



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.24005 OF 2024 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. K. GURURAJ
S/O LATE Y.V. KRISHNAPPA
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
R/AT NO.494, 2ND CROSS
YESHWANTHPURA MODEL COLONY
BENGALURU - 560022.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. JAYKUMAR S. PATIL, SENIOR COUNSEL A/W
SRI. AMBAJI RAO NAJRE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
MS BUILDING
BENGALURU - 560001.
2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BENGALURU DISTRICT - 560009.
3. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE DISTRICT
BENGALURU - 560009.

Digitally signed by
CHAYAS A
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



4. SMT. KAMALAMMA
W/O LATE H.S. MUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS
R/AT UTHANAHALI VILLGE
JALAH HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTHTLAUK 562157
PRESENTLY R/AT
NO.39/47, 2ND MAIN ROAD
8TH CROSS, GANGANAGAR
BENGALURU - 560032.

5. SMT. H.M. DHANALAKSHMI
D/O LATE H.S. MUNIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT UTHANAHALI VILLGE
JALAH HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTHTLAUK - 562157.

PRESENTLY R/AT
NO.39/47, 2ND MAIN ROAD
8TH CROSS, GANGANAGAR
BENGALURU - 560032.

6. SURESH KUMAR MAHOJI PATEL
S/O LATE MAHOJI MURJI PATEL
AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS
RA/T SONNAPPANAHALLI VILLAGE
BETTHALASURU CROSS
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BENGALURU - 562157.

7. SHIVAJI MAHOJI PATEL
S/O LATE MAHOJI MURJI PATEL
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
RA/T SONNAPPANAHALLI VILLAGE



BETTHALASURU CROSS
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BENGALURU - 562157.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. B.P. RADHA, AGA FOR R1 TO R3;
SRI. R. BHADRINATH, ADVOCATE FOR R4 AND R5;
SRI. N. VASUDEVA REDDY, ADVOCATE FOR R6 AND R7)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO
QUASH THE IMPUGNED COMMON ORDER DATED 23.07.2024
PASSED BY RESPONDENT NO.3 IN R.P.NO.123/2021 C/W
R.P.NO.184/2021 VIDE ANNEXURE-M.

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, petitioner is assailing the order dated
23.07.2024 in R.P.No.123/2021 c/w R.P.No.184/2021
(Annexure-M) passed by respondent No.3.

2. Heard Sri. Jayakumar S. Patil, learned Senior Counsel on
behalf of Sri. Ambaji Rao Najre, learned counsel for the



petitioner, Sri. R. Bhadrinath, learned counsel for respondent Nos.4 and 5 and Sri. N. Vasudeva Reddy, learned counsel for respondent Nos.6 and 7.

3. Sri. Jayakumar S. Patil, learned Senior Counsel invited the attention of the Court to the registered Sale Deed dated 16.05.1988 (Annexure-E) and submitted that father of the petitioner had purchased the land from respondent Nos.4 and 5 and thereafter the revenue records stand in the name of the father of the petitioner and further argued that subsequently the vendors of the petitioner i.e. respondent Nos.4 and 5 sold the schedule property in favour of respondent Nos.6 and 7 as per the registered Sale Deed dated 19.12.2003 and therefore, learned Senior Counsel submitted that respondent No.2 has rightly made an order in favour of the petitioner for entry of name of the petitioner in the revenue records. However, respondent No.3 on erroneous assumption of law has interfered with the same and therefore, sought for interference of this Court.

4. Per contra, Sri. R. Bhadrinath, learned counsel for respondent Nos.4 and 5 invited the attention of the Court to



the compromise decree in O.S.No.352/1981 on the file of Munisiff and JMFC, Devanahalli (Annexure-R5), and further contended that, father of the petitioner herein has received money from respondent Nos.4 and 5 and thereafter sale was made in favour of respondent Nos.6 and 7 as per the registered Sale Deed dated 19.12.2003 and therefore, sought for dismissal of the Writ Petition.

5. Sri. N. Vasudeva Reddy, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.6 and 7, submitted that, entry has to be made as per the registered Sale Deed and therefore, sought for dismissal of the Writ Petition.

6. Smt. B.P. Radha, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 3, sought to justify the impugned order at Annexure-A.

7. In the light of the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for the parties, on careful consideration of the writ papers would indicate that the land in question has been sold by respondent Nos.4 and 5 in favour of petitioner as per the registered Sale Deed dated 16.05.1988. However, perusal of



the same would indicate that there is a compromise decree between the parties as mentioned above.

8. It is also forthcoming from the Writ Petition that as per the registered Sale Deed dated 19.12.2003, respondent Nos.4 and 5 have sold the land in favour of respondent Nos.6 and 7. In that view of the matter, as there is a registered instrument made and pursuant to the same, the entry has been made in M.R.No.1/1988-89 and M.R.No.34/2003-04, I am of the view that, the said entry is made in accordance with law and therefore, I do not find any merit in the Writ Petition. However, it is open for the petitioner to establish right over the property in question, in a manner known to law.

9. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

sac
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 10