



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 23<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 32052 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)**

**BETWEEN:**

1. SMT THIMAKKA  
W/O LATE ARASIAH,  
AGED ABOUT 81 YEARS,
2. SRI.BYREGOWDA,  
S/O LATE ARASIAH,  
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
3. SRI.RAMAKRISHNA,  
S/O LATE ARASIAH,  
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
4. SRI.MUNIYAPPA,  
S/O LATE ARASIAH,  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
5. SRI.DUGLAIAH,  
S/O LATE ARASIAH,  
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,  
ALL ARE R/A KITTANAHALLI VILLAGE,  
DASNAPURA HOBLI,  
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK,  
BENGALURU-562130.



...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. CHIDANANDA P., ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA  
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,  
VIDHANA SOUDHA,



BENGALURU-560001,  
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY

2. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER  
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT  
KANDHAYA BHAVAN, K.G. ROAD,  
BENGALURU-56009.
3. TAHSILDAR JACKET  
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK,  
BENGALURU-560036.
4. KARNATAKA SLUM DEVELOPMENT BOARD  
NO. 55, 3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR, ABHAYA COMPLEX,  
RISALDAR STREET, SESHADRIPURAM,  
BANGALORE - 560020  
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN
5. PUTTAMMA  
W/O.MUDDANARASIMHAIAH  
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
6. LATHA  
W/o GANGAIAH  
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
7. MAHESH  
S/O KEMPANNA  
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
8. SHOBA  
W/O BHASKAR  
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
9. MANJULA  
S/o LATE HARISH  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
10. LAKSHMI  
W/O GANGADHAR  
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
11. H. NARSHIMA  
S/O NARSAPPA



AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS

12. YALLAMMA  
S/O MANAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS
13. MANJULA.A.M  
W/O DINESH  
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
14. MANAMMA  
W/O HANUMANTHAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
15. ROOJA  
D/O KRISHNAMURTHY  
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS
16. SUSHILA  
D/O NANJAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
17. NAGARTHNAMMA  
W/O NANJAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
18. KIRAN  
S/O KRISHNAMURTHY  
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
19. YASHODHA  
W/O CHANNABHOVI  
AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS
20. ANANDA  
S/O HANUMATHAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
21. MANJU  
S/O H.M.NARAYANA  
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
22. NAGAMMA  
W/O NARAYANA



- AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
23. LAKSHMANA  
S/O THIMMAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
24. JAYALAKSHMI  
W/O LAKSHMANA  
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
25. GNANENDRA  
S/O VENKTESHAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS
26. DINESH  
S/O NANJAPPA  
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
27. BASAVARAJU  
S/O NANJEGOWDA  
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS,
28. CHANNAPA  
S/O CHANNABOVI  
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS
29. PUSHPA  
W/O SATHISHA  
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS  
ALL ARE R/AT ASHRAYA NAGARA  
PEENYA 1<sup>ST</sup> STAGE  
BENGALURU – 560 058

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.V.SESHU., HCGP FOR R1 TO R3  
SRI.B.N.SURESH BABU., ADVOCATE FOR R4  
SRI. P.H.VIRUPAKSHAIAH., ADVCOATE FOR IMPEADING  
R5 TO R29)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 & 227 OF THE  
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE WRIT IN THE  
NATURE OF CERTIORARI QUASHING THE IMPUGNED OFFICIAL  
MEMORANDUM DATED 13.12.2024 ISSUED BY RESPONDENT  
NO.2 AT ANNEXURE-A AND ISSUE A WRIT IN NATURE OF



MANDAMUS DIRECTING THE RESPONDENT NO.3 TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATION DATED 15.03.2024 AT ANNEXURE-G ENTERING THE NAME OF THE PETITIONERS IN REVENUE RECORDS WITH RESPECT TO PROPERTY BEARING SY.NO.80, MEASURING 9 ACRES, SITUATED AT GIDDENAHALLI GRAMA, DASANAPURA HOBLI, BENGALURU NORTH TALUK, BENGALURU AND ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

**ORAL ORDER**

The petitioners are aggrieved by the impugned rectified Official Memorandum dated 13.12.2024 at Annexure 'A' passed by the respondent-Deputy Commissioner, Bengaluru Urban District, Bengaluru.

2. It is the contention of the petitioners that by the impugned Official Memorandum, the Deputy Commissioner has reserved 2 acres 20 guntas of land in Sy.No.80 of Giddenahalli Village, Dasanpura Hobli, Bangalore North Taluk, for the benefit of the Karnataka Slum Development Board. It is the contention of the petitioners that the land in question belongs to the petitioners, having regard to the fact that the re-grant was made at the hands of the



Special Deputy Commissioner under the provisions of The Mysore (Personal and Miscellaneous) Inams Abolition Act, 1954. It is pointed out to Annexure 'B' which is the order said to have been passed by the Special Deputy Commissioner in proceedings bearing No.57/1957-58, where 9 acres of land in Sy.No.80 of Giddenahalli Village is re-granted in favour of Sri Byraiah, S/o Duggaiah, who is none other than the father-in-law of the first petitioner and grandfather of the other petitioners. The petitioners have furnished handwritten RTCs of the year 1968-1969 to 1993-1994 reflecting the name of Sri Byraiah, S/o Duggaiah in column Nos.9 and 12(2). However, in the latest RTC, in column No.9 it is written as 'Sarkari Gomala'.

3. During the course of these proceedings, since contradictory statements were coming from the side of the petitioners and the respondent-state, this Court called for the original records from the Office of the Special Deputy



Commissioner, Inams abolition and accordingly the original records were brought before this Court.

4. On 16.02.2026, the following order was passed, noticing the contents of the original records:

*"Learned High Court Government Pleader has today brought before this Court the original records from the office of the Deputy Commissioner, the competent authority who has considered the applications said to have been filed by Sri Byraiah S/o Duggaiah, who sought for regrant of the lands under the provisions of the Mysore (Personal and Miscellaneous) Inams Abolition Act, 1954.*

*It is pointed out that in the order dated 04.07.1958 in case No.57/1956-57, the occupancy rights are conferred in favour of the said Byraiah in respect of Sy.No.85 measuring 5 acres 5 guntas and on the other hand, the application filed in respect of Sy.No.80 has been rejected on the ground that the said lands are gomal lands. The learned HCGP is also required to furnish the original of Annexure 'C' which is produced by the petitioners along with the writ petition.*

*The learned High Court Government Pleader submits that if the said order passed on 04.07.1958 is genuine, then it was impermissible for the Deputy Commissioner to pass one more order granting the lands to the applicant in Sy.No.80. The learned HCGP has also furnished the original mutation register before this court, where the entry in MR No.152/1962-63 is found, although it contains the name of Sri Byraiah, while referring to order dated 05.08.1958 in a case bearing No.INA/57/57-58.*



*Nevertheless, in the last column, where the inspecting officer's remarks are to be stated, it is left blank and whereas in respect of the other grantees, RR number is clearly quoted. It is also seen that in column No.7 the handwriting and signature is very different from the other entries and the ink also differs.*

*Nevertheless, this Court required the respondent authorities to state as to from which date and why the name of Sri Byraiah was discontinued from the revenue records. Learned HCGP submits that the proceedings were initiated and the same is pending consideration till date.*

*At this juncture, at the request of learned counsel for petitioners, re-list these matters on 23.02.2026.*

*Since the original records have been furnished, the presence of the respondent-Tahsildar, Bengaluru North Taluk is dispensed with.*

*Interim orders granted earlier stand extended till the next date of hearing.*

*Learned Counsel Sri M. Srinivas submits that he has filed an impleading application in the connected writ petition in W.P.No.23830/2025.*

*Office is directed to put up the same."*

5. Today again, the learned counsel for petitioners seeks to contend that what is found at Annexure 'B' is the genuine order said to have been passed by the Special Deputy Commissioner, re-granting 9 acres of land in



Sy.No.80 of Giddenahalli Village in favour of Sri Byraiah, son of Duggaiah.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for petitioners, the learned High Court Government Pleader and the learned counsel for the respondent-Board and on perusing the petition papers, including the original records as noted hereinabove, this Court is of the considered opinion that when this Court has looked into the original records and it is clear that in the order passed by the Special Deputy Commissioner, 5 acres and 5 guntas in Sy.No.85 have been re-granted in favour of Sri Byraiah and insofar as Sy.No.80 is concerned, it is clearly stated that since it is a gomal reserved land, the claim of the applicant is rejected and the detailed reasons are given in Case No.42 of the same Village, this Court need not look any further. Question of permitting another enquiry to be held by another officer would not arise. This Court having satisfied itself that the claim of the petitioners insofar as Sy. No.80 is concerned is not supported by any orders said to have



been passed by the Special Deputy Commissioner conferring the lands in favour of Sri Byraiah, the claim of the petitioners in that regard is required to be rejected and is accordingly rejected. The respondent-Board is permitted to proceed in terms of the grant made by the Special Deputy Commissioner.

7. For the reasons stated above, the writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

8. In view of the disposal of the writ petition, impleading application in I.A.No.1/2025 does not survive for consideration and accordingly the same stands disposed of.

All other pending I.As., also stand disposed of.

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

JT/-  
CT: JL