



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU
DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF JULY, 2026
PRESENT
THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAYKUMAR A. PATIL
REVIEW PETITION NO.121 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SANJEEVAPPA
S/O LATE ANJINAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS
R/AT MYLAPPANAHALLI VILLAGE,
HESARAGHATTA HOBLI,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK 560089

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. K.N.NITISH FOR
SRI. K. V. NARASIMHAN, ADVOCATES)

AND:

1. R SRINIVAS
S/O V RAMANAND
AGED 45 YEARS
R/AT NO 13, SWWC LAYOUT,
BEHIND KEB POWER STATION,
4TH PHASE,
YELAHANKA NEW TOWN,
BENGALURU 560054

Digitally
signed by
PAVITHRA N
Location:
High Court
of Karnataka



2. THE ASSITANT COMMISIONER
BENGALURU NORTH DIVISION (ADDL)
KANDAYA BHAVAN,
BENGALURU 560009
3. THE TAHSILDAR
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK (ADDL)
OPP CANARA BANK
YELAHANKA NEW TOWN,
BENGALURU 560064
4. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT,
KANDAYA BHAVAN
BENGALURU 560009

...RESPONDENTS

THIS RP IS FILED UNDER SECTION.114 R/W ORDER XLVII RULE 1 OF CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, 1908, PRAYING TO ALLOW THIS REVIEW PETITION AND REVIEW THE ORDER PASSED IN WA NO.745/2023 DATED 26.02.2026

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAYKUMAR A. PATIL



ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAYKUMAR A. PATIL)

This Review Petition is filed seeking to review the Judgment dated 26.02.2026, passed by this Court in Writ Appeal No.745/2023 (KLR-RR/SUR).

2. Sri.K.N.Nitish, learned counsel appearing for the review petitioner submits that the only ground on which the review is sought is that this Court allowed the writ appeal by setting aside the orders of the respondent Nos.2 and 4. However, the matter ought to have been remanded to the respondent No.2 to re-consider the case on merits.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, perused the order under review and the grounds of the review petition. The petitioner is seeking to remand the matter to the Assistant Commissioner. In our considered view, such a submission would amount to re-arguing the appeal which is impermissible in the review proceedings.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the review petitioner has been unable to point out any error apparent on the face of the record warranting review of the



judgment dated 26.02.2026. The review petition, therefore, fails, and is accordingly ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(VIJAYKUMAR A. PATIL)
JUDGE**

RAK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 1