



CNR: KAHC010822352011

NC: 2026:KHC:44982
WP No. 44388 of 2011

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 20TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.44388 OF 2011 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

1. RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS
S/O VENKATAMMA
R/O AEROHALLI VILLAGE,
YESWANTHPURA HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SANGAMESH R.B., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
M S BUILDINGS,
VIDHANA VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.
2. THE SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
BENGALURU.

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



CNR: KAHC010822352011

3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE NORTH SUB DIVISION
BENGALURU.
4. THE SPECIAL TAHSILDAR
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK
BENGALURU.
5. THE REVENUE INSPECTOR
YESWANTHPURA HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK.
6. R. DAYANANDA
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
S/O LATE M. RAMALINGAIAH
R/AT 1885, 5TH MAIN ROAD,
RPC LAYOUT, 2ND STAGE,
VIJAYANAGAR,
BENGALURU – 560040.
7. NARAYANASWAMY
SINCE DECEASED REPRESENTED BY
HIS LRS.
- 7(a). JAYALAKSHMI
W/O NARAYANASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS.
- 7(b). MANJUNATH
S/O NARAYANASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
- 7(c). SHOBHA
D/O NARAYANASWAMY



CNR: KAHC010822352011

NC: 2026:KHC:44982
WP No. 44388 of 2011

AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS

R7(a) TO 7(c) ARE R/AT
NO.1885, 5TH MAIN ROAD,
RPC LAYOUT, 2ND STAGE,
VIJAYANAGAR,
BENGALURU – 560040.

8. LOKANATH
S/O C RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
R/AT 413, 6TH BLOCK RAJAJINAGAR,
BENGALURU – 560010.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SPOORTHY HEGDE N., HCGP FOR R1-R5;
SRI. H.S. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R6, R7(a TO c);
SRI. V.B. SHIVAKUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R8)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO SET
ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 16.03.2011 PASSED BY THE 2ND
RESPONDENT IN REVISION/REVIEW PETITION 175/2008-09 AS
CONTAINED UNDER ANNEXURE A.

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

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



CNR: KAHC010822352011

NC: 2026:KHC:44982
WP No. 44388 of 2011

ORAL ORDER

In this writ petition, the petitioner is assailing the order dated 16.03.2011, produced as Annexure-A, passed by respondent No. 2-Spl. Deputy Commissioner.

2. Heard Sri. Sangamesh R.B., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner; Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N., learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for the respondent-State; Sri. H.S. Chandrashekar, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 6 and 7(A to C) and Sri. V.B. Shiva Kumar, learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 8.

3. Sri. Sangamesh R.B., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, contended that the impugned order suffers from infirmity, as respondent No. 2 had no jurisdiction to pass the said order under Section 136(3) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act,



CNR: KAHC010822352011

1964 and, accordingly, sought interference by this Court.

4. Per contra, Sri. H.S. Chandrashekar, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 6 and 7 submitted that respondent No.2 had jurisdiction under Section 25 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, and accordingly, he sought dismissal of the writ petition.

5. In the light of the arguments advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and upon careful consideration of the impugned order dated 16.03.2011, it is evident that respondent No. 2 has reconsidered the earlier order passed by him on 03.09.2009.

6. In this regard, it is a well-established principle of law that respondent No. 2, being a quasi-



CNR: KAHC010822352011

NC: 2026:KHC:44982
WP No. 44388 of 2011

judicial authority, has no power or authority to review its own order, in the absence of any statutory provision conferring such power.

7. Following the declaration of law made by this Court in the case of ***N. Chandra Reddy v. The State of Karnataka and Others*** reported in ***ILR 2016 KAR 3275***, wherein it has been held that there is no provision under the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, or the Rules framed thereunder conferring power on the authority to review an order passed by it, and therefore, I find force in the arguments advanced by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***allowed***. The order dated 16.03.2011, produced as Annexure-A, passed by respondent No. 2-Spl. Deputy Commissioner, is hereby set aside.



**NC: 2026:KHC:44982
WP No. 44388 of 2011**

CNR: KAHC010822352011

9. It is open to the parties to establish their respective rights in respect of the property in question before the competent Civil Court.

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

SB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 1