



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 10TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.20296 OF 2024 (KLR-RES)

C/W

WRIT PETITION NO.23111 OF 2024 (KLR-RR/SUR)

WRIT PETITION NO.8289 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

IN WP No. 20296/2024

BETWEEN:

1. M/S. SAMMY'S DREAM LAND COMPANY PVT. LTD.,
A COMPANY REGISTERED UNDER
PROVISIONS OF THE COMPANIES ACT, 1956
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT NO.9,
2ND FLOOR, BEL AIR DRIVE,
MEKHRI CIRCLE,
BELLARY ROAD,
R.T NAGAR
BENGALURU - 560 032.
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR
N. RAMESH.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M.S. SHAYAMSUNDAR, SENIOR COUNSEL,
SRI. JOSEPH ANTHONY, ADVOCATE)

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



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
VIDHANASOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001
REPRESENTED BY THE
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.
2. THE SPECIAL TAHSILDAR,
YELAHANKA TALUK,
YELAHANKA,
BENGALURU - 560 064.
3. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
NORTH SUB-DIVISION,
BENGALURU-560038.
4. THE TAHSILDAR,
YELAHANKA TALUK,
YELAHANKA,
BENGALURU-560 064.
5. SRI. MUNISWAMAPPA
S/O LATE CHIKKAMUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 80 YEARS
RESIDING AT NO.76,
HOSAHALLI VILLAGE,
JALA HOBLI,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK
BENGALURU.



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

6. SRI. K. BACHAPPA,
RESIDING AT NO.76,
HOSAHALLI VILLAGE,
JALA HOBLI,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK,
BENGALURU-561203,
LEGAL HEIR OF LATE DODDAVENKATAMMA.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1 TO R4;
SRI. P.N. MANMOHAN, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. PRASHANT L. KANAL, ADVOCATE FOR R5;
R6 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET
ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 08.07.2024 IN
PROCEEDINGS BEARING NO.RRT(DIS)CR 103/2024 PASSED BY
THE RESPONDENT NO.2 (ANNX-A) AND NULLIFY ANY OTHER
CONSEQUENTIAL ACTIONS TAKEN PURSUANT THERETO.

IN WP NO. 23111/2024

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. MUNISHAMAPPA
S/O LATE BIN CHIKKAMUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 80 YEARS,
R/AT NO.76,
HOSAHALLI VILLAGE,
JALA HOBLI,
YALAHANKA TALUK



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BANGALORE DISTRICT -560091.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. P.N.MANMOHAN, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. PRASHANT L. KANAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
VIDHANA SOUDHA
M S BUILDING
BENGALURU-560001
REPRESENTED BY ITS
SECRETARY.
2. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE NORTH SUB-DIVISION
BENGALURU -560002.
3. SPECIAL TAHSILDHAR
YELAHANKA TALUK
YALAHANKA
BENGALURU-560064.
4. THE TAHSILDAR
YELAHANKA TALUK
YALAHANKA
BENGALURU-560064.

DODDAVENKATAMMA
SINCE DECEASED BY HER LR.



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

5. K. BACCHAPPA
AGED ABOUT 80 YEARS,
R/AT HOSAHALLI VILLAGE,
JALA HOBLI,
YALAHANKA TALUK
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BENGALURU DISTRICT-560091.
6. M/S SAMMY'S DREAM LAND COMPANY PVT LTD.
A COMPANY REGISTERED UNDER
PROVISIONS OF THE COMPANIES ACT, 1956
HAVING ITS OFFICE AT NO.9
2ND FLOOR,
BEL AIR DRIVE ,
MEKRI CIRCLE
R T NAGAR, BENGALURU -560032.
REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR
SRI. N. RAMESH.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1 TO R4;
SRI. M.S. SHYAMSUNDAR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR R6;
R5 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO
SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 21.02.2024
PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2-ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER IN R.A.NO.216/2023 VIDE ANNEXURE-A.



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

IN WP NO. 8289/2025

BETWEEN:

1. SHRI. MUNISHAMAPPA
S/O LATE CHIKKAMUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 81 YEARS
NO.76, HOSAHALLI VILLAGE,
JALA HOBLI,
YALAHANKA TALUK,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK,
BENGALURU-560091.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. P.N. MANMOHAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
M S BUILDING
BENGLAURU-560001
REPRESENTED BY
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER AND
DISTRICT MAGISTRATE
BENGALURU URBAN
KEMPEGOWDA ROAD
BEHIND KANDAYA BHAVAN
BENGALURU-560009.
3. SHRI. K. BACHAPPA
SON OF LATE DODDAVENKATAMMA
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

HOSAHALLI VILLAGE
JALA HOBLI
YELAHNKA TALUK
BENGALURU-560 091.

4. SAMMY'S DREAMLAND COMPANY
PRIVATE LIMITED
A COMPANY REGISTERED
UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT
OFFICE AT NO. 9, 2ND FLOOR
BEL AIR DRIVE, MEKHRI CIRCLE
BELLARY ROAD, RT NAGAR
BENGALURU-560032
REPRESENTED BY ITS
MANAGING DIRECTOR.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1 AND R2;
SRI. M.S. SHYAMSUNDAR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI. JOSEPH ANTHONY, ADVOCATE FOR R4;
R3 SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO
THE ORDER OF THE RESPONDENT NO.2 DATED 25.11.1998
BEARING NO. ALN/NA/SR/29/98-88 VIDE ANNEXURE-A.



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

THESE WRIT PETITIONS HAVING BEEN RESERVED FOR
ORDERS, COMING ON FOR PRONOUNCEMENT THIS DAY,
E.S. INDIRESH J., MADE THE FOLLOWING:

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

CAV ORDER

1. In W.P.No.20296/2024, petitioner is assailing the order dated 08.07.2024 in RRT(DIS)CR.103/2024 (Annexure-A) passed by respondent No.2, therein.
2. In W.P.No.23111/2024, the petitioner (respondent No.5 in W.P.No.20296/2024) challenging the order dated 21.02.2024 (Annexure-A) passed by the respondent No.2, therein.
3. In W.P.No.8289/2025, the petitioner (respondent No.5 in W.P.No.20296/2024) challenging the order dated 25.11.1998 (Annexure-A) passed by the respondent No.2, therein.
4. The controversy between the parties is as to the change of entry in the revenue records pertaining to the subject land and therefore, the matters were heard together and disposed of by this common order.



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

5. It is the case of the petitioner in W.P.No.20296/2024, that one Smt. Doddavenkatamma was the owner of the land bearing Sy.No.137 of Hosahalli Village, Yelahanka Taluk and the said Smt. Doddavenkatamma along with her son - K. Bachappa as well as the grand children, had executed general power of attorney dated 01.07.1997 in favour of the Director of the petitioner Company as per Annexure-B, authorising him to process the conversion in respect of the subject land and accordingly, the respondent - authorities have passed a Notification dated 25.11.1998 (Annexure-C), converting the subject land for non agricultural purpose. It is also stated that, the entire extent of 1 acre 27 guntas in Sy.No.137 was sold in favour of the petitioner as per the registered Sale Deeds produced at Annexure-D series and therefore, the petitioner has approached the Hunasamaranahalli Panchayat seeking change of khata in the name of petitioner - Company in respect of the subject land. It is also stated that, the competent Planning Authority has approved the Layout Plan as per Annexure-F.



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

6. It is further stated that, Smt. Doddavenkatamma filed O.S.No.911/2012 challenging the aforementioned three sale deeds and the said suit came to be disposed of as per the settlement arrived at between the parties. It is also stated that one Sri.G.G. Raveesha had filed O.S.No.691/2020, claims to be the legatee of Smt. Doddavenkatamma, as per the Will dated 02.03.2013 and the suit is pending consideration before the competent Civil Court. It is the case of the petitioner that the respondent No.5 had made an application to respondent No.4 seeking khata in respect of the subject land, based on the registered Sale Deed dated 25.04.1966 and the said application was rejected. Thereafter the respondent No.5 has approached the respondent No.3 - Assistant Commissioner, by filing Appeal in R.A.(YLK)216/2023 which was also dismissed by order dated 21.02.2024 (Annexure-H).

7. It is also stated that, the respondent No.2, by the impugned order dated 08.07.2024 allowed the claim made by the respondent No.5 and steps have been taken to change the khata from the erstwhile owner - Smt. Doddavenkatamma in



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

favour of respondent No.5. Feeling aggrieved by the same, petitioner has presented W.P.No.20296/2024.

8. In W.P.No.23111/2024, the petitioner (respondent No.5 in W.P.No.20296/2024) challenged the order dated 21.02.2024 passed by the Assistant Commissioner in R.A.(YLK)216/2023, dismissing the claim made by the petitioner therein as to change of khata.

9. In W.P.No.8289/2025, the petitioner (respondent No.5 in W.P.No.20296/2024), challenged the order of conversion dated 25.11.1998 passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Bengaluru Urban District.

10. Heard Sri. M.S. Shyamsundar, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri. Joseph Anthony, learned counsel for the petitioner in W.P.No.20296/2024 (respondent No.4 in W.P.No.8289/2025 and respondent No.6 in W.P.No.23111/2024), Sri. Manmohan P.N., learned counsel appearing on behalf of Sri. Prashant L. Kanal, learned counsel for the petitioner in W.P.No.23111/2024 and in W.P.No.8289/2025 (respondent No.5 in W.P.No.20296/2024)



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

and Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader for respondent - State.

11. It is contended by Sri. M.S. Shyamsundar, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner, that the petitioner - Company has purchased the land in question as per the registered Sale Deed dated 07.01.1999 (Annexure-D) and two other sale deeds dated 18.11.1998 (Annexure-D1 and D2) and therefore, as the petitioner has purchased the land in question, the revenue entries have to be made in favour of the petitioner - Company. It is also contended by the learned Senior Counsel that the petitioner got converted the land in question and therefore, the respondent - authorities have no jurisdiction as to enter the name of respondent No.5 in W.P.No.20296/2024 in the revenue records. It is also contended that the respondent No.5 had approached the revenue authorities belatedly after a period of four decades seeking change of entry and therefore, the impugned order passed by the respondent No.2 - Tahsildar dated 08.07.2024 requires to be set aside.

12. Per contra, Sri. Manmohan P.N., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in W.P.No.23111/2024 and in



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

W.P.No.8289/2025 (respondent Nos.5 and 6 in W.P.No.20296/2024), contended that, the petitioner - Company has filed O.S.No.1153/2025 against Munishamappa (respondent No.5 in W.P.No.20296/2024) and the said suit came to be rejected by the Trial Court on 01.12.2025 and feeling aggrieved by the same, the petitioner - Company had preferred RFA No.2798/2025 before this Court, which came to be dismissed on 02.02.2026 and thereafter, confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP(C) No.9673/2026 dated 20.03.2026 and therefore, it is contended by Sri. Manmohan, learned counsel, that the petitioner - Company has failed to establish ownership before the Civil Court and as such, sought for dismissal of the petition in W.P.No.20296/2024 and to quash the order of conversion made in favour of petitioner - Company and therefore, contended that the petitioner - Company has no right, title or interest in respect of the subject land and accordingly, sought for setting aside the order of conversion made in favour of petitioner - Company.

13. Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader sought to justify the impugned orders passed by the



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

respondent - Tahsildar entering the name of Munishamappa in the revenue records.

14. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, the petitioner - Company is claiming right over the property based on the registered Sale Deeds dated 18.11.1998 and dated 07.01.1999. The respondent No.5 - Munishamappa claiming right over the property in question based on the registered Sale Deed dated 25.04.1966. In the backdrop of these aspects, title to the property has to be decided based on the Judgment and Decree of the Civil Court. In this regard, the petitioner - Company had filed O.S.No.1153/2025 seeking declaration that the petitioner - Company is the owner in possession of the schedule property inter alia, the sale deed dated 25.04.1966 made in favour of Munishamappa is not binding on the petitioner - Company and the said suit came to be rejected by the Trial Court by order dated 01.12.2025. The aforementioned order of the Trial Court was confirmed by the Division Bench of this Court in RFA No.2798/2025. The Judgment in RFA No.2798/2025 is confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

SLP(C)No.9673/2026 on 20.03.2026. It is pertinent to mention here that, by looking into the relief sought for by the petitioner - Company in O.S.No.1153/2025, the petitioner - Company has failed to establish right and title over the subject property and therefore, I am of the view that, the mutation entry made by the respondent No.2 - Tahsildar, Yelahanka in favour of Munishamappa (petitioner in W.P.No.8289/2025 and W.P.No.23111/2024) is just and proper which does not call for interference in these Writ Petitions.

15. In view of the above finding recorded by this Court in W.P.No.20296/2024, that the petitioner - Company has failed to establish its right in respect of the property in question, as such, in the light of the observations made above, I am of the view that the order of conversion made in favour of the petitioner - Company on 25.11.1998 (Annexure-A) in W.P.No.8289/2025 is required to be quashed.

16. It is also to be noted that, as the petitioner - Company has failed to establish its right over the property in question as per the observation made above and in view of the registered



CNR: KAHC010435222024

NC: 2026:KHC:42205
WP No. 20296 of 2024
C/W WP No. 23111 of 2024
WP No. 8289 of 2025

Sale Deed dated 25.04.1966, the order dated 21.02.2024 (Annexure-A) in W.P.No.23111/2024 is required to be quashed.

17. Accordingly, I pass the following:

ORDER

(i) W.P.No.20296/2024 is hereby dismissed.

(ii) W.P.No.23111/2024 is allowed and the impugned order therein, dated 21.02.2024 (Annexure-A) passed by the respondent No.2, is hereby quashed.

(iii) W.P.No.8289/2025 is allowed and the impugned order therein, dated dated 25.11.1998 (Annexure-A) passed by the respondent No.2, is hereby quashed.

(iv) Pending applications in these Writ Petitions, if any, do not survive for consideration.

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

sac

List No.: 1 Sl No.: 77