



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. 8514 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SMT. NAGAMMA,
W/O CHANAPPA ,
AGED ABOUT 72 YEARS ,
R/A BANDIKODIGEHALI VILLAGE,
JALA HOBLI,
YELAHANKA TALUK-562149.

...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 SHANMANATH NAIK, HCGP)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227
OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF
MANDAMUS DIRECTING 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 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/T(2)(NA)CR/55/2024-25.

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.Nagamma W/o Channappa. 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**