



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 22967 OF 2023 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. SRI K N NANJUNDASWAMY
S/O LATE SRI NANJUNDAPPA,
AGED 64 YEARS,
2. SRI PALANETHRA,
S/O LATE SRI NANJUNDAPPA,
AGED 59 YEARS
3. SMT. DEVEERAMMA,
D/O LATE SRI NANJUNDAPPA,
AGED 68 YEARS,

ALL ARE R/O KEMPANAHALLI VILLAGE,
YELAHANKA HOBLI AND TALUK,
BENGALURU - 560 064

THE PLAINTIFFS 1 TO 3 ARE
REP. BY THEIR GENERAL POWER
ATTORNEY HOLDER

4. SRI CHANDRAPPA,
S/O MUNEERAPPA,
AGED 46 YEARS,
R/AT NO.419, 6TH MAIN ROAD,
ATTURU LAYOUT, YELAHANKA HOBLI AND TALUK,
BENGALURU - 560064.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. D.R.RAVISHANKAR., SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI. V.R. BALARAJ., ADVOCATE)





AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S.BUILDING,
BENGALURU - 560001.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT,
BENGALURU - 560 009.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
BENGALURU NORTH SUB-DIVISION,
KANDAYA BHAVANA,
BENGALURU - 560 009.
4. THE TAHSILDAR,
YALAHANKA TALUK, YALAHANKA,
BENGALURU - 560064.
5. SRI K H MANJUNATHA,
S/O LATE SRI R HONNAPPA,
AGED 54 YEARS,
6. SRI K H NAGARAJA,
S/O LATE SRI R HONNAPPA,
AGED 51 YEARS,
7. SRI K H SHANKAR,
S/O LATE SRI R HONNAPPA,
AGED 49 YEARS,

RESPONDENTS 5 TO 7 ARE
R/AT NO.7, KEMPAHAHALI VILLAGE,
YELAHANKA HOBLI AND TALUK
BENGALURU - 560064.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.V. SESHU., HCGP FOR R1 TO R4
SRI. VIGNESHWAR S.SHASTRI., SR. COUNSEL FOR
SRI. B.M.SANTOSH., ADVOCATE FOR R5 TO R7)



THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 01/09/2023 PASSED BY THE LEARNED R2 IN REVISION PETITION NO. 29/2020 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A AND RESTORE THE ORDER DATED 19/06/2019 PASSED BY THE LEARNED R3 IN CASE NO. RA(BNA)377/2015-16 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-B AND GRANT AN INTERIM ORDER TO STAY THE OPERATION AND EXECUTION OF THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 01/09/2023 PASSED BY THE LEARNED R2 IN REVISION PETITION NO. 29/2020 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

The petitioners are aggrieved of the impugned order at Annexure-A passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore Urban District, in a proceedings bearing No.RP 29/2020. Earlier the petitioners filed an appeal before the Assistant Commissioner in RA (BNA) 377/2015-16 calling in question the mutation entry made in MR No.1/1992-93 and MR No.2/1992-93. The Assistant Commissioner allowed the appeal and set aside the mutation entries which were made in the year 1992-1993. Being aggrieved of the orders passed by the Assistant Commissioner, the private respondents herein preferred a revision petition



under Section 136(3) of the Act before the Deputy Commissioner. The Deputy Commissioner while noticing the fact that the petitioner's father Late Sri Nanjundappa had executed 2 sale deeds in favour of Sri Honnappa under which the private respondents herein claim and Sri Honnappa acquired right, title and interest in respect of 2 acres in Survey No.3 under registered sale deed dated 26.07.1975 and 1 acre under registered sale deed dated 18.11.1976. It is by virtue of the two registered sale deeds that the mutation entries were earlier made in MR No.1/1992-93 and 2/1992-93. Such being the position, the Deputy Commissioner concluded that the Assistant Commissioner could not have set aside the mutation entries and on the other hand the Assistant Commissioner should have directed the appellant before the Assistant Commissioner to approach a competent civil court to get a declaration of title.

2. Learned Senior Counsel Sri D.R.Ravishankar appearing for the petitioners submits that the facts that



are narrated herein above cannot be disputed. However, it is sought to be contented on behalf of the petitioners that the petitioners' father Sri Nanjundappa did not execute the sale deeds in favour of Sri Honnappa. Learned Senior Counsel submits that the petitioners have already filed O.S.No.513/2020 seeking permanent injunction and similarly the private respondents have also filed a suit in O.S.No.1568/2019 seeking permanent injunction. However, the petitioners are required to reconsider whether such a suit for bare injunction could be maintainable if the petitioners are contending that their father did not execute a sale deed in favour of Sri Honnappa. Be that as it may, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that for the present it would suffice if an entry is made in column No.11 regarding pending suits.

3. It is also not in dispute that the land in question has already been notified and acquired for the purpose of formation of Dr. Shivaramakaranth Layout and the



notifications contain the name of the private respondent and an award also has been passed in the name of Sri Honnappa.

4. Accordingly, the writ petition stands ***disposed of*** affirming the impugned order passed by the Deputy Commissioner. However, the respondent - Tahsildar, Yelahanka Taluk is directed to make an entry in column No.11 regarding the pendency of both the suits.

**Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE**

KLY
CT: JL