



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 5TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 38517 OF 2025 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

SMT. MUDDAGANGAMMA
W/O LATE RANGADASAPPA
AGED ABOUT 81 YEARS
RESIDENT AMALAGUNDI,
SEEBI AGRAHARA POST,
KALLAMBELLA HOBLI,
SIRA TALUK, TUMKUR - 572 125.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. R. SUBRAMANYA, SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI. DEVARAJA M.S, ADVOCATE)

AND:

Digitally signed
by
SHARADAVANI
B
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
M.S. BUILDING, BENGALURU - 560 001.

2. TAHASILDAR
SIRA TALUK
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 137.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. NAVYA SHEKHAR, AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) QUASHING THE



ENDORSEMENT ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 DATED 28.11.2025 BEARING NO. RRTCR/E-2128819 PRODUCED AS ANNEXURE -P 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

On 29.01.2026, this Court has passed the following Order:

"Learned AGA takes notice for both the respondents.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner is directed to serve copies of the writ petition along with Annexures on the learned AGA.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the application given by the petitioner to mutate her name in the revenue records pursuant to the death of her husband- Sri.Rangadasappa, who is the khatedar even in terms of the latest RTC at Annexure-M, has been rejected by the 2nd respondent-Tahsildar, Sira Taluk, by issuing the impugned endorsement at Annexure-P.

Learned Counsel submits that the Tahsildar is now saying that since there are no original Grant Records, the name of the petitioner cannot be entered



in the revenue records. Such a reasoning furnished by the 2nd respondent-Tahsildar, is atrocious. It is impermissible in law for the Tahsildar to have raised such a contention when admittedly the name of the petitioner's husband continues even in the latest RTC, at Annexure-M.

On the other hand, if any action was taken in accordance with law to remove the name of the petitioner's husband from the revenue records, there would have been some reason for the respondent-Tahsildar to say so and no action having been taken to remove the name of the petitioner's husband from the revenue records, issuance of the impugned endorsement will be contrary to law.

The 2nd respondent-Tahsildar, Sira Taluk, shall appear before this Court and have his say in this matter, on the next date of hearing.

Re-list this matter on 05.02.2026, for Preliminary Hearing."

2. Today, the Tahsildar of Sira Taluk, Mr. Anand Kumar, is present before the Court. The Tahsildar submits that in view of the Government Order bearing No.ComE156/SSM/2024, Bengaluru, dated 25.11.2024. The petitioner is required to furnish the original documents of the grant, without which the mutation entry cannot be made.



3. Having gone through the Government Order, this Court finds that the Government Order has no application to the present facts and circumstances of the case. The said Government Order is applicable in cases where an application is filed for phodi and durast of granted lands and in fact, for simplification of the proceedings. In that regard, the government order has been issued. This is a case where the petitioner's husband is the khatedar in terms of Annexure-M RTC for the year 2025-26. The RTC reflects the name of the petitioner's husband, Rangadasappa S/o Chikkarangappa in column No.9 to an extent of 10 acres in Survey No.26 of Kalenahalli Village, Kallambela Hobli, Sira Taluk, Tumkur District. The petitioner's husband, Sri Rangadasappa, died on 10.03.2004 and the petitioner has given an application to the respondent No. 2-Tahsildar, as found at Annexure-L dated 12.03.2024 seeking a mutation entry on the basis of succession. Therefore, this is not a case where the Tahsildar is required to call for information regarding the grant. The Government Order dated 25.11.2024 is not applicable to the facts and circumstances of this case. It is therefore evident that respondent No.2 is not doing his duty in accordance with law.



The reason behind the Tahsildar harassing the petitioner widow is also not too far to fetch, corruption has become rampant in the Revenue Department.

4. Similar grievances have been brought to the notice of this Court that the Tahsildars are insisting the applicants to furnish a copy of the Grant order while pointing out to Government Order dated 25.11.2024. The Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, is required to issue a clarification to the Government Order dated 25.11.2024. Such documents may be called for only in cases where the phodi has never been conducted. If phodi of the larger extent of land has already been made and sub-numbers are assigned to Hiduvalidars and if for some reason, phodi is required to be done again consequent to further sub-divisions, the authorities cannot call for the original grant orders and such other documents.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is **disposed of** with a direction to respondent No.2-Tahsildar, Sira Taluk, to proceed to enter the name of the legal heirs of the late Sri Rangadasappa in the revenue records within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



Direction is also given to respondent No.1-State of Karnataka, represented by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, to take action against respondent No.2-Tahsildar, Sira Taluk, for dereliction of duty. A report of action taken against respondent No.2 shall be furnished to this Court within a period of two months from today.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

rv
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 19