HC-KAR
NC: 2026:KHC:62149-DB
CCC No. 888 of 2025
CNR: KAHC010460772025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE N.V.BHAVANI

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 888 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SMT. RAMADEVI
D/O T.S. KRISHNASHASTHRI
AGED ABOUT 72 YEARS
R/A NO.2, 2ND FLOOR, 5TH MAIN ROAD
6TH CROSS, SARVABHOUMA NAGAR
CHIKKAKALASANDRA
SUBRAMANYAPURA,
BANGALORE SOUTH,
BANGALORE – 560061

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. NAMAN VANKDARI.M, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. MUTHU KUMAR K.V, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by YASHODA K L
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

AND:

1. SHIVAKUMAR KASNOOR
THE TAHSILDAR OFFICE AT
NANJANGUD TALUK,
MYSORE DISTRICT – 571301.

2. MOHAN KUMARI
THE DEPUTY TAHSILDAR
OFFICE AT 4M6F PLUS 43S,
MYSURU-OOTY ROAD
NANJANGUD TALUK,
MYSORE – 571301

3. LAKSHMIKANTH REDDY G

THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
OFFICE AT KRISHNARAJA BALWADI ROAD,
K G KOPPAL, KAJIHUNDI,
MYSURU, KARNATAKA – 570001.

4. VIJAYAKUMAR H.B.
THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
MYSORE SUB DIVISION, MYSORE,
KARNATAKA – 570005

…ACCUSED

5. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
MS. BUILDING
BENGALURU - 560001

…PROFORMA RESPONDENT

(BY SMT. B.SUKANYA BALIGA, AGA FOR PROFORMA R5& A1-A4)

THIS CCC IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 215 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA R/W SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, BY THE COMPLAINANT, WHEREIN PRAYS THAT THE HONBLE COURT BE PLEASED TO INITIATE CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST THE ACCUSED FOR HAVING DISOBEYED THE ORDER PASSED BY THIS HONBLE COURT ON ORDER DATED 24.02.2023 AS CORRECTED ON 09.08.2024 IN WP NO.4131/2023 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-H AND PUNISH THE ACCUSED FOR WILLFULLY AND DELIBERATELY DISOBEYING THE ORDER PASSED BY THIS HONBLE COURT.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT BANERJI
AND
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE N.V.BHAVANI

CNR: KAHC010460772025

ORAL ORDER

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

Heard Sri. Naman Vankdari (Enrolment No. KAR/1515/2020) learned counsel appearing on behalf of Sri K.V.Muthu Kumar, learned counsel for the complainant, who presses the petition. He also seeks time to file a rejoinder.

2. We have perused the compliance affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent No.1, who is the Tahsildar. The petition was filed to initiate contempt proceedings against the accused for having willfully disobeyed the order of this Court dated 24.02.2023 as corrected on 09.08.2024.

3. While partly allowing the writ petition, the Tahsildar was directed to publish the information regarding the claim made by the complainant in the village chavadi and call for objections from all interested persons. It was directed that if objections were received within the prescribed time, then the Tahsildar was to issue an endorsement to the complainant regarding the objection and call on her to get a declaration of her rights under the registered Will. If no objections were

forthcoming, the Tahsildar was directed to proceed to enter the name of the complainant on the specified properties in terms of the registered Will dated 04.05.1962. It was further observed that on the entry made by the Tahsildar, if no objections were received, it would not preclude any interested person to challenge the entries made in the land record.

4. On page No.55 of the affidavit filed on 01.10.2026 is an endorsement dated 08.08.2025 issued by the Tahsildar/accused No.1. It is noted therein that some objection was filed and another person had claimed a right of absolute ownership of the said lands. This was based on an order of the Land Tribunal in case LRF No.6215/74-75, the order being passed on 18.09.1981. That order was never challenged before any forum. It was noted by the Tahsildar that even in the present RTC, the Khata stands in the name of H. N. Mahadeva Nayaka. Accordingly, in terms of the direction of the High Court in the aforesaid writ petition, it was observed that the concerned parties have to resolve their rights before the Competent Civil Court.

5. Though the learned counsel for the complainant has sought to object to the observations made by the Tahsildar in the endorsement, however the fact remains that in the RTC the name of another person is recorded. Therefore, the Tahsildar has rightly taken a decision asking the complainant to resolve her rights before the Competent Civil Court.

6. In view of the aforesaid, this contempt petition is consigned.

SD/-
(JAYANT BANERJI)
JUDGE

SD/-
(N.V.BHAVANI)
JUDGE

GJM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 8