



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**  
**DATED THIS THE 24<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2026**  
**BEFORE**  
**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM**  
**WRIT PETITION NO. 24146 OF 2025 (GM-RES)**

**BETWEEN:**

1. SRI. B MUNISHAMAPPA  
S/O LATE CHIKKAMUNICHOWDAPPA,  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,  
RESIDING AT BISANAHALLI VILLAGE,  
JADE HOBLI, NADUVATHI,  
HOSKOTE TALUK,  
BENGALURU RURAL - 562 114.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MANJUNATHA G, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA  
REPRESENTED BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,  
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,  
VIDHANA SOUDHA,  
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE DEPUTY TAHSILDAR,  
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY TAHSILDAR,  
JADENAHALLI HOBLI NADAKACHERI,  
HOSKOTE TALUK,  
BENGALURU - 562 114.



3. THE ASSISTANT TAHSILDAR,  
OFFICE OF THE ASST. TAHSILDAR,  
JADENAHALLI HOBLI,  
HOSKOTE TALUK,  
BENGALURU - 562 114.
4. THE REVENUE INSPECTOR,  
JADENAHALLI HOBLI, HOSKOTE TALUK,  
BENGALURU - 562 114.
5. THE VILLAGE ACCOUNTANT,  
JADENAHALLI HOBLI, NADUVATHI,  
HOSKOTE TALUK,  
BENGALURU - 562 114.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ADITYA DIWAKAR, AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION DIRECTING RESPONDENT NO.2 (ASSISTANT TAHSILDAR) TO FORTHWITH ISSUE THE FAMILY TREE CERTIFICATE AS PER THE APPLICATION DATED 21.11.2023 AND BASED ON DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER AND ETC.,

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM

**ORAL ORDER**

The captioned writ petition is filed seeking a direction against respondent No.2 to issue a family tree certificate as per the application dated 21.11.2023.

2. Heard the learned counsel for petitioner and the learned AGA. Perused the grounds urged in the captioned petition.

3. On a pointed query by this Court as to the necessity for securing a family tree certificate, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner claims to have succeeded to certain immovable properties left behind by his deceased father and intends to alienate the same. It is further contended that the prospective purchaser is insisting upon production of a family tree certificate. Learned counsel would also fairly submit that in respect of certain ancestral properties, a Regular Second



Appeal is pending consideration before this Court and there exists an inter se dispute amongst the family members touching upon title and succession.

4. This Court, having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and on perusal of the material placed on record, is of the considered view that the relief sought is thoroughly misconceived. The very foundation for seeking issuance of a family tree certificate stands vitiated in the present case on hand, inasmuch as there is an admitted dispute amongst the legal heirs of late Munichowdappa, which has already culminated in civil litigation and is presently sub judice before this Court in a second appeal. In such circumstances, the question as to who are the rightful heirs and their respective entitlements cannot be summarily adjudicated or certified by the Revenue Authorities.

5. It is trite that issuance of a family tree certificate by the Revenue Officers is essentially



administrative in nature and is intended to facilitate undisputed cases of succession. The said mechanism cannot be invoked as a substitute for adjudication of contentious rights inter se between rival claimants. When parties are at loggerheads and their claims are the subject matter of adjudication before a competent Civil Court, any direction to the Revenue Authorities to issue a family tree certificate would not only be impermissible in law, but would also amount to permitting an executive authority to trench upon matters falling within the exclusive domain of Civil Courts.

6. In the present case, the petitioner is not even in a position to furnish complete particulars of all the legal heirs, including the siblings and children of late Munichowdappa. This Court finds that there is palpable ambiguity and suppression in the pleadings, which disentitles the petitioner from seeking any equitable relief under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Entertaining such a writ petition would lead to multiplicity of



proceedings and may potentially prejudice the rights of other contesting family members.

In that view of the matter, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has to necessarily work out his remedies before a competent Civil Court by seeking appropriate declaratory reliefs and consequential directions, where the rights of all parties can be comprehensively adjudicated on the basis of evidence.

7. For the foregoing reasons, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

**ORDER**

(i) The writ petition is dismissed.

(ii) It is held that issuance of a family tree certificate in the present case on hand is impermissible at the hands of the Revenue Authorities, in view of the subsisting inter se disputes between the family



members, which are already the subject matter of civil proceedings.

(iii) Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to work out his remedies before the competent Civil Court in accordance with law.

(iv) It is made clear that the observations made in this order are confined to the adjudication of the present writ petition and shall not influence the merits of the pending civil proceedings.

SD/-  
**(SACHIN SHANKAR MAGADUM)**  
**JUDGE**

ALB  
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 41