



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD
DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026
BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI M
WRIT PETITION NO. 104016 OF 2018 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

SHRI. SHANKRAPPA
S/O NINGAPPA BADIGER,
AGE: 33 YEARS,
OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O: MAREWAD,
TQ. AND DIST: DHARWAD.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI.D.V.PATTAR, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. ANAND.R.KOLLI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO
THE REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S. BUILDING, BENGALURU.
2. THE CHIEF OFFICER,
TOWN MUNICIPAL CORPORATION,
MUNAVALLI-591 117,
TQ: SAUNDATTI,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.P.N.HATTI, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. M.B.HIREMATH, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227
OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, SEEKING CERTAIN RELIEFS.

THIS WRIT PETITION IS LISTED FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN
'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, AN ORDER IS MADE AS UNDER:



ORAL ORDER

Sri.D.V.Pattar., counsel for the petitioner, Sri.P.N.Hatti., HCGP for respondent No.1-State and Sri.M.B.Hiremath., counsel for respondent No.2 have appeared in person.

2. The Writ petition is filed seeking the following reliefs:

"a) Issue a writ of in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned endorsement dated 01.07.2017 passed by respondent No.2 authority, the same is herewith produced and marked as Annexure-"F".

b) Issue a nature of mandamus directing the respondent No.2 authority to enter the name of the petitioner in respect of the property No.114/100 by virtue of registered sale deed dated 24.08.2012 at Munavali, Tq:Savandatti vide Annexure-"A" in the interest of justice and equity."

3. The petitioner contends that he has purchased the subject land under a registered sale deed from one Mr. Irappa Ranchappa Ganamukhi. Pursuant to the said sale deed, he approached the concerned authority seeking mutation of his name in the property records. However, his request was rejected by Respondent No. 2 on the ground that the petitioner's vendor



had no valid title to execute the sale deed. It was also observed that an official of Respondent No. 2 had created certain documents, and appropriate action has been taken against the erring official.

4. Sri.M.B.Hiremath, counsel for Respondent No. 2, while advancing his arguments, strenuously submits that there exists a serious dispute with regard to the question of title and, therefore, justifies the action of Respondent No. 2 in issuing the impugned endorsement.

5. Heard the arguments and perused the records with care.

6. The petitioner claims title to the property, whereas Respondent No. 2 seriously disputes the same. It is well settled that disputed questions of title cannot be adjudicated in a writ petition. Hence, no grounds are made out to quash the endorsement vide Annexure-F. The petitioner is at liberty to agitate his grievance before the appropriate forum, if so advised and if permissible in law.



**NC: 2026:KHC-D:4503
WP No. 104016 of 2018**

7. With above observations, the writ petition is
dismissed.

**Sd/-
(JYOTI M)
JUDGE**

AM/-
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 18