



CNR: KAHC010286272026

NC: 2026:KHC:42802
WP No. 12520 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.12520 OF 2026 (KLR-LG)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. VENKATARAMANAPPA
S/O LATE PILLAGA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
R/AT HUTTANAHALLI VILLAGE,
JALA HOBLI,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK,
BENGALURU DISTRICT- 562157.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SAGAR B.B., ADVOCATE (VC))

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT,
BENGALURU- 560009.
3. THE TAHSILDAR
YELAHANKA TALUK



CNR: KAHC010286272026

NC: 2026:KHC:42802
WP No. 12520 of 2026

(OLD BENGALURU NORTH TALUK),
BENGALURU- 560064.

4. THE TAHSILDAR-CUM-SECRETARY
COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED
UNDER SECTION 94A OF
THE KARNATAKA LAND REVENUE ACT,
YELAHANKA TALUK,
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT- 560064.
5. GAIL (INDIA) LTD.
REPRESENTED BY ITS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
(SOUTHERN REGION),
OFFICE AT SWAN, 2ND FLOOR,
NO.323, KODIGEHALI MAIN ROAD,
SAHAKAR NAGAR, BENGALURU,
KARNATAKA - 560092.
6. GAIL GAS LTD.
REPRESENTED BY ITS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
(SOUTHERN REGION),
OFFICE AT 3RD FLOOR,
NEXT BHARAT PETROLEUM BUNK,
DASARAHALLI MAIN ROAD,
MARIYANNAPALYA,
HEBBAL, BENGALURU,
KARNATAKA-560024.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHASHIKIRAN SHETTY, AG A/W
SMT. PRATHIMA HONNAPURA, AAG FOR
SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1 TO R4;
SRI. KUMAR N.J., ADVOCATE FOR R5 & R6)



CNR: KAHC010286272026

NC: 2026:KHC:42802
WP No. 12520 of 2026

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 06/04/2021 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 - DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT, BEARING NO. LND (Y) CR 437/2019-20, VIDE ANNEXURE-E, IN SO FAR AS IT GRANTS 3.4 ACRES OF LAND IN FAVOUR OF THE PRIVATE RESPONDENTS; AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

In this writ petition, the petitioner is assailing the order dated-Deputy Commissioner, insofar as it relates to the grant of 3.4 acres of land in favour of the private respondents (Annexure-E). The petitioner inter-alia, sought a direction to the respondent-authorities to consider the application in Form No.53 dated 12.04.1978, seeking regularisation of the land bearing Sy. No.72, measuring 20 guntas, situated at



CNR: KAHC010286272026

Huttanahalli Village, Jala Hobli, Yelahanka Taluk, as per Annexure-C.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that his forefathers were cultivating the land in question and, after their demise, the petitioner has been cultivating the same since 1950. Accordingly, the petitioner submitted an application before the revenue authorities seeking regularisation of the land in question and filed Form No.53.

3. It is further case of the petitioner that the application in Form No.53 filed by him is yet to be considered by the respondent-authorities. However, in the meanwhile, the respondent-authorities have granted an extent of 3.04 acres of land in Sy. No.72 in favour of respondent Nos.5 and 6. Therefore, it is the contention of the petitioner that, when the application filed by him was pending consideration before the



respondent-authorities, the grant made in favour of respondent Nos.5 and 6 pursuant to the order dated 06.04.2021 is liable to be set aside.

4. Heard Sri. Sagar B. B., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner; Sri. Shashikiran Shetty, learned Advocate General for Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., High Court Government Pleader for the respondent-State and Sri. Kumar N.J., learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos. 5 and 6.

5. Sri. Sagar B.B., learned counsel for the petitioner, submitted that, since the application filed by the petitioner was pending consideration before the respondent-authorities and the petitioner was in possession and cultivation of the land in question, the respondent-authorities had no authority in law to grant the very same land to respondent Nos.5 and 6. Accordingly, he sought interference by this Court.



CNR: KAHC010286272026

NC: 2026:KHC:42802
WP No. 12520 of 2026

6. Per contra, Sri. Shashikiran Shetty, learned Advocate General appearing for the respondent-State submitted that the grant in favour of respondent Nos.5 and 6 was made on 06.04.2021 and that the petitioner has approached this Court after a lapse of more than five years. Therefore, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

7. Learned Advocate General further contended that the petitioner has not filed any application in Form No.53 seeking regularisation of the land in question and disputed the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner in this regard. It was also contended that the land in question has been granted for a public purpose in favour of respondent Nos.5 and 6 and, therefore, the petitioner has no legal right to claim the very same land. Accordingly, learned Advocate General sought dismissal of the writ petition.



CNR: KAHC010286272026

8. Sri. Kumar N.J., learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.5 and 6, adopted the submissions made by the learned Advocate General and sought dismissal of the writ petition.

9. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, particularly the contention of the learned Advocate General that the petitioner has sought regularisation of the land by filing an application in Form No.53, and having regard to the object for which the land has been granted by the respondent-authorities in favour of respondent Nos.5 and 6 pursuant to the order dated 06.04.2021, by reducing the extent of land from Government Gomala land under Section 97(4) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, and the Rules made thereunder, I am of the opinion that no interference is called for in this writ petition.



CNR: KAHC010286272026

NC: 2026:KHC:42802
WP No. 12520 of 2026

10. It is also to be noted that the said land has been granted in favour of respondent Nos.5 and 6 on the basis of a lease-cum-sale arrangement. Therefore, having regard to the nature and purpose of the grant, the petitioner cannot claim a vested or enforceable right over the very same land merely on the basis of an alleged application seeking regularisation.

11. It is also to be noted that the petitioner has stated in the writ petition that he had made an application before the respondent-authorities seeking regularisation of the land in question and the same was disputed by the learned Advocate General, that, no such application was filed. In this regard, this Court, in the case of ***Muniyamma and others v. State of Karnataka and Others***, reported in **2011 (1) KLJ 232**, has held that an applicant seeking grant of land has no legal right to claim a particular parcel of



CNR: KAHC010286272026

NC: 2026:KHC:42802
WP No. 12520 of 2026

land. It has further been held that, in such circumstances, this Court cannot issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondent-authorities to grant the land in favour of the applicant.

12. In that view of the matter, I do not find any merit in the writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***dismissed***.

13. However, insofar as the application, if any, filed by the petitioner seeking regularisation of the land in question is concerned, the respondent-authorities shall consider the same in accordance with law, subject to the petitioner satisfying the applicable requirements, without creating any right in his favour merely on account of such consideration.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE