



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 9612 OF 2024 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. C.B. DEVARAJU
S/O LATE BASAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
OCCU: AGRICULTURIST
R/AT CHOWDIBEGURU VILLAGE,
KUDURU HOBLI, MAGADI TALUK,
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT - 562 120.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. GIRISH M.K, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
M.S. BUILDING, DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
RAMANAGARA DISTRICT,
RAMANAGARA - 562 159.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
RAMANAGARA SUB DIVISION,
RAMANAGARA - 562 159.

Digitally
signed by
PRIYANKA H
M

Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



4. THE THASILDAR
MAGADI TALUK,
MAGADI - 562 120.
5. SRI. GANGAIAH
S/O CHANNABSAVAIAH
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
RESIDING AT BAGINGERE
TIPPASANDRA HOBALI
MAGADI - 562 120.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. K.P. YOGANNA, AGA FOR R1 TO R4)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER PASSED BY THE R-4 IN PROCEEDINGS NO. RRT(D)270/2017-18 DTD. 20.06.2022 VIDE ANNEX-F 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

Learned Additional Government Advocate takes notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4. Notice to respondent No.5 is not necessary for the following reasons.



2. It is the contention of the petitioner that earlier when the petitioner filed an appeal before the Assistant Commissioner, Ramanagara Sub-Division in proceedings No.RA 318/2016-17, the Assistant Commissioner passed an order at Annexure - C dated 19.08.2016 remanding the matter back to the Tahsildar with a specific direction that he shall issue notice to all concerned, consider whether there would be any objection from the previous vendor/kathedar and proceed in accordance with law to consider entering the name of the petitioner in the revenue records pursuant to the sale deed dated 25.09.1964 under which the petitioner's father is said to have purchased 11 1/2 quantas of land in Sy.No.64/3 of Chowdibeguru Village, Kuduru Hobli, Magadi Taluk. However the Tahsildar has issued the impugned endorsement at Annexure - F dated 20.06.2022 refusing to consider the representation of the petitioner on the ground that the claim of the petitioner is a stale claim and for more than 30 years the name of the petitioner's father has not been entered in the revenue records pursuant to the registered sale deed.



3. In the considered opinion of this Court that such an endorsement could not have been issued by the Tahsildar. There is no provision which would preclude the Tahsildar from considering such a application/representation only on the ground that the claim is more than 30 years old. The correct position is to issue notice to the kathedar / vendor of the petitioner's father, hear the said person and if there is no objection from the said person or his legal heirs, the Tahsildar may proceed to remove the name of the previous owner / kathedar and enter the name of the legal heirs of Late Sri.Basappa, who is said to have purchased the property in question under the registered sale date dated 25.09.1964.

Accordingly the writ petition is **allowed** while setting aside the impugned endorsement at Annexure - F dated 20.06.2022 issued by the respondent - Tahsildar, Magagi taluk. The Tahsildar shall once again issue notice to the present kathedar and or the legal heirs of the kathedar or vendor of the petitioner's father, consider if there is any objection from their side having regard to the registered sale deed dated 25.09.1964 and proceed in accordance with law. The entire



NC: 2026:KHC:10299
WP No. 9612 of 2024

exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

GPG
List No.: 1 SI No.: 48