



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.14940 OF 2026 (LR-)

BETWEEN:

SRI M.P. RAJU
S/O LATE PATALAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS,
R/AT MAVALIPURA VILLAGE,
HESARAGHATTA HOBLI,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK,
BENGALURU - 560 089.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. T. SESHAGIRI RAO, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF LAND RECORDS,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
TALUK ADALITHA SOUDHA,
TALUK OFFICE ROAD,
DODDABALLAPURA SUB-DIVISION,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU - 561 203.
3. THE TAHSILDAR
TALUK ADALITHA SOUDHA,
TALUK OFFICE ROAD,
DODDABALLAPURA,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT,
BENGALURU - 561 203.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. B.J. ESWARAPPA, AGA)



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 31ST OCTOBER, 2018 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2-ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER IN CASE NO.LRF.SR(DO).101/2014-15 VIDE ANNEXURE-A; AND ETC.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, 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 31st October, 2018 (Annexure-A) passed by the respondent No.2-Assistant Commissioner in Case No.LRF:SR(D):101/2014-15, wherein, the subject land has been restored in favour of the State Government by declaring the registered Sale Deed dated 04th February, 2013 executed in favour of the petitioner as void.

2. Heard Sri. T. Seshagiri Rao, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri. B.J. Eswarappa, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondents.

3. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on careful consideration of impugned order dated 31st October, 2018 (Annexure-A), the same would indicate that the proceedings have been initiated against the petitioner



under Section 79A and 79B of the Karnataka Land Reforms Act, 1961. It is also forthcoming that the petitioner herein remained absent in the impugned proceedings.

4. Under the similar circumstances, this Court, in Writ Petition No.20349 of 2023 disposed of on 01st April, 2025 (Annexure-G), allowed the petition and directed the revenue authorities to restore the name of the petitioners in the revenue records. Paragraphs 1 to 4 of the said order reads as under:

"1. An order of vesting passed by the Assistant Commissioner for contravention of Sections 79A and 79B of the Karnataka Land Reforms Act, 1961('the Act', for short) is challenged in this petition.

2. The Assistant Commissioner proceeded to pass the impugned order on the ground that the petitioners have not produced any relevant documents despite service of notice. In essence, the impugned order passed was without hearing or without considering the claims of the purchasers. Since the order of vesting would take away the rights of the ownership of land in question, the appropriate course would be to afford one more opportunity to the petitioners.

3. In the normal course, the matter would have to be remanded to the Assistant Commissioner, since Sections



79A and 79B of the Act were omitted by virtue of an amendment to the Land Reforms Act, no useful purpose would be served by remanding the matter to the Assistant Commissioner and hence, the impugned proceedings initiated shall stand abated.

4. In view of the above, the revenue authorities to restore the name of the petitioners in the revenue record."

5. Therefore, following the law declared by this Court in the aforesaid petition, I am of the considered opinion that the facts of the case in hand are similar to that of the order passed by this Court in the aforesaid writ petition. Accordingly, impugned order dated 31st October, 2018 (Annexure-A) passed by the respondent No.2 in Case No.LRF:SR(D):101/2014-15 is hereby quashed; and respondent-Authorities are directed to restore the entries in the revenue records in respect of the schedule property in favour of the petitioner herein, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of this order. In the result, writ petition is ***allowed.***

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

ARK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 70