



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.16255 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. SHABREEN M.
W/O MD. AZMATHULLA KHAN
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.61,
5TH CROSS MYSORE ROAD,
MANJUNATHA NAGAR,
NEW GDDAHALLI,
BENGALURU 560026

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. NAMEED AHMED, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. SAMAD KHAN A., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT, K.G. ROAD,
BENGALURU 560009.
2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU SOUTH SUB-DIVISION, BENGALURU.
3. THE TAHASILDAR
ANEKAL TALUK, ANEKAL, BENGALURU URBAN
DISTRICT.
4. SRI H.R. MUNIREDDY
S/O LATE H.C. RAMASWAMY REDDY, AGED ABOUT



55 YEARS, RESIDING AT B. HOSAHALLI VILLAGE,
SARJAPURA HOBLI, ANEKAL TALUK, BENGALURU
URBAN DISTRICT.

5. SMT. H.N. KANTHAMMA
W/O LATE H.C. THIMMAREDDY, AGED ABOUT 50
YEARS, RESIDING AT B. HOSAHALLI VILLAGE,
SARJAPURAHOBOLI, ANEKAL TALUK, BENGALURU
URBAN DISTRICT.
6. SMT. KUTTEJ KHATOON
AGE ABOUT 70 YEARS
W.O ABDUL KHADER
R.AT NO.720, SANTHE BEEDI, DOMMASANDRA
VILLAGE BANGALORE 562125

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. B.P. RADHA, AGA FOR R1 TO R3;
SRI. J.C. KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R4;
SRI. AKASH V.T., ADVOCATE R5)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO
QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 22.05.2026 PASSED BY
THE 1ST RESPONDENT - DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, BENGALURU
URBAN DISTRICT, IN REVISION PETITION NO.RP/466/2024,
PRODUCED HEREIN AS ANNEXURE-A, AS BEING ILLEGAL,
ARBITRARY, PERVERSE AND CONTRARY TO THE PROVISIONS
OF THE KARNATAKA LAND REVENUE ACT.

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



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

ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri. Naveed Ahamed, learned counsel for Sri. Samad Khan A., learned counsel for the petitioner; Smt. B.P. Radha, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondent-State; Sri. J.C. Kumar, learned counsel for the respondent No.5 and Sri. Akash V.T., learned counsel for the respondent No.5.

2. In this writ petition, the petitioner is assailing the order dated 22.05.2026 passed by Respondent No.1-Deputy Commissioner, whereby the order dated 30.08.2024 (Annexure-B) passed by Respondent No. 2 has been set aside.

3. Sri. Naveed Ahamed, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contended that Respondent No. 1 has erroneously interfered with the



order passed by Respondent No. 2, wherein it was held that the petitioner had purchased the land in question under a registered Sale Deed dated 08.09.1944. Therefore, it was contended that the impugned order passed by Respondent No. 1 requires interference by this Court.

4. Per contra, Sri. J.C. Kumar and Sri. Akash V.T., learned counsel appearing for Respondent Nos.4 and 5, submitted that the entry made in M.R. No. 15/1992-93 was interfered with by Respondent No. 2 after a delay of 17 years, despite the fact that civil suits in respect of the subject land are pending consideration before the competent Civil Court. It was further contended that revenue authorities ought not to have altered the revenue entries when the rights of the parties are subject matter of adjudication in the pending suits.



5. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, I find force in the contention advanced on behalf of Respondent No. 4. The entry made in M.R. No. 5/1992-93 has been restored by Respondent No. 1 during the pendency of the civil suits concerning the subject land. Since the rights and title of the parties are yet to be adjudicated and crystallized in the pending suits, the order passed by Respondent No. 1 cannot be said to suffer from any legal infirmity calling interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, I do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order passed by Respondent No.1-Deputy Commissioner.

6. It is, however, made clear that the parties are at liberty to approach the competent revenue authorities for mutation and khata entries after the



rights of the parties are determined by the competent Civil Court in the pending suits.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

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

SB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 18