



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. 8518 OF 2026 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

SMT. B.NAGARATHNAMMA
W/O GOVINDASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 73 YEARS
RESIDING AT
BANDIKODIGEHALI VILLAGE,
JALA HOBLI,
YELAHANKA TALUK - 562 149.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI VASUDEVA REDDY N., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
VIDHANA SOUDHA,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. THE TAHSILDAR,
YELAHANKA TALUK,
MINI VIDHAN SHOUDHA
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT-560 064.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI SHAMANTH NAIK, HCGP)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO DIRECT RESPONDENT NO.2 - TAHSILDAR, YELAHANKA TALUK, TO CONSIDER AND DISPOSE OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 10.07.2025 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER (ANNEXURE-G) SEEKING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FINAL ORDER PASSED BY THE SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER-3, BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT IN





PROCEEDINGS NO.RRT(2)(NA)CR:57/2024-25 DATED 02.06.2025
(ANNEXURE-F) AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned HCGP is directed to take notice for all the respondents.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondent No.2-Tahasildar, Yelahanka Taluk, has failed to comply with the directions issued by the Special Deputy Commissioner in terms of order dated 02.06.2025 at Annexure-F in proceedings bearing RRT(2)(NA)CR:57/2024-25.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the proceedings were initiated at the instance of the Tahasildar, Yelahanka Taluk, under Section 136(3) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 and the Special Deputy Commissioner considered the allocation of the Tahasildar that the revenue entries have been made on the basis of bogus and forged documents. However, the Special Deputy Commissioner, after verifying the records, came to a conclusion that the mutation



entries which was made earlier is in accordance with law and having regard to the grant made in favour of Smt.Nagarathnamma W/o G.M.Govinda Swami. Accordingly, the directions were issued by the Special Deputy Commissioner to the Tahasildar to re-enter the name of the original grantee in the computerized RTC.

4. Learned counsel further submits that despite such directions being given to the Tahasildar and further request made by the petitioner in terms of Annexure-G, no action has been taken by the Tahasildar.

5. Consequently, writ petition stands ***disposed of*** with a specific direction to the respondent No.2-Tahasildar to proceed to comply with the directions issued by the Special Deputy Commissioner and make the appropriate entries in the computerized RTC as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE