



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 7071 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. SHIVA KUMAR A
S/O LATE SRI. ANDAANIAH,
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
R/AT ANDAANI GOWDANA PAALYA,
MOOGANA PURA, HUTRIDURGA HOBLI,
KUNIGAL TALLUK,
TUMKUR DISTRICT-572130

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MANU B P., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
M.S. BUILDINGS
DR.AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALORE-560 001
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY



2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
TUMKUR,
TUMKUR DISTRICT -572130

3. THE ASST. COMMISSIONER
TUMKUR SUB-DIVISION
TUMKUR-572130

4. THE TAHSILDAR
KUNIGAL TALUK
TUMKUR DISTRICT 572130.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. B.P. RADHA, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO (A) ISSUE ANY APPROPRIATE ORDER OR DIRECTION OR A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI BY QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT RRT (HTR) LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE-1752/25-26 DATED 08.12.2025, AS PER ANNEXURE-AIN RESPECT OF LAND IN SY NO-58/12 MEASURING 00-28½ PERCENT GUNTAS AND LAND IN SY NO- 58/3 MEASURING 00-28 GUNTAS SITUATED AT YADEHALLI VILLAGE. HULIYURUDURGA HOBLI, KUNIGAL TALLUK, TUMKUR DISTRICT AND ETC.,

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



CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned Additional Government Advocate accepts notice for the respondents.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is directed against the impugned endorsement at Annexure-A dated 08.12.2025. The petitioner had sought for deletion of the entries made in column No.11, which was made pursuant to an order passed by the Assistant Commissioner in proceedings No.RA/KUN/448/2023, whereby an interim order of stay is said to have been passed by the Assistant Commissioner. Nevertheless, in the impugned endorsement it is stated that the petitioner has not furnished a copy of the subsequent order passed by the Assistant Commissioner either recalling the order of stay or that the appeal itself is disposed off.

3. To a pointed question put to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether the petitioner



furnished a copy of the subsequent order passed by the Assistant Commissioner, there is no answer. Learned counsel is only pointing out to Annexure-Q, which is the representation given by the petitioner on 28.08.2025.

4. Having regard to the facts narrated herein above, this Court is of the considered opinion that if the Tahsildar sought for a copy of the order subsequently passed by the Assistant Commissioner, it was the duty of the petitioner to furnish such a copy to the Tahsildar.

5. Consequently, the petition stands ***disposed off***, reserving liberty to the petitioner to furnish a copy of the order said to have been passed by the Assistant Commissioner subsequently. If such a copy of the order is furnished by the petitioner, respondent No.4-Thasildar, Kunigal Taluk shall proceed to consider the grievance of the petitioner and pass necessary orders in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible and at any rate



**NC: 2026:KHC:17182
WP No. 7071 of 2026**

within a period of six weeks from the date of the receipt of
the copy of this order.

**Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE**

SSB