HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:55172
WP No. 30955 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010681292026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 05TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.30955 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. RAMACHANDRE GOWDA
S/O MOOGEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
R/AT LINGAPATTANA VILLAGE,
HALAGURU HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT-571430.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HARSHA KUMAR GOWDA H.R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

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

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S. BUILDING,
DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDI,
BENGALURU-560001
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.

2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
BENGALURU SOUTH DISTRICT
BENGALURU-562159.

3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
RAMANAGARA SUB-DIVISION,
RAMANAGARA-562159.

4. TAHASILDAR
KANAKAPURA TALUK
KANAKAPURA – 562117.

5. SRI. B.S. SHIVANNA
S/O LATE SIDDALINGE GOWDA
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
R/A LINGAPATTANA VILLAGE
HALAGURU HOBLI
MALAVALLI TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT – 571430.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. ADITYA DIWAKARA, AGA FOR R1 TO R4)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 17.03.2026 PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.2 IN RP NO.167/2025 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-H.

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

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

CNR: KAHC010681292026

ORAL ORDER

1. Learned Additional Government Advocate accepts notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

2. Heard Sri. Harsha Kumar Gowda H.R., learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, and Sri. Aditya Diwakara, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondent-State.

3. In this writ petition, the petitioner is assailing the order dated 17.03.2026 passed by respondent No.2 in R.P.No.167 of 2025 produced at Annexure-H.

4. The petitioner claims right over the subject property on the basis of a registered sale deed. On the other hand, respondent No.5 also claims right over the said property on the basis of a registered sale deed dated 29.09.1967.

5. In view of the rival claims and the dispute with regard to the title and boundaries of the subject property, the petitioner is required to establish his right before the competent Civil Court. The observation made by respondent No.2 relegating the parties to approach the competent Civil Court is, therefore, just and proper. Accordingly, no interference is called for in this writ petition.

6. In the result, the writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

SB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 28