



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.19666 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. PALVIT DEVELOPERS LLP
HAVING REGISTERED OFFICE AT
MAXWOTH FORT ROAD
NO.108, 4TH FLOOR,
NEAR MINERVA CIRCLE,
BENGALURU-560004
REPRESENTED BY ITS PARTNER
BHERUMAL JAIN
REGISTERED UNDER SECTION 12(1) OF
LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT, 2008.

2. PRONOVA REALTY LLP
HAVING REGISTERED OFFICE AT
NO.97, MYSORE ROAD, CHAMRAJPETE,
BENGALURU-560004
REPRESENTED BY ITS PARTNER
BHARAT BHANDARI
REGISTERED UNDER SECTION 12(1) OF
LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT, 2008.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. UDAY HOLLA, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. GOUTAM CHAND S.F., ADVOCATE)



AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
DR.B R AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU -560001
REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY.
2. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT
DODDABALLAPURA-561203.
3. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT
DODDABALLAPURA-561203.
4. TAHASHILDAR
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT
DODDABALLAPURA-561203.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO
SETTING ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 17/06/2025
PASSED IN RP NO.25/2025 BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2-
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER VIDE ANNEXURE-A; 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

1. In this Writ Petition, petitioners are assailing the order dated 17.06.2025 passed in R.P.No.25/2025 (Annexure-A) by the respondent No.2, inter alia, sought for confirmation of the Orders dated 04.11.2024 in R.A.Nos.386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397 of 2024 (Annexures- D and D1), passed by the respondent No.3.

2. Facts in nutshell are that, petitioners claim to be owners in possession of land bearing Sy.No.150/P71, 150/P106, 150/P14, 150/P109, 150/P87, 150/P110, 150/P15, 150/P59 and 150/P108 of Hulikunte Village, Doddabelavangala Hobli, Doddaballapura Taluk, Bengaluru Rural District, to an extent of 34 acres having purchased the same as per Registered Sale Deeds during 2021, as per Annexures-B to B10. It is further stated in the Writ Petition that the land in question was granted in favour of the vendors of the petitioners and their predecessors under the provisions of the Land Reforms, Land Revenue, GMF (Grow More Food) Scheme, etc. and the revenue records stand in the names of the vendors of the petitioners



and their predecessors for more than 50 years. RTC extracts are produced at Annexure-C series. It is further stated in the Writ Petition that after the purchase of the land in question by the petitioners, petitioners have approached respondent No.3 for transfer of revenue records in their names. In this regard, the petitioners have produced the order dated 04.11.2024 passed by respondent No.3 at Annexure-D and D1 respectively. It is the grievance of the petitioners that, the respondent No.2 has registered the Revision Petition under Section 136(3) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 stating that the land granted in favour of the vendors of the petitioners is fake and as such the proceedings was conducted as per Annexure-F. Thereafter, the respondent No.2 has completed the entire proceedings as per Annexure-A to the Writ Petition, stating that, the land granted in favour of the vendors of the petitioners is without any basis and contrary to law and therefore, passed the impugned order at Annexure-A dated 17.06.2025. Feeling aggrieved by the same, the petitioners have presented this Writ Petition.

3. Heard Sri. Uday Holla, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri. Goutam Chand S.F., learned counsel for the



petitioners and Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader for the respondents.

4. Sri. Uday Holla, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners refers to Annexure-B series and contended that, the vendors of the petitioners were the grantees of the land in question and those grants have been made for more than 70 years and therefore, submitted that the impugned proceedings initiated against the petitioners suffers from infirmity as the revenue authorities cannot go into the title of the property beyond reasonable period and accordingly, sought for interference of this Court. It is also argued by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners that respondent No.3 after considering the entire material on record has ordered for change of mutation in the name of the petitioners and therefore, the impugned action on the part of respondent No.2 requires to be interfered with by this Court. It is further argued by the learned Senior Counsel that, the respondent No.2 has not allowed the Revision Petition, however, has interfered with the grant orders produced at Annexure-L series which is in gross violation of principles of natural justice and the impugned order is liable to be quashed.



5. Per contra, Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for the State sought to support the impugned order at Annexure-A and submitted that what was granted in favour of vendor of the petitioners is only a temporary saguvali chit and no permanent grant has been made in favour of the vendors of the petitioners and therefore, sought for dismissal of the Writ Petition.

6. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, on careful consideration of the Writ Petition would indicate that, the petitioners had purchased the schedule property from the original grantees which has been made during 1952-53 onwards. Though the grant orders refer to as temporary grant made in favour of vendors of the petitioners, however, the same cannot be interfered with by exercising suo-motu proceedings by respondent No.2. In this regard, this Court in identical matters in W.P.No.8522/2024 disposed of on 04.08.2025 and in W.P.No.23095/2013 disposed of on 13.01.2020 and in W.P.No.41881/2019 disposed of on 31.01.2024 has quashed the revisional orders passed by the Special Deputy Commissioner by following the Judgment of the Hon'ble



Supreme Court in the case of JT. COLLECTOR, RANGA REDDY DISTRICT AND ANOTHER Vs. D. NARSING RAO AND OTHERS reported in (2015) 3 SCC 695, held that the competent authority has no jurisdiction to interfere with the grant orders belatedly that too, after three to four decades of grant made in favour of the grantees. In that view of the matter, I find force in the submissions made by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners and as such, I pass the following:

ORDER

- (i) Writ Petition is allowed.
- (ii) The order dated 17.06.2025 in R.P.No.25/2025 (Annexure-A) passed by respondent No.2 is set aside.
- (iii) The Orders dated 04.11.2024 in R.A.Nos.386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397 of 2024 (Annexures-D and D1) passed by the respondent No.3 are hereby confirmed.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

sac
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 13