



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.27581 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. HANUMANTHAIAH
S/O LENKAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
R/AT RAGHUNATHAPURA VILLAGE,
THIPPASANDRA HOBLI,
MAGADI TALUK,
RAMNAGARA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MALLANNA, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. ANDANAPPA GURAPPA BALLOLLI,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR BEEDHI,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
DISTRICT OFFICE COMPLEX,
BENGALURU SOUTH DISTRICT,
RAMANAGAR - 562 159.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
RAMANAGAR SUB-DIVISION,
RAMANAGAR,
BENGALURU SOUTH DISTRICT - 562 159.

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



4. THE THASILDAR
MAGADI TALUK,
MAGADI,
BENGALURU SOUTH DISTRICT - 562 120.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. B.P. RADHA, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO SET-ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 11TH AUGUST, 2025 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3-ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER IN CASE NO.LNDRUC/14/2024 VIDE ANNEXURE-A IN RESPECT OF LAND BEARING SURVEY NO.106, MEASURING 20 GUNTAS SITUATED AT MACHOHALLI VILLAGE, THIPPASANDRA HOBLI, MAGADI TALUK; AND ETC.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

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

ORAL ORDER

In this petition, the petitioner is challenging the order dated 11th August, 2025 (Annexure-A) passed by the respondent No.3-Assistant Commissioner in Case No.LNDRUC/14/2024.

2. Heard Sri. Mallanna, learned counsel on behalf of Sri. Andanappa Gurappa Ballolli, appearing for the petitioner and Smt. B.P. Radha, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondents.



3. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on perusal of the averments made in the writ petition, it is not in dispute that the impugned order is passed under Section 136(2) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act. In that view of the matter, the petitioner is having an efficacious remedy under Section 136(3) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act to challenge the impugned order. Therefore, reserving liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent authority under Section 136(3) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, writ petition is ***disposed of.***

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

ARK
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 12