



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 8936 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SHRI. RAVIN KUMAR REDDY
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
SON OF LATE PANDAPPA RAMAPPA REDDY,
RESIDING AT NO. 1, "VAJRAMALE",
OPPOSITE RENUKA NATIONAL COLLEGE,
1ST MAIN, NAGARABHAVI,
BANGALORE - 560 072.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. DHANANJAY JOSHI, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SMT. KAVITHA DAMODARAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEDDI,
BENGALURU - 560 001
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY.
2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
NORTH SUB-DIVISION,
K G ROAD, BANGALORE - 560 009.
3. THE TAHSILDAR,
BANGALORE EAST TALUK,

Digitally signed
by JUANITA
THE JESWINI
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



KR PURAM,
BENGALURU - 560 036

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHAMANTH NAIK, HCGP)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECTING THE R2 TO CONSIDER THE FRESH REPRESENTATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER DATE 23/02/2026 (ANNX-J) AND CONSEQUENTLY DIRECT THE R2 TO IMPLEMENT AND INCORPORATE THE ORDER DATED 14/10/2022 (ANNX-D) BY INCORPORATING THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER IN THE COMPUTERIZED RTC / KHATHA, IN COLUMN NO. 9 AND COLU,M NO. 12(2) OF THE RTC IN RESPECT OF THE SCHEDULE PROPERTY 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 High Court Government Pleader takes notice for all the respondents.

2. Learned Senior Counsel Sri.Dhananjay Joshi, appearing for the petitioner submits that earlier too, the petitioner was before this Court in writ petition No.33185/2024



seeking a writ of mandamus to direct the Tahsildar, Bangalore East Taluk, to enter the name of the petitioner in the revenue records on the basis of succession since the petitioner has succeeded to the property belonging to his father, late Sri. Pandappa Ramappa Reddy, whose name is reflected in the RTC. This Court disposed of the writ petition on 09.12.2024, while recording the submissions of the learned High Court Government Pleader that respondent No.4-Tahsildar doubts the genuineness of the grant said to have been made in favour of the petitioner's father. It was directed that the Tahsildar may conduct an enquiry in that regard and take action in accordance with law. However, when the orders passed by this Court were not complied with, the petitioner filed a contempt petition in CCC (Civil) No.408/2025 and during the course of the contempt proceedings, a compliance affidavit was filed by the Tahsildar, that despite notice being issued to the petitioner calling upon him to produce the documents to establish the genuineness of the claim, the petitioner failed to produce any document and accordingly, an endorsement dated 12.05.2025 was issued to the petitioner in compliance with the directions issued by this Court in W.P.No.33185/2024. The contempt proceedings were



dropped, reserving liberty to the petitioner to furnish the documents as sought for. Accordingly, the petitioner once again gave a representation on 23.02.2026 along with the requisite documents, but the Tahsildar has not passed any orders.

3. Learned Senior counsel submits that this Court has held in many such cases that the revenue authorities cannot call for records every time there is a mutation sought pursuant to the death of the kathedar or transfer of the rights in favour of a subsequent purchaser. Having regard to the provisions contained in Sections 127 and 128 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, under these circumstances, where the mutation is sought based on the death of the khathedar, the Tahsildar cannot call for original records to verify the genuineness of the grant. This Court has noticed the Government Order dated 25.11.2024 bearing No.KAME156/SSM/2024, where for the purposes of conducting phodi and durast, the survey settlement authorities are entitled to call for the original grant orders or saguvali chits and the earlier mutation orders. This Court has directed that the said government order would apply only in cases of conducting



phodi and durast and not in respect of the mutation entries in terms of Sections 127 and 128 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964. Moreover, this Court in W.P.No.38517/2025, by Order dated 05.02.2026, had also directed the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, to issue a clarification to the Government Order dated 25.11.2024 that such documents may be called for only in cases where the phodi was never conducted earlier. If phodi of the larger extent of land has already been made and sub-numbers are assigned to Hiduvalidars and if for some reason phodi is required to be done again consequent to further subdivisions, the authorities cannot call for the original grant orders and such other documents.

4. In the considered opinion of this Court, the action of the respondent-Tasildar in declining to enter the name of the petitioner in the revenue records, when admittedly the name of the petitioner's father stands in the revenue records, calling for the original grant orders etc., for further verification, was totally uncalled for. If for any reason the Tahsildar was of the opinion that the name of the petitioner's father could not have



been entered in the revenue records, then appropriate action should have been taken by the Tahsildar to get the mutation entries cancelled in accordance with law. This is not a stage where the Tahsildar can make use of the government order to call for the original grant orders to verify as to whether the mutation entry made in the revenue records in the name of the petitioner's father is genuine or not.

5. For the foregoing reasons, the writ petition stands ***disposed of*** with a specific direction to respondent No.3- Tahsildar, Bangalore East Taluk, to proceed to consider the application filed by the petitioner, find out as to who are the legal heirs of late Sri.Pandappa Ramappa Reddy, and enter the names of the legal heirs of late Sri.Pandappa Ramappa Reddy, the present Kathedar in the revenue records and in the computerized RTC as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Ordered accordingly.



**NC: 2026:KHC:17719
WP No. 8936 of 2026**

Learned High Court Government Pleader is permitted to
file memo of appearance within a period of four weeks from
today

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

rv
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 22