



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.7880 OF 2024 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. DINESH
S/O RAMEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
OCC.: AGRICULTURIST,
R/AT BIKKODU VILLAGE,
BELUR TALUK,
HASSAN DISTRICT - 573 115.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M. JAGANNATH ALVA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
M.S. BUILDING,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
HASSAN DISTRICT,
HASSAN - 573 201.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
HASSAN DISTRICT,
HASSAN - 573 201.
4. THE TAHSILDAR
BELUR TALUK,
HASSAN - 573 115.



5. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
THE KARNATAKA POWER TRANSMISSION
CORPORATION (KPTCL),
HEAVY WORKS SECTION,
HASSAN - 573 201.
6. THE KARNATAKA APPELLATE TRIBUNAL
BLOCK NO.1,
M.S. BUILDING, 1ST FLOOR,
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
REP BY ITS SECRETARY.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1 TO R4 AND R6;
SRI. H.V. DEVARAJU, ADVOCATE FOR R5)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 28.06.2019 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 VIDE ANNEXURE-F AND ORDER DATED 06.02.2024 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.6 IN REVENUE APPEAL NO.114/2021 VIDE ANNEXURE-G; DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NO.4-TAHASILDAR TO CONSIDER THE PETITION/REPRESENTATIONS DATED 20.01.2016, 17.05.2019 AND 21.02.2023 VIDE ANNEXURES 'E1', 'E2' AND 'E3' RESPECTIVELY AND TO PASS APPROPRIATE ORDERS IN TERMS OF THE ORDER PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 DATED 27.03.2003 VIDE ANNEXURE-D.; AND ETC.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR FURTHER HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

In this petition, the petitioner is challenging the order dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure-F) passed by the respondent No.2-Deputy Commissioner and order dated 06.02.2024



(Annexure-G) passed by the Karnataka Appellate Tribunal in Revenue Appeal No.114/2021; *inter alia* sought for a direction to the respondent No.4-Tahasildar to consider the representations of the petitioner dated 20.01.2016 (Annexure-E1), 17.05.2019 (Annexure-E2) and 21.02.2023 (Annexure-E3).

2. Heard Sri. M. Jagannath Alva, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner; Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for respondents 1 to 4 and 6; and Sri. H.V. Devaraju, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.5.

3. Sri. M Jagannath Alva, learned counsel appearing for petitioners invited the attention of the Court to the Grant Certificate produced at Annexure-A and submitted that the respondent No.3-Assistant Commissioner, by considering the said Grant Certificate in the proceedings at Annexure-D, by order dated 27.03.2003, had remitted the matter to the competent Committee for taking action in the matter. Learned counsel further submits that the order dated 27.03.2003 (Annexure-D) passed by the respondent No.3 was confirmed by



the respondent No.2-Deputy Commissioner in Case No.RA.161/2002-03, by order dated 19.01.2009 and by the Karnataka Appellate Tribunal, Bengaluru in Revision Petition No.105/2009, by order dated 26.08.2009 (Annexure-J) and also confirmed by this Court in Writ Petition No.26875 of 2009, by order dated 09.09.2009 (Annexure-K). Therefore, he submits that allotment of very same land, which is pending consideration before the competent Committee to the respondent No.5-KPTCL as per the impugned order dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure-F) by the respondent No.2 does not arise. Accordingly, he sought for interference of this Court.

4. Per contra, Sri. H.V. Devaraju, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.5-KPTCL submits that, after the allotment made by the respondent No.2 in favour of the respondent No.5 in terms of the impugned order dated 28.06.2019 (Annexure-F), certain construction works have been made for establishing the Sub Station in the subject land. Therefore, learned counsel sought for dismissal of the petition.



5. Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader sought to justify the impugned order passed by the respondent No.2.

6. In the light of submission made by learned counsel appearing for the parties, on careful consideration of Grant Certificate at Annexure-A, the same would indicate that the subject land has been granted in favour of the petitioner and the said grant was challenged before the respondent No.3 in the proceedings at Annexure-D. The respondent No.3, by order dated 27.03.2003 (Annexure-D), remitted the matter to the competent Committee to take action in the matter. The said order was confirmed by the respondent No.2, by order dated 19.01.2009 (Annexure-H) and by the Karnataka Appellate Tribunal, Bengaluru, by order dated 26.08.2009 (Annexure-J) in Revision Petition No.105/2009, so also, by this Court in Writ Petition No.26875 of 2009, by order dated 09.09.2009 (Annexure-K). In that view of the matter, as the application made by the petitioner as to the grant of subject land is still pending consideration before the competent Committee, I am of the view that, there is no impediment for the respondent



No.4-Tahasildar to consider the case of the petitioner in accordance with law, within an outer limit of four months from the date of receipt of this order.

7. It is made clear that, since the respondent-Authorities have not taken action in furtherance of the remand made by the respondent No.3 in the proceedings at Annexure-D, parties are directed to maintain *status quo* as on today, in respect of the subject land, till the consideration of same by the respondent No.4-Tahasildar. It is also made clear that, this Court has not expressed any opinion on merits of the case as to the allotment of land made in favour of the respondent No.5-KPTCL on the ground that the matter is pending consideration before the respondent No.4 and said aspect of the matter is kept open. With this observation, writ petition stands ***disposed of.***

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

ARK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 79