



CNR: KAHC010838742025

NC: 2026:KHC:47848-DB
CCC No. 1655 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 2ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 1655 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRI P.N.VISHWANATHA REDDY,
S/O LATE SRI.P.NATARAJ ,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
R.AT NO.181, RV ROAD,
V.V.PURAM,
BENGALURU- 560 004.

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI.G.B.NANDISH GOWDA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S.BUILDING,
DR.B.R.AMEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001.

...PROFORMA RESPONDENT

2. SHASHIDHAR MADIYAL,
FATHER NAME NOT KNOWN
TO THE COMPLAINANT,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
THE TAHSILDAR,
ANEKAL TALUK,
ANEKAL-562 106.

...ACCUSED

(BY SMT.B.SUKANYA BALIGA, AGA FOR
PROFORMA RESPONDENT NO.1 AND ACCUSED NO.2)

Digitally
signed by K S
RENUKAMBA
Location:
High Court of
Karnataka



**NC: 2026:KHC:47848-DB
CCC No. 1655 of 2025**

CNR: KAHC010838742025

THIS CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURT ACT, 1971 BY THE COMPLAINANT, PRAYING THAT THE HON'BLE COURT BE PLEASED TO INITIATE CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ACCUSED AND PUNISH HIM WITH ACCORDANCE WITH LAW FOR HAVING DISOBEYED THE ORDER OF THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 26.09.2025 PASSED IN W.P.NO.27970/2025 (KLR-RES).

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI
AND
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.M.NADAF

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI)

Heard the counsel for the complainant and the learned AGA appearing for the accused.

2. The allegation is made in this contempt petition that the order of this Court dated 26.09.2025 passed in Writ Petition No.27970/2025 (KLR-RES) has been disobeyed. The order dated 26.09.2025 reads as follows:-

"ORAL ORDER

Learned High Court Government Pleader takes notice for all the respondents.

2. The prayer in the writ petition is to issue a writ of mandamus directing the 3rd respondent - Deputy Tahsildar, Anekal Taluk to consider the representations at Annexures-H and L and to



CNR: KAHC010838742025

furnish information as to whether the Index of Land and Records of Rights (IL and RR) of the year 1987, produced by the opposite party in OS.No.1393/2006 is genuine or not.

3. Learned High Court Government Pleader submits that the Tahsildar cannot give such declaration as to whether the IL and RR produced by the other side before the Civil Court is genuine or not. Learned HCGP submits that if the petitioner is aggrieved of any such entry in IL and RR, he has to question the same in a manner known to law and cannot seek a declaration at the hands of the Tahsildar.

4. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent No.2 -Tahsildar may be directed to furnish a copy of the said order in the Index of Land and Records of Rights of the year 1987, to enable the petitioner to raise a challenge to the same in a manner known to law.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of, reserving liberty to the petitioner to file an application before respondent No.2 - Tahsildar, Anekal Taluk, seeking such information and if such application is filed, the Tahsildar shall forthwith furnish such information to the petitioner to enable the petitioner to raise a challenge to such orders.

Ordered accordingly."



**NC: 2026:KHC:47848-DB
CCC No. 1655 of 2025**

CNR: KAHC010838742025

3. The contention of learned counsel for the complainant is that earlier an endorsement dated 04.04.2026 was filed along with an affidavit dated on 15.04.2026 stating that the documents submitted by the applicant did not match the original documents in the Archive's Branch and *prima facie* it had been found that the documents submitted by the applicant were fabricated documents according to the submitted report. Therefore it was informed to the applicant that the record of rights and index of land documents attached to his appeal are *prima facie* fabricated documents.

4. Today, an affidavit has been filed by the Learned AGA, in which the deponent is Mr. Shashidhar Jagadeesh Madiyal, presently serving as Tahsildar, Anekal Taluk; that subsequent to the issuance of the endorsement dated 21.08.2026, the office of the Tahsildar, Anekal, has also communicated the said endorsement to the complainant by way of registered post on 21.08.2026. Annexure-R2 is the endorsement dated 21.08.2026, in which it is informed that the requested Index of Land and Record of Rights documents for the year 1987 pertaining to Survey No.161/1 of Kommasandra Village,



CNR: KAHC010838742025

NC: 2026:KHC:47848-DB
CCC No. 1655 of 2025

Sarjapura Hobli, Anekal Taluk, are not available in the Archive's Branch of that office.

5. It is the submission of learned counsel for the Complainant that two contradictory stands are taken by the accused in the two affidavits filed by him. Therefore, the accused needs to be proceeded against for contempt of court. As is evident from perusal of Paragraphs-4 and 5 of the judgment of the learned Single Judge, the submission made by the counsel for the petitioner was that the Tahsildar be directed to furnish a copy of the order, in the Index of Land and Record of Rights of the year 1987 to enable the petitioner to raise a challenge to the same in a manner known to law. The petition was disposed of reserving liberty to the petitioner to file an application before the Tahsildar, Anekal Taluk, seeking such information, and if such information is filed, the Tahsildar was required to furnish such information to the petitioner to enable him to raise a challenge to such orders.

6. A perusal of the representation moved by the petitioner, the translated copy of which is at page 24 of the said Writ Petition reflects that contrary to the liberty granted by



CNR: KAHC010838742025

NC: 2026:KHC:47848-DB
CCC No. 1655 of 2025

this Court, the application was made to the Tahsildar enclosing the Index of Land and Record of Rights of Survey No. 161/1 of Kommsandra Village, Sarjapura Hobli, Anekal Taluk, requesting him to verify the said documents and to issue information by certifying the signature appearing in those documents, whether the signature of Deputy Tahsildar, who worked during that time and the seal of Deputy Tahsildar, Anekal (*sic*) appeared in those documents. Therefore, no such application as permitted by the Court was filed by the complainant. Be that as it may, the endorsement dated 21.08.2026, which is enclosed to the affidavit filed today by the Learned AGA is in compliance of the order of the Writ Court. No contempt is made out. The contempt case is consigned.

**Sd/-
(JAYANT BANERJI)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(T.M.NADAF)
JUDGE**

KGR
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 16