



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.27360 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI DODDEGOWDA
S/O LATE PUTTEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
RESIDING AT CHIKKABICHANAHALLI VILLAGE,
BILIKERI HOBLI,
HUNSUR TALUK,
MYSORE DISTRICT - 571 105.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. GIRISH KUMAR B.M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
MYSORE DISTRICT,
MYSURU - 570 001.
2. ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
HUNSUR SUB DIVISION,
HUNSUR - 570 015.
3. TAHSILDAR
H D KOTE 571 114.
4. VILLAGE ACCOUNTANT
G-B SARAGURU AND
HAMPAPURA HOBLI - 571125.

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



5. SMT. MARAMMA
W/O LATE DEVEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 79 YEARS
6. SMT. MAHADEVI
W/O SWAMYGOWDA
D/O LATE DEVEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 59 YEARS
7. SMT. CHIKKATHAYAMMA
W/O REVANNA
D/O LATE DEVEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS.
8. SRI. KOMARIEGOWDA
S/O LATE DEVEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
9. SMT. MANGALA
D/O LATE DEVEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
10. SMT. YASHODHA
D/O LATE DEVEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS.

R5 TO R10 ARE
R/AT CHIKKABICHANAHALLI VILLAGE,
BILIKERI HOBLI,
HUNSUR TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 105 .

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1 TO R4;
SRI. K.M. JAGANATH, ADVOCATE FOR R5 TO R10)



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 08.11.2005 IN REVISION NO.76/2003-04 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 VIDE ANNEXURE - D.

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

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties.

2. In this writ petition, the petitioner has called in question the order dated 08.11.2005 passed by respondent No.1 in R.P. No.76/2003-04, produced at Annexure-D.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that he is the owner of land bearing Sy.No.146/3 measuring 8 acres 35 guntas situated at Halladamanuganahalli Village, Hampapura Hobli, H.D. Kote Taluk, which is stated to be his ancestral property. It is contended that one late



Devegowda had allegedly managed to secure revenue entries in respect of the entire extent of the said land. It is further averred that respondent Nos.5 to 10 had preferred R.P. No.76/2003-04 before respondent No.1 challenging the order dated 27.08.2003 passed by respondent No.2, and respondent No.1, by order dated 08.11.2005, allowed the revision petition and set aside the order passed by respondent No.2.

4. Sri. Girish Kumar B.M., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, contended that respondent No.1 has committed an error in not properly appreciating the material available on record. He submitted that M.R. No.82/2001 clearly reflected a partition in the petitioner's family and the consequent entitlement of the petitioner over the subject property. It is further contended that respondent No.1 has failed to consider the issue of limitation and delay



in preferring the revision petition. On these grounds, he seeks interference of this Court.

5. Per contra, Sri K.M. Jaganath, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.5 to 10, submitted that the present writ petition has been filed nearly twenty years after the impugned order dated 08.11.2005 and is therefore liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches. He further submitted that the petitioner has already suffered an adverse judgment and decree in O.S. No.40/2006, which has been confirmed in R.A. No.33/2012 by the First Appellate Court. Accordingly, he contended that the impugned order passed by respondent No.1 does not call for any interference.

6. Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N, learned High Court Government Pleader also submitted that the writ



petition suffers from delay and laches and is liable to be dismissed on that ground alone.

7. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and upon perusal of the material on record, it is evident that the impugned order passed by respondent No.1 is dated 08.11.2005. The present writ petition has been filed after an inordinate delay of nearly twenty years. The petitioner has not placed any satisfactory explanation for approaching this Court after such a prolonged period. Accordingly, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches.

8. That apart, a perusal of the impugned order would indicate that respondent Nos.5 to 10 are claiming rights over the property on the basis of a registered Sale Deed dated 05.08.1959. It is also not



in dispute that the petitioner has suffered adverse judgments before the competent Civil Court in O.S. No.40/2006 and in R.A. No.33/2012. In view of the concurrent findings recorded by the Civil Courts and having regard to the inordinate delay in filing the present writ petition, I do not find any infirmity or illegality in the impugned order dated 08.11.2005 passed by respondent No.1 calling for interference under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

9. However, it is submitted at the Bar that the petitioner has preferred R.S.A. No.1386/2015, which is stated to be pending consideration before this Court. Therefore, it is made clear that, in the event the petitioner succeeds in the aforesaid Regular Second Appeal, it is open to him to approach the



competent revenue authorities seeking appropriate mutation entries or consequential reliefs in accordance with law and subject to the outcome of the said proceedings.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

SB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 3