. M. PRAKASH,
S/O. SRI. MARIGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,

ALL ARE RESIDENTS OF
CHIKKAGANGAVAADI VILLAGE,
DUDDA HOBLI, MANDYA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571405.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1 & R2;
SRI. K.R. NAGARAJA, ADVOCATE FOR
R4, R6 TO R9, R11 TO R17;
R10 DECEASED)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO
QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 29.08.2025 PASSED BY
THE RESPONDENT NO.2 - THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,



CNR: KAHC010064182026

NC: 2026:KHC:45500
WP No. 3311 of 2026

MANDYA DISTRICT IN CASE NO.I.N.A.11/2017 VIDE ANNEXURE-A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

1. In this Writ Petition, petitioners are assailing the order dated 29.08.2025 in case No.I.N.A.11/2017 as per Annexure-A.
2. Sri. Harischandra M., learned counsel appearing for the petitioners contended by referring to the applications filed by the petitioners seeking occupancy right as per Annexures-E, E1 and E2, and also the tenancy agreements produced at Annexures- D and D1, submitted that Sri. Sannegowda (husband of petitioner No.3) had taken the subject land on lease as a kadim tenant under the Archak - Sri. H. Ramaswamy and therefore, contended that the petitioner is a tenant under the land in question which is belonging to Sri. Anjaneyaswamy Temple of Honnemadu Village, Dudda Hobli, Mandya Taluk and District. It is further contended by inviting the attention of the



CNR: KAHC010064182026

Court to the order dated 23.04.1993 in C.R.P.No.3250/1987 (Annexure-H), that the finding recorded at para 7 therein is without jurisdiction and accordingly, sought for interference of this Court.

3. Per contra, Sri. K.R. Nagaraja, learned counsel appearing for private respondents, submitted that the petitioner being not a tenant under the deity or the Government as the temple in question is a notified temple under the provisions of the Karnataka Hindu Religious Institutions and Charitable Endowments Act, 1997, the finding recorded by the respondent-authority is required to be confirmed in this Writ Petition.

4. Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for the respondent Nos.1 to 3 also submitted that the temple in question is a notified temple and accordingly, sought for dismissal of the Writ Petition.

5. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties, on careful consideration of the impugned order dated 29.08.2025 passed by the Appellate Authority, wherein, the



CNR: KAHC010064182026

**NC: 2026:KHC:45500
WP No. 3311 of 2026**

contentions raised by the petitioners herein that Sannegowda had entered into a Guttige Kararu with the archak of the temple in question and therefore the entire case of the petitioners revolves around the Guttige Kararu produced at Annexure-D1. Taking into consideration the finding recorded by this Court in C.R.P.No.3250/1987 (Annexure-H) and the finding recorded by respondent No.2 at Annexure-A, wherein the petitioners had sought right in respect of the land in question as a tenant under the Archak of the temple in question, however, as no re-grant order has been passed in favour of Archak of the temple in question nor the petitioners herein are claiming right over the property in question against the deity, and in that view of the matter, as the petitioners are claiming right over the property in question as a tenant under the Archak of the temple who is not a landlord under the provisions of the Mysore (Religious and Charitable) Inams Abolition Act, 1955, it is relevant to extract paragraph Nos.15 and 16 of the Judgment dated 01.10.2013 in W.A.No.2421/2005 which is noted below:

" 15. Section 6 of the Act deals with other tenants to be tenants under the Government. Every tenant of



CNR: KAHC010064182026

the inamdar other than a kadim tenant or a permanent tenant shall, with effect on and from the date of vesting, and subject to the provisions of Chapter IV, be entitled to be continued as a tenant under the Government in respect of land of which he was a tenant under the Inamdar immediately before the date of vesting.

16. Therefore, to be eligible for grant of occupancy rights under Section 6, the condition precedent is that the claimant should be a tenant of the inamdar. A tenant of the Archak is not entitled to grant of occupancy rights under the said provision. It is not a case of M.S.Ramaiah that he was a tenant of the inamdar i.e., Hanumantha Devaru Temple. It is his specific case that he took this land on lease under a guthige karar from the Archak of the Temple. This aspect has been completely missed by the Deputy Commissioner while passing the impugned order."

(underlined by me)

6. Following the Judgment of the Division Bench of this Court as noted above, as the specific claim of the petitioners that they have taken the land on Guttige Kararu from the Archak of the temple in question, who has no legal right to be declared as



CNR: KAHC010064182026

**NC: 2026:KHC:45500
WP No. 3311 of 2026**

owner of the schedule land, therefore, I am of the view that, no interference is called for in this Writ Petition.

7. Accordingly, with the above observations, the Writ Petition is dismissed.

8. Consequently, pending applications do not survive for consideration.

**SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE**

SAC
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 21