



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 38260 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

BETWEEN:

SRI. RAJU
S/O. DYAVAIHA
AGED ABOUT 76 YEARS,
R/O ALLAMPURA, KAIMARA PO,
CHIKKAMAGALUR,
KARNATAKA - 577 133.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ABHIRAJ B. CHENGTI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
THROUGH REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
VIDHANA SOUDHA, BENGALURU,
KARNATAKA -560 001
(THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY)
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
DC OFFICE,
CHIKMAGALUR -577 101.
3. THAHASILDAR,
CHIKMAGALUR TALUK,
CHIKMAGALUR - 577 101.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. V. SESHU, HCGP)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE
IMPUGNED EVICTION NOTICE DATED 10.10.2025 BEARING
NO.TAHCKM-ADMINOMISC/103/25(E-76424) ISSUED BY R3





PRODUCED AT ANNEX-E AS BEING ULTRA VIRES THE OF THE
PROVISION OF KARNATAKA LAND REVENUE ACT, 1964 AND
ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned High Court Government Pleader takes notice for
all the respondents.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is directed towards
the impugned notice at Annexure-E dated 10.10.2025 issued by
the respondent - Tahsildar, Chikkamagaluru Taluk. The Learned
counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has filed
an application seeking lease of 1 acre 10 guntas of land in
Sy.No.25 of Allampura Village, Chikkamagaluru Taluk and
District in terms of Section 94E of the Karnataka Land Revenue
Act, 1964 (for short 'the Act, 1964'). The petitioner has made
one more application in the year 2024 for the same purpose
and no orders have been passed by the competent authority till
date. However the impugned notice has been issued by the
Tahsildar despite the petitioner awaiting consideration of his
application and it was impermissible for the Tahsildar to have



issued the impugned notice calling upon the petitioner to vacate the lands in question.

3. There is sufficient force in the submission of the learned counsel for petitioner. Unless the applications filed by the petitioner under Section 94E of the Act, 1964 for lease of the lands in question are considered by the competent authority and orders are passed, the Tahsildar could not have issued the impugned notice.

Consequently, the writ petition is ***allowed***. The impugned notice at Annexure - E dated 10.10.2025 issued by respondent No.3-Tahsildar, Chikkamagaluru Taluk is hereby quashed and set aside. Directions are also issued to respondent No.3 - Tahsildar to place the applications of the petitioner before the Committee for regularisation of unauthorised occupation within a period of 6 weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. The Committee shall thereafter consider the applications and pass necessary orders as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of 2 months from the date on which the application would be placed before the Committee.



NC: 2026:KHC:11046
WP No. 38260 of 2025

Needless to observe that until such orders are passed by the competent authority, no precipitative actions shall be taken against the petitioner for eviction.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

GPG
List No.: 1 SI No.: 34
CT-SG