



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 36453 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. SRINIVAS P
S/O LATE PAPANNA,
AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS,
R/AT "VENKATESHWARA NILAYA",
JYOTHI NAGAR,
OPPOSITE K.E.B. OFFICE,
SIRA TOWN, SIRA,
TUMAKURU DISTRICT - 572 132.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. BHUVAN K.P, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
M.S.BUILDING, DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU - 560 001
REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY.
2. THE TAHSILDAR
SIRA TALUK, SIRA - 572 137
TUMAKURU DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. NAVYA SHEKHAR, AGA FOR R1 AND R2;
SRI. GOUTHAM K.V, ADVOCATE AND
SRI. VIVEK S, ADVOCATE FOR R3)





THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE IMPUGNED NOTICE DATED 24.11.2025 IN NO. LAQ/CR/07/2025-26 ISSUED BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT- THE TAHSILDAR, SIRA TALUK, SIRA, TUMAKURU DISTRICT, PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-N TO THE WRIT PETITION, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY 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 grievance of the petitioner is directed towards the impugned notice at Annexure-N dated 24.11.2025 issued by the Tahsildar, Sira Taluk. Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out from the reference in the notice that at the request of the local MLA, the notice has been issued alleging that the petitioner has encroached upon 30 guntas of land belonging to respondent No.3-Taluk Agriculture Produce Co-operative Marketing Society Ltd. This court, while passing an interim order of stay on 02.12.2025, has noticed that if there is an illegal encroachment into the neighbouring property, then the



aggrieved person is required to approach the Civil Court, but cannot move the Tahsildar.

2. Admittedly, the land does not belong to the government. There is a dispute between the petitioner and the respondent No.3-Society. That being the admitted position, the Tahsildar could not have interfered to issue notice and try to remove the encroachment at the hands of the petitioner. The remedy available for respondent No.3 is to approach a competent Civil Court to redress its grievance.

3. Consequently, the writ petition is **allowed** while quashing the impugned notice at Annexure-N dated 24.11.2025 issued by the respondent-Tahsildar, Sira Taluk. As noticed hereinabove, liberty is, however, reserved to respondent No.3 to redress its grievance in a manner known to law.

Ordered accordingly.

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