



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.35871 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. MALLAMMA
W/O CHIKKAMUNIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
R/AT GULYA NANDIGUNDA VILLAGE
TUBUGERE HOBLI
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT-561 203.
2. SRI. MUNIKRISHNAPPA
S/O DODDAKALAPPA
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
R/AT GULYA NANDIGUNDA VILLAGE
TUBUGERE HOBLI
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT-561 203.
3. SRI. SHIVANNA
S/O CHIKKA BUDDAPPA
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
R/AT GULYA NANDIGUNDA VILLAGE
TUBUGERE HOBLI
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT - 561 203.



4. SRI. BABU P.
S/O LATE PILLEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT GULYA NANDIGUNDA VILLAGE
TUBUGERE HOBLI
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT-561 203.

REPRESENTED BY GPA HOLDER
SRI.SAJJID ALI AGA
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
R/AT GULYA NANDIGUNDA VILLAGE
TUBUGERE HOBLI
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT-561 203.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. BIPIN HEGDE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560001.
2. THE TAHSILDAR,
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK,
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT - 561203.
3. THE JOINT DIRECTOR OF LAND RECORDS (JDLR),
BANGALORE DIVISION,
BENGALURU - 560001.



4. THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
LAND RECORDS (ADLR)
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK,
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT - 561203.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V.G. BHANUPRAKASH, AAG, A/W
SMT. B.P. RADHA, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 14.11.2025 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 IN CASE NO. REV/31/2025-26 VIDE ANNEXURE-A; QUASH THE SURVEY REPORT AND SKETCH DATED 20.02.2025 VIDE ANNEXURE-S; 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 E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

1. In this Writ Petition, petitioners are assailing the order dated 14.11.2025 in case No.REV/31/2025-26(Annexure-A), passed by respondent No.3, survey report and sketch dated 20.02.2025 (Annexure-S), inter alia, sought for a direction to



Tahsildar - respondent No.2, to issue RTC for new Sy.Nos.259, 260, 261 and 262 of Gulya Nandigunda Village, Tubugere Hobli, Doddaballapura Taluk, Bengaluru Rural District, in favour of the petitioners.

2. The relevant facts for adjudication of this Writ Petition are, that the petitioners claim to be owners of the land in question bearing Sy.No.30, situated at Gulya Nandigunda Village, Tubugere Hobli, Doddaballapura Taluk, Bengaluru Rural District, as per the resolution passed by the Bagair Hukum Committee on 30.12.2003 and further, the petitioners have produced saguvali chit issued to them. It is also stated in the Writ Petition that the khata was mutated in the name of the petitioners and RTC extracts reflect the name of the petitioners. It is further stated in the Writ Petition that the petitioners have made an application to Tahsildar and Survey Department authorities seeking phodi and durusti of the land granted to them and accordingly, the Tahsildar addressed letters dated 04.10.2024 (Annexures - E to E4) to respondent No.4. Respondent No.4 issued notices to the petitioners for conducting spot inspection for phodi on 18.10.2024 as per



Annexure-F. Thereafter, sketch was prepared identifying the petitioners' land and accordingly, new survey numbers were assigned as 259, 260, 261 and 262 of Gulya Nandigunda Village. The survey sketch, letter dated 19.12.2024 directing respondent No.4 for further action and letter dated 24.12.2024 addressed by respondent No.4 to respondent No.2, are produced by the petitioners herein as per Annexures- G, H and J to the Writ Petition, respectively. It is further stated in the Writ Petition that at the instance of the complaint lodged by one Sri. P. Venkatesh, claiming to be the State General Secretary of Bahujana Samaj Party, to the Hon'ble Minister, Department of Revenue, the respondent - authorities have initiated action against the petitioners. It is also forthcoming from the Writ Petition, that there is a dispute between the GPA Holder of 4th petitioner with the said complainant. However, the same has nothing to do with the Writ Petition facts are concerned.

3. In the meanwhile, letter dated 28.10.2025 was addressed by respondent No.3 to respondent No.2 as to submit a report with regard to grant of land to petitioners, as per Annexure-U.



The Tahsildar accordingly, submitted a report dated 11.11.2025 stating that the petitioners are in possession of the land in question in terms of the land already phoded in favour of the petitioners. In the meanwhile, suo-motu proceedings have been initiated against the petitioners by respondent No.3 under Section 56 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 and accordingly, respondent No.3, by the impugned order dated 14.11.2025 (Annexure-A), quashed the earlier phodi made in favour of the petitioners herein. Feeling aggrieved by the same, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

4. Heard Sri. Bipin Hegde, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Sri. V.G. Bhanuprakash, learned Additional Advocate General along with Smt. B.P. Radha, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondents.

5. It is argued by Sri. Bipin Hegde, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners by referring to earlier phodi made in favour of the petitioners herein who were the grantees of the land in question situated at Gulya Nandigunda Village and saguvali chit issued in favour of the petitioners herein,



submitted that phodi and durust has been made in respect of the land in question and same has been approved by the competent authority as per Annexures - G, H and J respectively. However, it is the principal submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that at the instance of one Sri. P. Venkatesh who claims to be the State General Secretary of Bahujana Samaj Party, who had dispute with the GPA Holder of the fourth petitioner herein, has addressed a letter to the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue to initiate action in respect of the land in question which has culminated in passing of the order at Annexure-A. It is argued by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that once an order has been passed by the competent authority, and thereafter, the very same authority cannot initiate proceedings under Section 56 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 and accordingly, sought for interference of this Court.

6. Per contra, Sri. V.G. Bhanuprakash, learned Additional Advocate General and Smt. B.P. Radha, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondents, supporting the impugned order, submitted that quashing of the



earlier durust was made in the impugned order as there were mistakes crept in so far as identifying the land in question is concerned including the measurement of phoded land and accordingly, sought for dismissal of the Writ Petition.

7. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, on consideration of the material on record would indicate that there is no dispute with regard to land granted in favour of the petitioners by the Government as per the saguvali chit produced at Annexure-B series and C Series. It is also forthcoming from the Writ Petition that the survey was conducted and sketch has been prepared by the competent authority - respondent No.4 and same has reached finality as the DDLR, by letter dated 19.12.2024 (Annexure-H), has approved the same. In the said backdrop of the case, I am of the view that, when the authority who has approved the sketch made in favour of the petitioners herein, cannot again become a petitioner/complainant to initiate action against the petitioners under Section 56 of the KLR Act. The respondent No.4 and the DDLR have approved the phodi and durust made in favour of



the petitioners as per Annexures - G, H and J and thereafter, the said authorities have become functus officio and they cannot initiate action against the petitioners under Section 56 of the KLR Act before the respondent No.3. It is also to be noted that the respondent authorities have to consider their earlier orders before initiating any action in consonance with their own orders at the instance of people like the complainant, which has to be deprecated.

8. It is also forthcoming from the report (Annexure-B) dated 11.11.2025 wherein, in furtherance of the directions issued by respondent No.3, the respondent No.2 has filed the report at Annexure-B which has reached finality based on the possession and earlier phodi and durust made in favour of the petitioners. In that view of the matter, the impugned order dated 14.11.2025 in case No.REV/31/2025-26(Annexure-A), passed by respondent No.3, and the survey report and sketch dated 20.02.2025(Annexure-S), are hereby quashed and the respondent No.4 is directed to issue new RTC extract in favour of the petitioners herein based on the new Sy.Nos.259, 260, 261 and 262 situated at Gulya Nandigunda Village, Tubugere



**NC: 2026:KHC:33024
WP No. 35871 of 2025**

Hobli, Doddaballapura Taluk, Bengaluru Rural District, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

9. With the above observations, the Writ Petition stands allowed.

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

sac
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 53