



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 19<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 39465 OF 2025 (KLR-RR/SUR)**

**BETWEEN:**

SRI. K P PATALAPPA  
S/O LATE PILLA ANJANAPPA,  
AGED ABOUT 74 YEARS,  
R/AT KALKERE VILLAGE,  
HORAMAVU POST, K.R.PURAM HOBLI,  
BENGALURU EAST TALUK-560016.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. JAYALAKSHMAMMA K.B., ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

Digitally signed  
by JUANITA  
THEJESWINI  
Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA  
REP. BY ITS REVENUE SECRETARY,  
VIDHANA SOUDHA,  
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR ROAD,  
BENGALURU- 560001.
2. THE SPECIAL TAHSILDAR,  
BENGALURU EAST TALUK,  
K.R. PURAM, TALUK OFFICE-560067.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT.NAVYA SHEKHAR., AGA)



THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ENDORSEMENT DATED 04.03.2025 VIDE RRTCR/476/2024-25 ISSUED BY THE 2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ISSUE DIRECTION TO THE RESPONDENTS TO RESTORE THE NAME OF THE PETITIONER BY DELETING THE NAME OF GOVERNMENT FROM COLUMN NO. 9 AND 12 OF THE R.T.C IN RESPECT OF SCHEDULE LANDS AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

**ORAL ORDER**

Learned Additional Government Advocate takes notice for both the respondents.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that on the previous occasion the petitioner was before this Court in W.P.No.21514/2022 seeking a direction to the respondent-Tahsildar to consider the representation given by the petitioner to enter his name in the revenue records. This Court by order dated 05.12.2023 disposed of the writ petition while directing the Tahsildar to consider the



representation and pass necessary orders within an outer limit of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. However, the Tahsildar has issued the impugned endorsement dated 04.03.2025 at Annexure-A stating that although it is true that such directions were issued by this Court and a decree of permanent injunction has been passed by the Civil Court in O.S.No.26556/2010 restraining the State and the Revenue Authorities from interfering with the peaceful possession of the suit schedule property, nevertheless, as per the instructions of the Deputy Commissioner, an appeal has been directed to be preferred in respect of the said judgment and decree and therefore, it is not possible to enter the name of the petitioner in the revenue records.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner further submits that such an endorsement could not have been issued by the Tahsildar, having regard to the directions issued by this Court and a decree of permanent injunction being granted by the competent Civil Court restraining the State



and its authorities from interfering with the peaceful possession of the suit schedule property at the hands of the petitioner. Learned Counsel submits that the claim of the petitioner in respect of the lands in question viz., 10 Guntas in Survey No.17 and 11 Guntas in Survey No.19 stem from the orders passed by the Additional Special Deputy Commissioner for Inams Abolition in proceedings bearing No.103/1956-1957 dated 20.12.1964, where the occupancy rights have been conferred in favour of the petitioner. It is also true that the name of the petitioner was entered in the revenue records as can be seen from Annexure-D, RTC. However, without notice to the petitioner his name has been removed from the RTC and the name of the Government has been inserted. It is therefore the prayer of the petitioner to remove the name of the Government and enter the name of the petitioner in the revenue records.

4. Having regard to the facts stated hereinabove, this Court is of the considered opinion that the



respondent-Tahsildar, is duty bound to verify from the records as to whether the name of the petitioner was earlier entered in the revenue records. If it is found that the mutation orders have already been passed in favour of the petitioner and there being no reason to remove the name of the petitioner and to enter the name of the Government, that too without notice to the petitioner, the petitioner has a right to have his name re-entered in the revenue records.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***disposed of*** with a direction to the respondent-Tahsildar, Bengaluru East Taluk to verify from the records and if it is found that the claim of the petitioner is genuine, then the name of the petitioner shall be entered in the revenue records as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.



6. Needless to observe that as directed in the previous writ petition, the possession of the petitioner shall not be disturbed till a decision is taken by the respondent-Tahsildar.

7. Learned Additional Government Advocate is permitted to file memo of appearance within a period of four weeks from today.

**Sd/-**  
**(R DEVDAS)**  
**JUDGE**

DL  
CT: JL