



CNR: KAHC010434292022

NC: 2026:KHC:49734
WP No. 18931 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 18931 OF 2022 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT CHANDRAMMA
W/O PUTTARAJU
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
OCC HH WORK.
2. SRI SATISH, S/O PUTTARAJU
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS.
3. SMT.JYOTHI
D/O PUTTARAJU
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS
OCC: HH WORK.
4. SRI KUMARA
S/O APPAGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
OCC AGRL.

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

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI SHIVAYOGESHA SHIVAYOGIMATH, ADVOCATE FOR
SMT.RATNA N SHIVAYOGIMATH., ADVOCATE)



CNR: KAHC010434292022

NC: 2026:KHC:49734
WP No. 18931 of 2022

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
M S BUILDING, BENGALURU -1.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
MYSURU, DIST: MYSURU -570001.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
HUNSUR SUB DIVISION
HUNSUR, DIST MYSURU -571105.
4. THE TAHSILDAR
H D KOTE, TQ: H D KOTE
DIST: MYSURU -571114.
5. SRI NANJIAH
S/O TATANAHALLI NANJIAH
R/O BHEEMANAHALLI VILLAGE
TQ: H D KOTE, DIST: MYSURU -571114.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI ADITYA DIWAKARA, AGA, FOR R1 TO R4,
SRI H MOHAN KUMAR, ADVOCATE, FOR R5)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 16.06.2022 IN NO.HKDKSPT 137/1979-80 PASSED BY THE R3 VIDE ANNEXURE-J.DIRECTING THE R3 AND R4 TO RESTORE THE REVENUE ENTRIES IN NAME OF THE PETITIONERS IN RESPECT OF (SY.NO.1/10) NEW SY.NO.21/1 SITUATED AT YELEHUNDIKAVAL VILLAGE, KASABA HOBLI, TQ HD KOTE, DIST, MYSURU.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN `B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:



CNR: KAHC010434292022

NC: 2026:KHC:49734
WP No. 18931 of 2022

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

ORAL ORDER

In this petition, the petitioners are assailing the order dated 16.06.2022 (Annexure-J) passed by respondent No.3, inter alia, seeking a direction to respondents No.3 and 4 to restore the revenue entries in the name of the petitioners.

2. Sri Shivayogesha Shivayogimath, learned counsel for the petitioners contended, by referring to the order dated 16.12.1988 passed by this Court in WP No.14020/1985 (Annexure-D), that, this Court has given a benefit to the petitioners as to construction made in the property, and also to harvest the crop raised therein. He, therefore, submitted that the said aspect of the matter has not been considered by respondent No.3 while passing the impugned order.

3. *Per contra*, Sri H Mohan Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.5 submitted that, the



CNR: KAHC010434292022

**NC: 2026:KHC:49734
WP No. 18931 of 2022**

respondent No.5 is the original grantee, and has succeeded before this Court in the aforementioned writ petition, and respondent No.3 has implemented the order passed by this Court (Annexure-D), and therefore, sought for dismissal of the writ petition.

4. Learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondents No.1 to 4 justifies the impugned order.

5. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, it is not in dispute that, the father of petitioner No.4 herein has filed WP No.14020/1985 and this Court by order dated 14.11.1988 (Annexure-C) dismissed the writ petition, and thereafter, this Court by order dated 16.12.1988 on IA No.2, has directed the respondent - Authorities to draw mahazar as to any improvement has been made by the petitioners and also allow them to harvest the standing crop in the land in question as well as any dwelling house



CNR: KAHC010434292022

**NC: 2026:KHC:49734
WP No. 18931 of 2022**

situated in the land in question. Pursuant to the same, the respondent No.5 has approached the respondent - Authorities and thereby, following the proceedings in PTCL 03/1984-85 dated 30.08.1985 passed by the Deputy Commissioner and the order passed by this Court at Annexures - C and D, respondent No.3 has passed the impugned order dated 16.06.2022 at Annexure-J, and therefore, I am of the view that, no interference is called for in this writ petition as the respondent No.3 has implemented the order passed by this Court. In that view of the matter, the writ petition is dismissed.

Pending IA's, if any, are disposed of accordingly.

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

BKM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 55