



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 18TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 155 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. SRI V.S. RAVISHANKAR
S/O. LATE SRINIVAS
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
RESIDING AT CHIKKAJALA
JALA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE - 560 064

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SMT. SUSHEELA, SENIOR ADVOCATE FOR
SRI NARAYANA SWAMY P M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SRI JAGADISH
THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
BANGALORE - 560 034
2. SRI MANJUNATH
THE JOINT DIRECTOR OF LAND RECORDS
OFFICE OF DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
BANGALORE - 560 001



3. SRI SHREYAS
THE TAHASILDAR
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK (ADDL)
YELAHANKA
NOW YELAHANKA TALUK
BANGALORE - 560 064

...ACCUSED

4. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
VIDHANA SOUDHA - 560 001

...PRO FORMA RESPONDENT

(BY SRI S.H. RAGHAVENDRA, AGA)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE
CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, PRAYING TO TAKE SUITABLE
ACTION AGAINST ACCUSED NO.1 TO 3 FOR THEIR WILLFUL
DISOBEDIENCE OF THE ORDER DATED 24.01.2023 PASSED BY
THIS HON'BLE COURT IN W.P.NO.689/022(KLR-RES) AT
ANNEXURE-A.

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.M. POONACHA

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. VIBHU BAKHRU, CHIEF JUSTICE)

1. The complainant has filed the present complaint alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 24.01.2023, passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.689/2022(KLR-RES).
2. Paragraph 7 of the said order, which is alleged to have been violated, reads as under:

"7. In that view of the matter, the Tahasildar is directed to look into the original grant register, Saguvalli chit issue register, mutation register and all contemporaneous record in the presence of the petitioner so that the petitioner also will be satisfied of having looked into the original records. If the original records reveal the fact that grant was indeed made in favour of the original grantee Sri Nanjunda Shastri and subsequently the sale executed by Sri Nanjunda Shastri in favour of Smt. Chowdamma was acknowledged by the revenue authorities and her name was entered in the land records, then it does not lie in the mouth of the revenue authorities to say or reject the application of the petitioner to conduct phodi and durasth in respect of the land in question. On the other hand, on verification if it is found that there is no entry of the grant said to have been made in favour of Sri Najundada Shastri, then the Tahasildar may place the matter before the Deputy Commissioner, who heads the committee for building missing records. The



committee shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and thereafter necessary orders shall be passed for building records."

3. The learned senior counsel for the complainant rightly points out that there are three limbs in paragraph 7 of the impugned order. First, relates to the examination of original grant register, saguvali chit issue register, mutation register and all other contemporaneous records in the presence of the complainant. The said examination was not conducted in the complainant's presence. But that infraction has been cured by complying with the subsequent order dated 05.02.2026 passed by this Court in the present proceedings.

4. She states that the second limb clearly indicates that there are two courses of action open to the accused. The first course is to conduct phodi and durast, which is contingent on the accused being satisfied of the grant in favour of the original grantee, Sri.Nanjunda Shastri, and the subsequent sale in favour of Smt. Chowdamma. The second is to place the matter before the Deputy Commissioner.

5. She states that in the present case there is ample material to establish the grant as well as the subsequent sales. Yet, the



accused have not accepted the same and have proceeded on the basis that there is no entry of grant in favour of Sri.Nanjunda Shastri.

6. The accused have placed the matter before the Deputy Commissioner, which the accused was required to do, if there was no grant.

7. The affidavits of compliance indicate that although the accused found material to establish a temporary grant, he did not find any original record evidencing a permanent grant. According to the accused there are no records establishing a permanent grant in favour of the original grantee. The complainant states that there is ample material to draw the necessary inference. This is contentious issue and is not required to be examined in the present proceedings.

8. We are unable to accept that the order passed by this Court has been disobeyed and therefore proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 are required to be initiated in this regard. The complaint is, accordingly, closed.



9. We, however, clarify that this order will not preclude the complainant from availing of substantive remedies, albeit in accordance with law.

**Sd/-
(VIBHU BAKHRU)
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**Sd/-
(C.M. POONACHA)
JUDGE**

KMV
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 1