



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 20775 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. B R RAMAKRISHNEGOWDA
S/O LATE RAMEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS,
R/AT BANNENAHALLI VILLAGE,
BOOKANAKERE HOBLI, K.R.PET TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571 426.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ROOPESHA B., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
MANDYA,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571 401
2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
PANDAVAPURA SUV-DIVISION,
PANDAVAPURA,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571 434
3. THE TAHSILDAR,
K.R.PET TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571 426.
4. SMT. SHIVAMMA,
W/O LATE VENKTARAMEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS,



R/AT BANNENAHALLI VILLAGE,
BOOKANAKERE HOBLI,
K.R.PET TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571 426.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. HARISH A.S., AGA FOR R1 TO R3)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO I) ISSUE ANY APPROPRIATE ORDER OR DIRECTION OR A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI AND TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED- 15/04/2025 PASSED BY THE 1ST RESPONDENT IN CASE NO-R.P. 270/2024 VIDE ANNEXURE H IN DISMISSING THE PETITION AND CONFIRMING THE ORDER DATED- 14/06/2024 PASSED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT IN CASE R.MIS.NO.(K) 191/2024, VIDE ANNEXURE -E 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 Nos.1 to 3.

2. In this writ petition, the petitioner is assailing the Order dated 15.04.2025 (Annexure-H) passed by respondent



No.1, and the Order dated 14.06.2024 (Annexure-E) passed by respondent No.2.

3. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and on careful consideration of the impugned order at Annexure-H would indicate that the mutation has been made based on the Will dated 28.08.2002.

4. In that view of the matter, taking into consideration the declaration of law made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Tarachandra v. Bhawarlal and Another***¹, the reasons assigned by the respondents-authorities is just and proper. However, it is open for the petitioner to agitate his civil rights in a manner known to law.

With this observation, petition is ***rejected***.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

BH
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 38

¹ 2025 SCC Online SC 2902