



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 21687 OF 2025 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

1. SHIVABASAYA KATTI
S/O. YAMANAPPA KATTI,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE,
M.K. LTD.,
2. YASHOD KUMAR COUR
S/O AMBIKA PRASAD COUR,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
3. SHIVANANDA
S/O. N. RAMABHATTA,
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
4. PRAKASH BAYAR,
S/O. A.S. KRISHNAMURTHY BAYER,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
5. VIJAYALAKSHMI M. KALAL,
W/O. LATE MUKUNDAPPA KALAL,
D/O LATE MALLESH KALAL,
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS,

Digitally
signed by
SUNITHA K S
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



6. R.G. NARASAPUR,
S/O. GUNDURAO B. NARASAPUR,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
7. DATTATREYA VISHWAS NAIK
S/O VISHWAS NAIK,
AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS,
8. H.S.RAMESH
S/O H.K.SATHYANARAYANA,
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LIMITED,
9. SRI. HARSHA.K.
S/O SHESHA BHAT.K.,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
10. SRI. K.HOOVAPPA
S/O SUBBAYYA GOUDA,
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, MYSORE KIRLOSKAR LTD.,
11. DANCES ROCHE
S/O. LOVIS ROCHE,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
12. B.N. RAJENDRABABU,
S/O.B.N. VENKATARAMANAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
13. DR. GOPI
S/O. CHIKKAVEERACHAR,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,



EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,

14. L. RAMACHAR,
S/O. LAKSHMANACHAR,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
15. S.K.PANI
S/O SUBRAMANYA MODULIYAR,
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS,
16. SMT. KALAVATHI
W/O LATE N.S.MODALIYAR,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
17. D. VARADARAJARAO,
S/O.D. RAGHAVENDRARAO,
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
18. H.V. ASHOKA,
S/O.H.N. VENKATESHA BHATTA,
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
19. N.S. NAGARAJ,
S/O. SANNATHIMMAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
20. SRI. VITTAL TULJARAMSA
S/O LATE TULAJARAMSA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
21. G.S. KRISHNAMURTHY,
S/O.G. SEETHARAMAIAH,



AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,

22. U.V.V. MALLIKARJUNA RAO,
S/O. BHASAKARRAO,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
23. S.M.PRAKASH
S/O LATE SATYANARAYAN
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
24. P.R. KODER
S/O. RANGAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
25. A.P. DIXIT,
S/O. PANDURANG DIXIT,
AGED ABOUT 68 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
26. SATISH P. DIXIT,
S/O. PANDURANG DIXIT,
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
27. RAHUL JADHAV,
S/O. SURESH JADAV,
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,
28. SMT. THUNGA,
W/O. G. MUNIYAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS,



29. D. HITENDRAKUMAR
S/O. DEVICHAND,
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
30. D. KAMALESH,
S/O. D. DEVICHAND,
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
31. A.G. NARASAPUR,
S/O. GUNDURAO B. NARASAPUR,
AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS,
EX-EMPLOYEE, M.K. LTD.,
32. M.N. GURUNATHA RAO
S/O M.N.AMBAJI RAO,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
33. GEETHAS. G.RAO
W/O M.N.GURUNATHA RAO,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
34. BASAVARAJ.H.
S/O NANJAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
35. M.N. MALATESHA RAO
S/O M.N.AMBAJI RAO,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
36. K.M.GIRIJAMMA
W/O K.M.KOTRAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,



ALL ARE R/O M.K. OFFICERS COLONY
YANTRAPURA,
HARIHAR – 577 002

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. MALLIKARJUNA G CONTRACTOR., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
GOVT. OF KARNATAKA,
VIDHANASOUDHA,
BENGALURU
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
DAVANAGERE DISTRICT,
DAVANAGERE – 577 001
3. SUB REGISTRAR,
HARIHARA TALUK,
HARIHARA – 577 002
4. THE COMMISSIONER,
MUNICIPAL COUNSEL,
HARIHARA TOWN,
DAVANAGERE DISTRICT – 577 002

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. B.P. RADHA, AGA FOR R1 TO R3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226
AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO



QUASH THE ENDORSEMENT DTD 21.03.2024 AS PER ANNEX-G, DIRECT R-3 TO EXECUTE THE SALE DEEDS BY WAY OF REGISTRATION AND R-4 AS PER SALE DEED TO EFFECT THE KHATHA.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned counsel for the petitioners has filed a memo dated 13.03.2026, stating that the petitioners are required to furnish certified copies and other documents which they are not able to comply and therefore, a liberty is sought to withdraw the writ petition and file a fresh writ petition on the same cause of action.

2. However, the office has raised objections that there is Deficit Court Fee payable by the petitioners.

3. Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***dismissed as withdrawn*** reserving a liberty to the petitioners to file



NC: 2026:KHC:16228
WP No. 21687 of 2025

a fresh petition on the same cause of action, however, the same shall be subject to the petitioners paying the court fee.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

SKS