



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 6037 OF 2026 (GM-ST/RN)

BETWEEN:

1. VENKATESH V
AGED ABOUT 67 YEARS
SESHAGIRAHALLI VILLAGE
BIDADI HOBLI,
RAMANAGARA TALUK
BANGALORE SOUTH,
KARNATAKA-562109
2. SHIVANNA
SON OF KARIYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
SESHAGIRAHALLI VILLAGE
BIDADI HOBLI,
RAMANAGARA TALUK
BANGALORE SOUTH -562109.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. AKKIMANJUNATH GOWDA K.,ADVOCATE)





AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY CHIEF SECRETARY
VIDHANA SOUDHA
BANGALORE - 560 001.
2. DISTRICT REGISTRAR
BANGALORE SOUTH DISTRICT
NO-103, GROUND FLOOR,
DISTRICT OFFICE SAMKIRNA,
RAMANAGARA TOWN -562 159.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.B. RAVINDRANATH., AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO- TO CALL FOR RECORDS AND GRANT AN ORDER DIRECTION OR WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI QUASHING THE NOTICE OF THE R2 DATED 23.01.2026 IN DUS-45-A(3)/RN/04/2025-26 VIDE ANNEX-A, WITH RESPECT OF PETITIONERS.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B M SHYAM PRASAD



ORAL ORDER

The petitioners, who have presented the Sale Deed dated 28.06.2024 [*Annexure-C*] for registration under the Indian Registration Act, 1908 [for short, '*the Act*'] with the jurisdictional Sub-Registrar, is aggrieved by the issuance of notice under Section 45-A of the Karnataka Stamp Act, 1957 [for short, '*the Stamp Act*']. The second respondent has issued this notice for *suo motu* initiation under Section 45-A(3) of the Stamp Act.

Sri Akkimanjunath Gowda K., the learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that this notice is issued calling upon the petitioners to show cause against an order upon an under valuation relying upon the conversion/diversion order as mentioned in Column No.11 of the RTC notwithstanding the fact that RTC records show that [**a**] this land is being cultivated for ragi, [**b**] diversion is dated 20.07.1998, and even according to the terms upon which such



diversion is permitted, the diversion was valid for two years, and **[c]** the notice is dated 23.01.2026 stipulating 21 days for response but it is dispatched and delivered to the petitioners only on 07.02.2026.

Sri B. Ravindranath, the learned Additional Government Advocate, who is called upon to accept notice for the respondents, is heard in the light of this grievance and for disposal of the petition. The petitioners must have a reasonable opportunity to substantiate his case against undervaluation and if despite objections as afore are recorded and the second respondent decides against the petitioners, the petitioners have alternative appellate remedy. Therefore, this Court is of the view that there must be interference in this petition only to enable a reasonable opportunity to the petitioners to file a response to the Show Cause Notice and calling upon the second respondent to consider the petitioners' objections by a reasoned order. Hence, the following:



ORDER

- [a] The petition is allowed calling upon the second respondent to permit the petitioners time till 23.03.2026 to file objections in response to the show cause notice dated 23.01.2026 [Annexure-A].
- [b] The petitioners are at liberty to file such objections along with a certified copy of this order by that time.
- [c] The second respondent is directed to dispose of the *suo motu* proceedings by a reasoned order in the light of the petitioners' specific defense which could be, amongst others, the objections as recorded by this Court.

**Sd/-
(B M SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE**

SA
ct:sr