



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 2720 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. M/S ANNAPURNESHWARI BUILDERS
AND DEVELOPERS
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT SY.NO.17,
SHOP NO.15, 1ST FLOOR,
KODIGEHALLI MAIN ROAD,
SAHAKAR NAGAR POST,
BANGALORE-560092
REP. BY ITS MANAGING
PARTNERS P2 TO P4
REGD. UNDER THE PARTNERSHIP ACT,1932
2. SRI. G. K. SHANKAR
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
S/O.LATE KENCHAPPA
3. SRI.G.L.VENKATESH REDDY
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
S/O.LATE LAKSHMAIAH REDDY
4. SRI.K.MURALI
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
S/O.RAMACHANDRA NAIDU
R/O P2 TO P4 HAVING OFFICE AT
SY. NO.17, SHOP NO.15,
1ST FLOOR, KODIGEHALLI MAIN ROAD,
SAHAKAR NAGAR POST,
BANGALORE 560 092.

Digitally signed
by JUANITA
THEJESWINI
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SANDESH KUMAR M., ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S.BUILDING, K.R.CIRCLE,
DR.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU 560 001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE URBAN
BANGALORE 560 001.
3. THE TAHSILDAR,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK,
BENGALURU 560 024.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.SHAMANTH NAIK, HCGP)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO-DIRECT R3 TO EFFECT THE REVENUE ENTRIES BY CONSIDERING THE REPRESENTATION DATED 02.12.2025 MADE BY THE PETITIONERS VIDE ANNEX-E 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 grievance of the petitioners is that respondent No.3-Tahsildar, Bengaluru North Taluk has not entered the name of the petitioners in the revenue records pursuant to the registered sale deed dated 15.03.2023. Learned



counsel submits that this Court has held, having regard to the provisions contained in Sections 127 and 128 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 that the purchasers under registered sale deeds need not even file an application seeking mutation entry of their names in the revenue records, since the purchasers would have paid the requisite fee to enable the Sub-Registrar to generate a 'J' slip which shall be forwarded to the Tahsildar and the Tahsildar is required to enter the name of the purchasers in the revenue records. However, the petitioners have given a representation at Annexure-E dated 02.12.2025 following the earlier applications given in the year 2023 itself, yet, respondent No.3 - Tahsildar has not passed any orders mutating and entering the name of the petitioners in the revenue records.

2. This Court is being flooded with such writ petitions seeking a writ of mandamus directing the Tahsildars to enter the name of the purchasers in the revenue records. These are surely unnecessary litigation



which are brought before this Court. If the Tahsildars do their duty in terms of the law and the directions issued by this Court, there is no need for the purchasers who have acquired title to come before this Court seeking directions to the Tahsildars.

3. It is pertinent to note that the State Legislature thought it fit to enact a law known as the Karnataka Sakaala Services Act, 2011 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act, 2011'), to provide for guarantee of services to citizens in the State of Karnataka within the stipulated time limit and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto. The stated objective of the said enactment is to provide for guarantee of services to citizens in the State that the services that they seek from any of the Offices/Officers of the Government shall be serviced within the time stipulated in the said enactment.

4. Section 3 of the Act, 2011, provides that every citizen shall have right to obtain citizen related services in



the State in accordance with the provisions of the Act within the stipulated time specified in the schedule. Commensurate to the said right vested with the citizens, every designated officer and his subordinate public servant of the public authority is saddled with a duty to provide such citizen related services within the time stipulated in the schedule and also display the same on the notice board of their offices.

5. Section 5 of the Act provides that the stipulated time would start from the date when required application for scheduled service is submitted to the designated officer or to a person subordinate to him authorised to receive the application in such manner as may be prescribed. It stipulates that such application shall be duly acknowledged.

6. Sub-section (2) of Section 5 provides that the designated Officer on receipt of an application under sub-section (1) shall within the stipulated time either directly



provide the service or through an Officer duly authorised by him or reject the application and in case of rejection of application, shall record the reasons in writing and intimate the applicant, the information about the period of making appeal against the decision and all the details of the competent Officer to whom the first appeal lies.

7. Section 6 of the Act, 2011, provides that the concerned public authority, or local authority as the case may be, is required to maintain and monitor the status of the applications and when information is sought by the applicants, the status of the application shall be informed to the applicant.

8. Section 8 of the Act, 2011 provides that in case of delay or default in the delivery of such services beyond the stipulated time, the applicant is entitled to seek compensatory costs in accordance with the provisions of the Act and the Rules made therein.



9. Section 9 of the Act, 2011 provides that such of the officers who fail to provide the services within the stipulated time shall be liable to pay costs not exceeding Rs.500/- and shall bear costs of Rs.20/- for every day's delay.

10. Section 14 of the Act, 2011 provides that defaults on the part of the designated Officer in the timebound delivery of citizen related services as defined in the Act shall not be counted towards the misconduct, as the purpose and object is to sensitize the public servant towards the citizen and to enhance and imbibe a culture of deliver time bound services to the citizens. Sub-section (2) of Section 14 provides that any case of any designated Officer who is a habitual and wilful defaulter, without any reasonable cause and persistently failed to receive an application or has failed to provide service within the stipulated time or intentionally denied the request for service or delayed inordinately, the head of the public authority concerned shall be competent to take



appropriate disciplinary action after recording a finding to this effect but not before giving showcause notice and opportunity of hearing to defaulting officer.

11. Sub-section (3) Section 14 provides that in order to encourage and enhance the efficiency of the designated Officer, a letter of appreciation for not a single default reported may be issued and entered in his Annual Performance Report by the head of the public authority.

12. The Schedule to the Act under the heading '4. Revenue Department', at Sl.No.26 provides for the service - change of khata (undisputed cases), where the designated Officer is the Tahsildar and the stipulated time for change of khata is 60 working days.

13. Such being the position and provision of law and this Court being flooded with such writ petitions alleging inaction on the part of the Tahsildars to change the khata, based on registered instruments and orders/judgments/ decrees of the competent Court, which would mean that



these are undisputed cases, such inaction would be clearly in violation of the provisions contained in the Act, 2011.

14. It is also surprising that the competent officers under the Act, 2011 have not complied with the provisions of the Act inasmuch as not monitoring the applications, not providing information on the notice boards and not taking action against the Tahsildars for failure on their part to provide the services within the time stipulated in the schedule of the Act.

15. Attention of the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department is also drawn to this order so that the Tahsildars shall be sensitized in this regard. Prompt action on the part of the Tahsildars will reduce the number of such writ petitions being filed before this Court. This Court also proposes to henceforth pass orders in such cases where there is gross violation of the provisions of the Act, 2011 to impose costs on the respondent-State, in terms of the provisions of the said Act, 2011.



16. The Principal Secretary of Revenue Department, shall ensure that the Notice Boards in Office of the Tahsildars in the State shall henceforth indicate the information regarding pending applications and disposed of applications in terms of the provisions of the Act, 2011. Compliance Report in this regard shall be filed by the Principal Secretary of Revenue Department before this Court within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

17. Accordingly, writ petition is ***disposed of*** with a direction to respondent No.3 - Tahsildar, Bengaluru North Taluk to proceed and enter the name of the petitioners in the revenue records pursuant to the registered sale deed. The entire exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

18. Costs of Rs.500/- (Rupees five hundred only) is levied on the third respondent-Tahsildar, Bengaluru North



Taluk, payable to the petitioner. The costs shall be paid along with the copy of the order that would be furnished by the respondent-Tahsildar to the petitioner.

19. Registry is hereby directed to forward a copy of this order to the Principal Secretary of Revenue Department, Government of Karnataka, for compliance.

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