HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:59373
WP No. 31282 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010681982026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 31282 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI HUCHAIAHA
S/O SMT. HUCHAMMA,
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS,
R/O HOUSE NO-70,
NAGENAHALLI VILLAGE,
MADHURE HOBLI,
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK,
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT,
BANGALORE- 577527

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SAGAR B B.,ADVOCATE)

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

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BANGALORE-560001
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.

2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
KANDHAYA BHAVAN,
BANGALORE-560001.

3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
DODDABALLAPURA SUB DIVISION,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
DODDABALLPURA
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT- 561203.

4. THE THASILDAR,
DODDABALLAPUR TALUK,
OFFICE OF THE THASILDAR,
DODDABALLPURA
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT- 561203.

5. SRI.S.N.KRISHNAPPA,
S/O SIDDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT MAJOR,
R/O NAGENAHALLI VILLAGE,
MADHURE HOBLI,
DODDABALLAPURA TALUK,
BANGALORE RURAL DISTRICT,
BANGALORE- 577527.

6. SRI.K.HANUMANTHAPPA,
S/O KARIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT MAJOR,
R/O #34, 2ND MAIN,
2ND CROSS, NEAR SAPTHAGIRI
ENGINEERING COLLEGE,
SHETTIHALLI, JALA HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK,
BANGALORE-562120.

7. SMT. JAYALAKSHMI,
W/O LATE GANGARAJU,
AGED ABOUT MAJOR,
R/O NO 103, 1ST A CROSS,
NEAR VENKATAPPA GARDEN,
L.I.C. COLONY, YESHWANTHPUR,
BANGALORE NORTH,
BANGALORE-560022.

8. SMT.SIDDAGANGAMMA,
D/O SIDDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT MAJOR,
R/O NO 14, 7TH MAIN ROAD,
MOHAN KUMARA NAGAR,
BANGALORE-560022.

9. SMT. RADHA,
W/O LATE SIDDAGANGA.S,
NO 14, MAIN ROAD,
MOHAN KUMARA NAGAR,
BANGALORE-560022.

10. SMT. GANGAMMA,
D/O SIDDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT MAJOR,
R/O MOHAN KUMARA NAGAR,
BANGALORE-560022.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI SHAMANTH NAIK, AGA, FOR R1 TO R4,
SRI V SHIVAKUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R7, R9 AND R10)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 09.06.2025 PASSED IN RA/DPB-564/2023 PASSED BY THE R3 VIDE ANNX-S QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 14.07.2026 PASSED IN RP NO. 182/2025 PASSED BY THE R2 VIDE ANNX-T.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

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

2. Sri V Shivakumar, learned counsel is appearing for respondent Nos.7, 9 and 10.

3. In this writ petition, the petitioner is assailing the order dated 09.06.2025 (Annexure-S) passed by respondent No.3 and order dated 14.07.2026 (Annexure-T) passed by respondent No.2.

4. Sri Sagar B B, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, contended that, there is a procedural irregularity committed by respondent No.4 having changed mutation as the said Authority became functus officio after entering the name of petitioner in the mutation register. Therefore, learned counsel submitted that the procedure adopted by the respondent No.4 is contrary to law as the said Authority has no jurisdiction to review its own order, and therefore, sought for interference of this Court.

5. *Per contra*, Sri. V. Shivakumar, learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.7, 9 and 10 contended that, the private respondents herein are claiming right over the property based on the registered sale deed. The private respondents herein sought for dismissal of the writ petition.

6. Sri. Shamanth Naik, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for respondent - State submitted that the mutation has been effected as per the registered sale deed, and therefore, contended that the petitioner has to establish his right in respect of the land in question.

7. Having taken note of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, I find merit in the submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that, the respondent No.4 has no jurisdiction to review its own order. However, taking into

consideration the factual aspects on record, as the mutation has been effected based on the registered sale deed dated 19.04.1965, and therefore, though the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contended that, the aforementioned registered sale deed is illegal, however, the same cannot be interfered with under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in the peculiar circumstances of the case.

8. In that view of the matter, as the mutation has been effected based on the registered sale deed dated 19.04.1965, I am of the view that, no interference is called for in this writ petition. However, it is open for the petitioner to establish his right over the property in question in a manner known to law before the Civil Court.

9. In that view of the matter, no interference is called for. However, it is made clear that, it is the duty of the respondent - Authorities to follow the procedure contemplated under the Karnataka Land Revenue Act,

1964 and the Rules made thereunder while considering the application made by the parties to effect mutation register.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

BKM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 31