



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.15452 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. JAYARAM M.S.
S/O SIDDEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS,
R/AT. NO.230, MAIN ROAD,
MAHADEVAPURA,
SRIRANGAPATTANA TALUK,
MANDYA -571415.
2. SRI. A.L. RAMESH,
S/O N.LINGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
R/AT. NO. 69/A, 2ND CROSS,
HOSAHALLI VILLAGE,
KRISHNARAJAPET TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT-571401.

Digitally signed
by CHAYA S A
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. H.M. MANJESH, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
M.S BUILDING
BENGALURU-576001
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.



2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
PARK ROAD 2, PES COLLEGE CAMPUS,
NEAR DISTRICT COURT,
MANDYA- 571401.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
PANDAVAPURA SUB-DIVISION,
PANDAVAPURA,
MANDYA DISTRICT -571434.
4. THE TAHASILDAR
SRIRANGAPATTANA,
MINI VIDHANA SOUDHA,
SRIRANGAPATTANA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT -571438.
5. SRI. JAYARAMU,
S/O JAYARAMEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 69 YEARS.
6. SMT.TIMMAMMA,
W/O LATE. SIDDEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 82 YEARS.
7. SMT. DODDATHAYAMMA,
D/O LATE SIDDEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS.
8. SMT. SHANTHAMMA,
D/O LATE SIDDEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS.
9. SMT. SAKAMMA,
D/O LATE SIDDEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS.



10. SMT. SANNATHAYAMMA,
D/O LATE SIDDEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS

11. SRI. RAJU,
S/O LATE. SIDDEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,

RESPONDENTS NO.5 TO 11 ARE
R/AT, CHIKKANKANA HALLI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
SRIRANGAPATTANA TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT -571438.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1 TO R4)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 17.04.2026 PASSED BY THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, MANDYA DISTRICT, MANDYA, RESPONDENT NO.2 HEREIN IN NO.R.P.508/2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-P.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

1. Heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.
2. In this Writ Petition, petitioners are assailing the order dated 17.04.2026(Annexure-P) passed by respondent No.2 in R.P. No.508/2025.



3. Having taken note of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 4, on consideration of the writ records would indicate that Respondent No.2, after considering the entire material on record, has rightly passed the impugned order.

4. The controversy is as to the grant made in favour of the petitioner as well as private respondent Nos.5 to 11 herein are concerned. As both the petitioner as well as respondent Nos.5 to 11 herein are claiming the land in question as grant being made in their favour, I am of the view that, it is open for the petitioner/parties to approach the competent authority under Rule 108-K of the Karnataka Land Revenue Rules, 1966.

5. In that view of the matter, the Writ Petition is accordingly, rejected.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

sac
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 11