HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:61869
WP No. 31300 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010682342026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 6TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 31300 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. EARAMMA,
   W/O LATE MAHADEVANAYAKA,
   AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
   R/AT HULLENAHALLI VILLAGE,
   BILIKERE HOBLI, HUNSUR TALUK,
   MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 103.

2. SRI. MAHESH NAYAKA,
   S/O LATE MAHADEVANAYAKA,
   AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,
   R/AT HULLENAHALLI VILLAGE,
   BILIKERE HOBLI, HUNSUR TALUK,
   MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 103.

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

3. SRI. SANTOSH NAYAKA,
   S/O LATE MAHADEVANAYAKA,
   AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS,
   R/AT HULLENAHALLI VILLAGE,
   BILIKERE HOBLI, HUNSUR TALUK,
   MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 103.

4. SRI. KIRAN KUMAR,
   S/O LATE MAHADEVANAYAKA,
   AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,
   R/AT HULLENAHALLI VILLAGE,

BILIKERE HOBLI, HUNSUR TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 103.

…PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. PRITHVI RAJ B N., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S. BUILDING,
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001.

2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
MYSURU DISTRICT,
MYSURU - 570 001.

3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
HUNSUR SUB-DIVISION, HUNSUR,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 105.

4. THE TAHSILDAR,
HUNSUR TALUK, HUNSUR,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 105.

SMT. CHIKKAMANCHAMMA,
SINCE DECEASED,
BY HER LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES

5. SRI. SHIVANNA,
S/O LATE CHIKKAMANCHAMMA,

6. SRI. DODDASWAMY,
S/O LATE CHIKKAMANCHAMMA,

7. SRI. KUMAR,
S/O LATE CHIKKAMANCHAMMA,

SRI LAKSHMANA,
S/O LATE CHIKKAMANCHAMMA,
SINCE DECEASED,
BY HIS LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES

8. SMT. KALAMMA,
W/O LATE LAKSHMANA,

9. KUM. NANDINI,
D/O LATE LAKSHMANA,

10. SRI. NANDEESH,
S/O LATE LAKSHMANA,

ALL R/AT NARADAPANAHALLI VILLAGE,
BILIKERE HOBLI, HUNSUR TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 105.

SMT. PUTTAGOWRAMMA,
SINCE DECEASED,
BY HER LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES

11. SRI. SUNDARANAYAKA,
S/O LATE PUTTAGOWRAMMA,

12. SRI. MAHADEVANAYAKA,
S/O LATE PUTTAGOWRAMMA,

BOTH ARE R/AT DODDAMARAGOWDANAHALLI
VILLAGE, ILAVALA HOBLI,
MYSURU TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 570 026.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF LATE
DODDAMANCHAMMA,
W/O LATE MANCHANAYAKA

13. SMT. JAYAMMA,
W/O LATE MALESH,

14. SMT. HEMA,
D/O LATE MALESH,

BOTH R/AT NARADAPANAHALLI VILLAGE,
BILIKERE HOBLI,
HUNSUR TALUK,
MYSURU DISTRICT - 571 105.

15. SRI. NAGANAYAKA @ NAGARAJANAYAKA,
S/O LATE CHOWDAYYA,
AGED ABOUT
R/AT HOUSE NO.2267,
SRI HARI MEDICAL BUNGLOW,
6TH CROSS, VINAYAKANAGAR,
MYSURU - 570 012.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.SHAMANTH NAIK, AGA FOR R1 TO R4)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE ORDER DATED 2-9-2026 PASSED BY RESPONDENT NO.2 IN RP NO.72/2026, VIDE ANNEXURE-A; B. ISSUE A WRIT OF

MANDAMUS, OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION, DIRECTING RESPONDENT NO.4, TO FORTHWITH EFFECT MUTATION/CORRECTION OF KHATA OF SY.NO.52 MEASURING 4 ACRES 32 GUNTAS SITUATED AT HULLENAHALLI VILLAGE, BILIKERE HOBLI, HUNSUR TALUK, MYSURU DISTRICT, IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITIONERS

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, 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. In this writ petition, petitioners are assailing the order dated 02.09.2026 (Annexure-A) passed by respondent No.2 *inter alia* sought for direction to respondent No.4 to make correction of khata in respect of the land bearing Survey No.52 measuring 4 acres 32 guntas situated at Hullenahalli Village, Hunsur Taluk, Mysuru District in favour of the petiitoners.

3. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on careful consideration of the finding recorded by respondent No.3 in the order dated 08.02.2023 (Annexure-F), wherein the petitioners herein have sought for change of correction in respect of mutation which stands in the name of the private respondents herein.

4. In that view of the matter, taking into consideration the finding recorded by both the authorities, I am of view that no interference is called for, in this writ petition. However, it is open for the petitioner to establish their right over the land in question before the Civil Court, in a manner known to law.

Accordingly, writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

PSJ
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 7