



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 8137 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI CHOWDAPPA
S/O LATE SIDDAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
R/AT VENGSAANDRA VILLAGE,
KYASAMBALLI HOBLI,
KGF TALUK - 563 116.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI K. VIJAYA KUMAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
KOLAR SUB-DIVISION.
KOLAR-563 101.
2. THE TAHSILDAR,
KGF TALUK,
KGF - 563 122.
3. SRI CHANDRAKUMAR,
S/O LATE V. BALAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
4. SRI RAMESH,
S/O LATE V. BALAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
5. SRI. SURESH,
S/O LATE V. BALAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,





RESPONDENTS NO.3 TO 5 ARE
R/AT VENGSAHNDRA VILLAGE,
KYASAMBALLI HOBLI,
KGF TALUK - 563 116.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. B.P.RADHA, ADVOCATE FOR R1 & R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT DATED 16/12/2025 ISSUED BY R1 IN RA 588/2025, PRODUCED AS ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.,

THIS PETITION IS COMING ON FOR FRESH MATTERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned AGA is directed to take notice for the respondent Nos.1 and 2.

2. Notice to other respondents is not necessary for the following reasons:

The petitioner is aggrieved by the action of the respondent No.1-Assistant Commissioner, Kolar Sub-division, Kolar, in issuing the impugned Endorsement at Annexure-A declining to entertain an appeal filed by the petitioner under Section 136(2) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964.

3. On perusal of the impugned Endorsement, it is clear that the Assistant Commissioner is of the opinion that the



petitioner is raising a challenge to an order passed in the year 1994-1995 and there has been *phodi* done subsequently and there have been subsequent sale transactions and the revenue entries are accordingly mutated and therefore, the Assistant Commissioner cannot enter into disputed questions of title at this juncture. The Assistant Commissioner has therefore directed the petitioner to approach competent Civil court to get a declaration of title.

4. No infirmity can be found in the impugned endorsement issued by the respondent No.1-Assistant Commissioner, since a full bench of this Court, in case of ***Jayamma vs. State of Karnataka and Others*** reported in ***ILR 2020 KAR 1449***, has clearly held that the revenue authorities will not be permitted to go into disputed questions of title and the Civil Court alone is competent to decide such disputed questions of time.

Writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE