



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.34199 OF 2025 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. T.R. LAKSHMINARAYANA
S/O. LATE RAMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, RESIDING AT
DODDATHUMAKUR VILLAGE, MADHURE HOBLI,
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK, BENGALURU-577201.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. R. SUBRAMANYA, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. NARASIMHARAJU, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU-560 001.
2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
DODDABALLAPUR SUB-DIVISION
DODDABALLAPURA-561 203.
3. THE COMMITTEE FOR REGULARISATION
OF UNAUTHORISED OCCUPATION OF LANDS,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,



DODDABALLAPURA TALUK,
DODDABALLAPURA-561 203.

4. THE TAHSILDAR,
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK,
DODDABALLAPURA-561 203.

...RESPONDENTS

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

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ENDORSEMENT DATED 01-08-2025 VIDE FILE NO.TH-D-LNDSOLND2/3063/2024 ISSUED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT AS PER ANNEXURE-A; AND ETC.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

In this writ petition, the petitioner has assailed the Endorsement dated 01.08.2025 issued by the Respondent No.4 (Annexure-A) and has sought a direction to Respondent No.4 to issue a Saguvali Chit in the name of the petitioner in terms of the Resolution of the Committee dated 13.06.2011



(Annexure-C) and to effect mutation of the petitioner's name in the revenue records.

2. The relevant facts necessary for adjudication of the writ petition are that the petitioner's mother, late Mangamma, had submitted an application as an unauthorised cultivator seeking regularisation of land bearing Sy.No.62 of Doddatumkur Village, Doddaballapura Taluk, Bengaluru Rural District, measuring 1 acre 03 guntas. The said application came to be rejected by Respondent No.2 on 23.09.1994. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner's mother preferred an appeal before Respondent No.2. It is also stated that, the respondent No.3-Commiteee has considered the applications and rejected the same by order dated 29.07.1998 (Annexure-B), Respondent No.2 set aside the order of rejection and remitted the matter to Respondent No.4 for reconsideration and to



ascertain whether the petitioner's mother had been cultivating the land for a period of three years prior to 14.04.1990.

3. It is further stated in the writ petition that the reports of the Surveyor and the Tahsildar were considered by the Committee and, by resolution dated 13.06.2011 (Annexure-C), the Committee resolved to regularise the land in favour of the petitioner's mother. The petitioner has also produced the report of the Revenue Inspector (Annexure-D), which indicates that the petitioner's mother had been cultivating the land in question for more than 30 years.

4. In the meanwhile, the petitioner approached this Court in W.P. No.28745/2015 seeking a direction to the respondents to issue a Saguvali Chit. This Court, by order dated 04.01.2016 (Annexure-E), directed the respondents to consider the petitioner's



claim in accordance with law. Thereafter, Respondent No.4, by Endorsement dated 27.07.2016 (Annexure-F), rejected the petitioner's claim on the ground that the land in question was situated within 5 kilometres of the Doddaballapura City Municipal Council limits.

5. It is also forthcoming from the writ petition that the petitioner approached this Court on two further occasions seeking issuance of a Saguvali Chit. Ultimately, in W.P. No.2507/2022, this Court, by order dated 30.10.2024 (Annexure-H), quashed the Endorsement dated 27.07.2016 and remanded the matter to the respondent-authorities for fresh consideration.

6. Pursuant to the directions issued by this Court, Respondent No.4 issued the impugned Endorsement dated 01.08.2025 (Annexure-A) stating that the land claimed by the petitioner's mother falls



within 18 kilometres of the BBMP limits. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has presented this writ petition.

7. Heard Sri. Subramanya R., learned counsel appearing for Sri. Narasimharaju, for the petitioner and Smt. B.P. Radha, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondent-State.

8. Sri. Subramanya R., learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the original rejection of the petitioner's claim by the Committee dated 23.09.1994 was set aside by Respondent No.2 by order dated 29.07.1998, and the matter was remanded for reconsideration as to ascertain whether the petitioner's mother had been cultivating the land for three years prior to the relevant date. He further referred to the resolution at Annexure-C and submitted that the Committee, after considering the



Revenue Inspector's report and spot inspection, had recommended issuance of a Saguvali Chit.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner also drew the attention of the Court to the Revenue Inspector's report at Annexure-D, wherein it is stated that the petitioner's mother had been cultivating the land since 1970. He further submitted that the Endorsement dated 27.07.2016 (Annexure-F), which was subsequently quashed by this Court in W.P. No.2507/2022, could not form a basis for denying the petitioner's claim. According to him, once the competent authority had recommended for grant of the land, and as such there remained no impediment for Respondent No.4 to issue the Saguvali Chit in respect of the land in question.

10. It was further argued that, having regard to Section 94-A of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act,



1964, the land in question is situated beyond three kilometres from Doddaballapura as per the relevant notification applicable at the material point of time. Therefore, the observations made by the Respondent No.4 in the impugned endorsement are unsustainable.

11. Per contra, Smt. B.P. Radha, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondent-State sought to justify the impugned endorsement. She contended that although the original application had been made during 1980, the petitioner's mother had subsequently filed another application in Form No.53 during 1994 in respect of Sy.No.49 of Doddatumakuru Village. She invited the attention of the Court to Annexure-R1 and submitted that the said application had been rejected by the competent authority. Referring to Annexure-R1, she argued that the recommendation therein pertaining to



Sy.No.49 and therefore, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

12. Learned Additional Government Advocate further referred to Annexure-R3, which is an application dated 29.01.1999 filed by the petitioner's mother in respect of Sy.No.62 of Doddatumakuru Village in Form No.53. It was contended that the said application was rejected on 28.08.2003 (Annexure-R4) and the said rejection of application had attained finality. On that ground also, she sought for dismissal of the writ petition.

13. In light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, and upon careful consideration of the material on record, it is evident that the petitioner's claim relates to unauthorised cultivation of land bearing Sy.No.62 of Doddatumkur Village. The original claim was rejected



by the Committee on 23.09.1994. The said order was set aside by Respondent No.2 by order dated 29.07.1998, and the matter was remitted for fresh consideration to ascertain whether the petitioner's mother had been cultivating the land for three years prior to 14.04.1990.

14. It is also forthcoming from Annexure-C that the Bagar Hukum Committee, by Resolution dated 13.06.2011, recommended grant of the land to the petitioner's mother based on a spot inspection. Further, the Revenue Inspector's report dated 26.09.2005 (Annexure-D) records that the petitioner's mother had been in occupation of the land since 1970 and that she did not own any other land.

15. It is also pertinent to note that this Court, in W.P. No.2507/2022, quashed the endorsement dated 27.07.2016 passed by the respondent-authorities



rejecting the claim for regularisation of unauthorised occupation. The petitioner has also produced RTC extracts indicating that the petitioner's mother had been cultivating the land in question.

16. The records further disclose that the respondent-authorities have granted land to other grantees in the very same survey number. If such grants have been made to similarly situated persons/ grantees as reflected in the RTC extracts produced at Annexure-M series, the respondent-authorities could not have discriminated against the claim made by the petitioner's mother. If the reasoning contained in the impugned Endorsement is accepted in the petitioner's case, the same standard ought to have been applied uniformly to all grantees in the very same survey number.



17. It is also relevant to note that under Section 94-A of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, Doddaballapura was a Town Municipal Council, and it is not in dispute that the land in question was situated beyond three kilometres from the town limits as per the position prevailing prior to 17.03.2018.

18. Though the learned Additional Government Advocate attempted to contend that the petitioner's earlier application had been rejected, the same yardstick ought to have been applied to all similarly situated persons whose names appear in Annexure-M series.

19. It is also forthcoming from the order sheet dated 07.01.2026 that this Court had directed Respondent No.4 to issue a Saguvali Chit to the petitioner. However, no action has been taken by Respondent No.4 in compliance with the said interim



order, which shows the callousness of the respondent NO.4 to comply with the order passed by this Court, and such act of the respondent No.4 has to be deprecated.

20. In that view of the matter, I find considerable force in the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Accordingly, the impugned endorsement cannot be sustained. Hence, the following:

ORDER

(i) The writ petition is ***allowed***.

(ii) The Endorsement dated 01.08.2025 (Annexure-A) issued by Respondent No.4 is hereby quashed.

(iii) A writ of mandamus is issued directing Respondent No.4 to issue a Saguvali Chit in favour of the petitioner, being the legal heir of late Mangamma



(the original applicant), in respect of land bearing Sy.No.62 measuring 1 acre, 03 guntas situated at Doddatumkur Village, Doddaballapura Taluk, in terms of the Resolution dated 13.06.2011 (Annexure-C), within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(iv) Upon issuance of the Saguvali Chit, the respondent-authorities shall effect mutation of the revenue records in favour of the petitioner in accordance with law.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

SB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 80