



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 6545 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

K S SHIVAMALLAMMA
W/O N.KEMPANANJIAH
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
NO.219/1, OLD BANDIKERI,
K.R MOHALLA,
MYSURU-570024

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SANDESH T B., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
M.S BUILDING, AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560001,
REP BY IS CHIEF SECRETARY
2. THE SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
MYSURU SUB-DIVISION
MYSURU-570001
3. ASSISTANCE COMMISSIONER
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
MYSURU SUB-DIVISION
MYSURU-570001
4. TAHASILDAR
T.NARASIPURA TALUK

Digitally signed
by JUANITA
THEJESWINI
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



MYSURU DISTRICT-571124

5. RAGAVENDRA.S
S/O S. SHIVARAMU
KUPYA VILLAGE AND POST
KASABA HOBLI,
T.NARASIPURE TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT-571124
6. S. SHIVARAMU
S/O LATE MADEGOWDA
KUPYA VILLAGE AND POST
KASABA HOBLI,
T.NARASIPURE TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT-571124.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. NAVYA SHEKHAR., AGA FOR R1 TO R4
SRI. T.P.VIVEKANANDA., ADVOCATE FOR R5 & R6)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED
ORDER DTD. 15.01.2025 PASSED BY THE R-2 VIDE ANNEX-E
AND GRANT AN INTERIM ORDER TO STAY THE IMPUGNED
ORDER DTD. 15.01.2025 PASSED BY THE R-2 VIDE ANNEX-E
AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner and respondent No.6 are sister and
brother, while respondent No.5 is the son of respondent



No.6. The dispute between the siblings is in respect of the joint family properties in Survey No.51, measuring 2 acres 9 guntas situated at Kupya Village, Kasaba Hobli, T.Narasipura Taluk, Mysuru District. The petitioner is aggrieved of the order passed by the Special Deputy Commissioner, Mysuru District, at Annexure 'E' in proceedings bearing R.P.No.180/2023 dated 15.01.2025, whereby the Special Deputy Commissioner set aside the orders passed by the Tahsildar and the Assistant Commissioner while directing the Tahsildar to enter the name of respondent No.6 in respect of 2 acres and 9 guntas in Survey No.51.

2. Earlier, respondent No.6 had filed an application before the Tahsildar, T.Narasipura Taluk, seeking deletion of the name of the petitioner herein from the revenue records pursuant to mutation order bearing No.M.R.5/1998-99. The Tahsildar rejected the application on the ground that the partition which respondent No.6 is claiming is an unregistered partition deed. Respondent



No.6 had earlier filed an appeal under Section 136 (2) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act before the Assistant Commissioner, Mysore Sub-Division in R.A.No.138/2017 questioning the mutation entry made in favour of the petitioner herein in M.R No.5/1998-99. The Assistant Commissioner partly allowed the appeal while directing the Tahsildar, T.Narasipura Taluk, to decide the issue at his level. Accordingly, the Tahsildar passed an order at Annexure 'A' dated 16.10.2020 rejecting the claim of the respondent no.6 on the ground that the claim is based on an unregistered partition deed dated 25.05.1992.

3. The appeal filed by the respondent No.6 before the Assistant Commissioner in RA No.461/2020 was also dismissed on 27.04.2022. Thereafter the Special Deputy Commissioner, Mysuru District, has passed the impugned order at Annexure 'E' allowing the revision petition filed under Section 136(3) of the Act while directing the Tahsildhar to enter the name of the respondent No.6 in respect of 2 acres 9 guntas in Survey No.51.



4. When the matter came up for preliminary hearing before this Court, this Court passed an order while issuing notice to the private respondents and directing that the *status quo* shall be maintained in respect of the revenue entries till the next date of hearing.

5. Learned counsel for the contesting respondents no.5 and 6 submits that there have been subsequent developments after this writ petition is filed. Respondents No.5 and 6 have sold the property in question to a third party under registered sale deed dated 27.03.2025. Learned counsel submits that respondents No.5 and 6 were not aware of the interim orders passed by this court and the learned counsel submits that the records may be verified and it will show that the notice is not served on respondents No.5 and 6 till date. However, when the purchaser sought to have her name entered in the revenue records, she was informed of the interim orders passed by this court and the said purchaser has informed respondents no.5 and 6 of the pendency of this writ



petition and the interim orders passed by this court and thereafter respondents no.5 and 6 have voluntarily appeared before this court by filing vakalath on 10.09.2025.

6. Learned Counsel for the private respondents would therefore submit that having regard to the subsequent developments, the prayer made in this writ petition may not survive for consideration.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner however submits that when interim order has been passed by this court on 07.03.2025 directing the parties to maintain *status quo* in respect of the revenue entries, the private respondents could not have sold the property in violation of the orders passed by this court.

8. In the considered opinion of this court, having regard to the facts narrated hereinabove, now that the property has been transferred in favour of third party, the matter regarding the revenue entries as prayed for in this



writ petition will not survive for consideration. The parties will have to work out their remedies before the Civil Court.

9. With these observations, the writ petition stands ***disposed of.***

Pending I.As., if any stand disposed of accordingly.

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

JT/-
CT: JL