



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 16569 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SMT. SUSHEELAMMA,
W/O. S.P. NAGARAJ,
AGED 62 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 148,
BENGALURU NORTH - 4,
SHIVAKOTE VILLAGE,
BENGALURU - 560 089.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. JAYARAJ D.S, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT, M.S BUILDING,
BENGALURU, KARNATAKA - 560 001.
2. THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER,
YELAHANKA TALUK,
BENGALURU NORTH,
KARNATAKA - 562 123.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. B.P. RADHA, AGA FOR R1)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) ISSUE A WRIT



IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT OR ORDER QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT BEARING NO. S.YEL.TP/R.H/2025-26 DATED 04.03.2026 ISSUED BY THE CONCERNED JURISDICTIONAL EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF YELAHANKA TALUK - RESPONDENT NO. 2 VIDE ANNEXURE - A1 AND ETC.,

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

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

ORAL ORDER

Learned Additional Government Advocate accepts notice for respondent No.1.

2. In this writ petition, petitioner is assailing the endorsement dated 04.03.2026 (Annexure-A1) issued by respondent No.2 *inter alia* sought for direction to the respondent No.2 to consider the representation dated 11.02.2026 (Annexure-A) filed by the petitioner.

3. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and on careful consideration of the Annexure-B, the Hakku Pathra issued by the competent



authority, wherein there is no seal with date or under which provision the said document has been issued by the competent authority.

4. In that view of the matter, I am of the view that it is the duty of the petitioner to establish his right over the property in question. Since the respondents have disputed in their endorsement at Annexure A1 that, there is no such document in their office, I am of the view that, no interference is called for in this writ petition. However, it is open for the petitioner to establish her right over property in question and thereafter approach the competent authority.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

VS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 16