



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 18TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 36462 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT.K.BHUVANESHWARI
AGED ABOUT 78 YEARS,
W/O. LATE T.SUNDARAVELU
D/O. LATE RUKMINIYAMMA
R/AT NO.506, 1ST CROSS,
GIRIDARSHINI LAYOUT,
ALANAHALLI, MYSORE-570 028.
2. SRI.PURUSHOTHAMA K.
AGED ABOUT 74 YEARS,
S/O. LATE KRISHNA CHAR D. AND
LATE RUKMINIYAMMA
R/AT 13/B, 12TH MAIN ROAD,
RAGHAVENDRA NAGARA,
MYSORE-570 011
3. SMT.M.UMA
W/O LATE LAKSHMIPATHI
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS
NO.MIG -3, 1ST CROSS
5TH MAIN OPP.TO AKSHAYA BANDARA
KALYANAGIRI,
MYSORE 570 019.

Digitally signed
by

SHARADAVANI
B

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



4. SMT. VASANTHI
D/O BHUVANESHWARI
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
R/AT ALLANAHALLI LAYOUT,
MYSORE 570 028.

...PETITIONERS

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

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
M.S BUILDING DR. B.R AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BENGALURU-560 001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
MYSURU DISTRICT- 570 005.
3. THE TAHSILDAR
MYSURU TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT- 570 005.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.SHAMANTH NAIK, HCGP)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE ORDER
DTD 25.02.2025 BEARING NO.MYSDC-RRT/RRT/652/2021(E-
144775) PASSED BY THE R2 VIDE ANNEX-S AND ETC.

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

The grievance of the petitioners is directed against the impugned order at Annexure-S dated 25.02.2025 passed by the respondent - Deputy Commissioner, Mysuru District.

2. In short, the petitioners herein who claim to be the legal heirs of late Sri.Siddachari and his wife Smt.Dhanakotiyamma are aggrieved of the action of the respondent authorities in not accepting the arrears of land revenue and removing the forfeiture clause pada from the RTC, having regard to the law laid down by this Court. In the *interregnum* the Deputy Commissioner points out to certain previous documents only to state that in the Kardha, the name of one Thimma, S/o Mangichanna is also reflected along with the name of Sri.Siddachari. Learned counsel submits that when there is no dispute regarding the fact that the mutation entries are subsequently carried out in the name of Sri.Siddachari the Deputy Commissioner was required to collect the arrears of land revenue and enter the name of the legal



heirs of late Sri.Siddachari in the RTC, while removing the forfeiture clause pada.

3. This Court, in the case of ***Shivanna Vs. Deputy Commissioner*** in ***W.P.No.19639/2021*** dated ***05.09.2022*** has held that having regard to Section 163 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, and Rule 119 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Rules, 1966, that in normal circumstances where there are arrears of land revenue, it is not the intention of the Government to forfeit agricultural lands. The provisions are clearly directed towards the other cases where charges are created by orders passed by Courts of law and other competent authorities where the parties are in default for payment and the Courts and authorities deem it fit to direct recovery of such debts to be collected as arrears of land revenue. In all other cases, in terms of the amended provision, which came into effect from 01.04.1988, the Government has granted relaxation and enabled the revenue authorities to accept the application for cancellation of forfeiture even in cases where the land was sold and purchased on account of the Government dues, but which were not disposed of otherwise.



4. It is also an undisputed fact that the lands in question were notified for acquisition for the benefit of the Mysuru Urban Development Authority with a preliminary notification No.LAQ(4).CR.31/2005-06 dated 13.12.2006 and the same was challenged by the petitioners mother Smt.Rukminiyamma, D/o. late Siddachari in W.P.No.33140 to 33144/2016 and this Court by order dated 25.10.2016 quashed the preliminary notification following the earlier decisions rendered in W.P.No.10917-10923/2014 and connected matters. This Court also further clarified in the order dated 09.11.2016 that quashment of the preliminary notification enures to the benefit of the writ petitioner Smt.Rukminiyamma. That being the position, and there being no further claim by any of the persons claiming under Sri.Thimma, S/o Mangichanna or any other person, there was no need for the Deputy Commissioner to have rejected the application on that ground.

5. Consequently, the writ petition is ***disposed of*** with a direction to the respondent-Tahsildar, Mysuru Taluk, to inform the petitioners of the arrears of land revenue within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this



order. If the petitioners are called upon to pay the arrears of land revenue, they shall pay the same and after payment of the arrears of land revenue, the forfeiture clause shall be removed and the name petitioners mother Smt.Rukminiyamma, D/o. late Siddachari, shall be entered in the revenue records. Thereafter, the Tahsildar shall find out as to who are the legal heirs of Smt.Rukminiyamma, and proceed to enter their names in respect of the land measuring 12 guntas in Sy.No.101 situated at Lalitadri Pura Village, Varuna Hobli, Mysuru Taluk and District, in column No.9 of the RTC within a period of two months from the date of payment of the arrears of land revenue, if any in accordance with law. Consequential endorsement at Annexure-T issued by the Tahsildar, Mysuru Taluk is also quashed and set aside.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE