



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. 9222 OF 2026 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI Y DEVARAJU
S/O YARRAPPA, AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS, R/AT
BYRANAYAKANAHALLI VILLAGE, NANDI HOBLI,
CHIKKABALLAPURA TALUK,
CHIKKABALLAPURA - 572 103.
2. SRI. Y. MANJUNATHA
S/O YARRAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
R/AT BYRANAYAKANAHALLI VILLAGE,
NANDI HOBLI, CHIKKABALLAPURA TALUK,
CHIKKABALLAPURA - 572 103.
3. SRI. B. VINOD KUMAR
S/O BYRAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS, R/AT SLV NILAYA,
DINNEHOSAHALLI ROAD, WARD NO.18,
CHIKKABALLAPURA TOWN,
CHIKKABALLAPURA - 562 101.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. RAJESWARA.P.N.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,





DR.B.R. AMBEDKAR VEEDI,
M.S. BUILDING,
BENGALURU 560 001,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.

2. THE TAHSILDAR
CHIKKABALLAPURA TALUK,
CHIKKABALLAPURA - 562 101.
3. REVENUE INSPECTOR
NANDI HOBLI,
TEMPLE ROAD,
CHIKKABALLAPURA TALUK,
CHIKKABALLAPURA - 562 103.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V. SESHU, HCGP)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE
ORDER DATED 03.03.2026 DIGITALLY SIGNED ON 09.03.2026
IN CASE NO.RRTDISP/426/2025 PASSED BY THE 2ND
RESPONDENT (ANNEXURE-A) AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned HCGP takes notice for all the respondents.



2. Learned HCGP raises a preliminary objection that the order impugned is passed by the Tahsildar, Chikkaballapura Taluk on 03.03.2026 declining to enter the name of the petitioners in the revenue records pursuant to registered sale deed dated 03.12.2025 and therefore, such an order passed by the Tahsildar under Section 129 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short) is appealable before the Assistant Commissioner under Section 136(2) of the Act.

3. Upholding the submissions of the learned HCGP, the writ petition stands ***disposed of***, reserving liberty to the petitioners to approach the Assistant Commissioner.

4. Ordered accordingly.

5. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the Tahsildar could not have directed entry of the name of the Government in the revenue records on the application filed by the petitioners,



to that extent, it is submitted that the Tahsildar had no jurisdiction. Therefore, learned counsel prays that for a reasonable period appropriate direction may be issued to the Tahsildar and the revenue Authorities not to enter the name of the Government in the revenue records and not to disposes the petitioners till the petitioners approach the Assistant Commissioner and secure appropriate interim orders.

7. Accepting the submission of learned counsel for petitioners, the respondent-Tahsildar is hereby directed not to precipitate the matter any further for a period of four weeks to enable the petitioners to approach the Assistant Commissioner and secure appropriate interim orders.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

KTY/List No.: 1 SI No.: 15