HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:61521
WP No. 31458 of 2026

CNR: KAHC010684212026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 05TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

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

WRIT PETITION NO.31458 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. PUTTABASAVEGOWDA C.
   S/O LATE CHOWDEGOWDA
   AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
   R/A KAMSAGARA VILLAGE
   KASABA HOBLI
   MALAVALLI TALUK
   MANDYA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RAHAMATHULLA KOTHWAL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. DEVEERAMMA
   W/O LATE MADEGOWDA
   AGE ABOUT 85 YEARS
   R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
   KASABA HOBLI,
   MALAVALLI TALUK,
   MANDYA DISTRICT.

2. SRI. DR. CHOWDEGOWDA
   S/O LATE MADEGOWDA
   AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
   R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
   KASABA HOBLI,

Digitally signed by CHAYAS A
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

3. SMT. B.M. VASANTHA
W/O CHOWDEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 63 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

4. SRI. BASAVEGOWDA
S/O LATE MADEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 63 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

5. SMT. SHIVAMMA
W/O BASAVEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 60 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

6. SRI. DR. MADEGOWDA
S/O LATE MADEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 60 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

7. SMT. MANJULA
W/O DR. MADEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 58 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

8. SRI. DR. HONNE GOWDA
S/O LATE MADEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 58 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

9. SMT. L. MANJULA
W/O DR. PONNEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 55 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

10. SRI. DR. NAGEDRAKUMAR
S/O LATE MADEGOWDA
AGE ABOUT 58 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

11. SMT G K SUNEETHA
W/O DR. NAGENDRAKUMAR

AGE ABOUT 54 YEARS
R/AT KAMASAGARA VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT.

12. THE TAHSILDAR
MALAVALLI TALUK MALAVALLI
MANDYA DISTRICT.

13. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
MALAVALLI SUB DIVISION
MALAVALLI
MANDYA DISTRICT.

14. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
MANDYA DISTRICT
MANDYA.

…RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHAMANTH NAIK, AGA FOR R12 TO R14)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 01.09.2026 PASSED BY RESPONDENT NO.14-DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, MANDYA DISTRICT IN R.P.NO.213/2025, IN THE PROCEEDINGS ARISING OUT OF THE CHALLENGE TO I.H.C. NO.2/1988-89, INSOFAR AS THE SAME ADVERSELY AFFECTS THE PETITIONER'S REVENUE ENTRIES AND DIRECTS RE-EXAMINATION/ENTRY OF 29 GUNTAS IN THE NAME OF MODEGOWDA, SON OF CHOUDAGOWDA VIDE ANNEXURE-A; AND ETC.

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

1. The learned Additional Government Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 12 to 14.

2. Heard Sri. Rehamathulla Kothwala, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, and Sri. Shamanth Naik, learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondent-State.

3. In this writ petition, the petitioner is assailing the order dated 01.09.2026 passed by respondent No. 14 – Deputy Commissioner, in R.P. No. 213 of 2025.

4. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties, it is evident that the petitioner is claiming right over the property based on the registered Sale Deeds dated 04.09.1935 and 18.08.1937. The

petitioner seeks rectification of the mutation entries by incorporating the extent of 3.27 acres instead of 2.38 acres, as reflected in the aforementioned registered Sale Deeds.

5. In view of the above, the petitioner is at liberty to establish his right over the property in accordance with law as the petitioner is claiming the right over the property based on the sale deeds which are executed for more than seven decades ago. Having regard to the nature of the claim and the material on record, this Court finds no perversity in the order passed by the revenue authorities calling for interference.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

SD/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE

SB
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 35