



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 6529 OF 2026 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. NANJAPPA
S/O LATE MARANNA,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
2. SMT. BHAGYAMMA
D/O LATE MARANNA,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
3. SMT. GOWARAMMA
D/O LATE MARANNA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
4. SRI. MUNISHAMAPPA,
S/O LATE MARANNA,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,

ALL ARE RESIDING AT:
HANCHARHALLI VILLAGE,
MANDUR POST, BIDRAHALLI HOBLI,
BANGALORE EAST TALUK,
BANGALORE – 560 049

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SANYAY T.K., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. VARUN JAYKUMAR PATIL, ADVOCATE)





AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF RVENUE,
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
M.S. BUILDINGS, AMBEDKAR VEEDI,
BANGALORE – 560 001
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT,
K.G. ROAD,
BANGALORE – 560 009
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
NORTH SUB-DIVISION,
BANGALORE DISTRICT – 560 009
4. THE TAHASILDAR
TALUK OFFICE,
BANGALORE EAST TALUK.
BANGALORE – 560 036

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT.NAVYA SHEKHAR, AGA)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO A) TO ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS TO DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NO.4 CONSIDER THE PETITIONERS REPRESENTATION DATED 11.08.2025 AND 5.01.2026 TO EFFECT THE MUTATION IN THE NAME OF THE PETITIONERS AS PAVATHI VARASU VIDE ANNEXURE-F AND G. IN RESPECT OF LAND BEARING SY. NO.51 AN EXTENT 1 ACRE 30 GUNTAS SITUATED AT HANCHARHALLI VILLAGE, MANDUR POST BIDARAHALLI HOBLI, BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT.



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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned Additional Government Advocate takes notice for all the respondents.

2. The prayer in the writ petition is to issue a writ of mandamus directing respondent No.4-Tahsildar, Bangalore East Taluk, to consider the representations dated 11.08.2025 and 05.01.2026 given by the petitioners to effect mutation in the name of the petitioners in the revenue records, on the basis of succession.

3. On hearing the learned counsel for petitioners and perusing the petition papers, this Court finds that although it is the claim of the petitioners that late Sri.Maranna, the father of the petitioners purchased the land in question under a registered sale deed dated 11.05.1972 and it is contended that mutation entries were made in the name of Sri.Maranna in the revenue records, nevertheless, on further proof, this Court finds that the latest RTC does not contain the name of the



petitioners' father. It is now submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the name of the petitioners' father was never entered in the revenue records. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that after computerization, the name of the petitioners' father was removed from the revenue records.

4. On perusal of the latest RTC, this Court finds that the names of a few individuals are found in column No.9 and in column No.10 two mutation orders are found in M.R.No.10/2003-2004 dated 28.06.2004 & M.R.No.T4/2015-16 dated 04.12.2015. The petitioners are required to raise a challenge to the said mutation order in accordance with law and have the name of the petitioners' father first re-entered in the revenue records. Only then the question of considering the representations of the petitioners for substituting their names in the revenue records in the place of their father would arise.

5. With these observations, the writ petition stands **disposed of.**

Ordered accordingly.



NC: 2026:KHC:12532
WP No. 6529 of 2026

Learned Additional Government Advocate is permitted to file memo of appearance within a period of four weeks from today.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

rv
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 13