



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE K.S.HEMALEKHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 102465 OF 2025 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

PUTTAPPA S/O. DYAMAPPA NARTI
AGE: 65 YEARS, OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O. SHIGGAON, TQ: SHIGGAON,
DIST: HAVERI-581110.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. D.M.MALLI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MANTESH S/O. NINGAPPA MALLADAD
AGE: 50 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS,
R/O. SHIGGAON, TQ: SHIGGAON,
DIST: HAVERI-581205/581110.
2. BASAVARAJ S/O. NINGAPPA MALLADAD
AGE: 48 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS,
R/O. SHIGGAON, TQ: SHIGGAON,
DIST: HAVERI-581205/581110.
3. MAHESH S/O. NINGAPPA MALLADAD
AGE: 46 YEARS, OCC: BUSINESS,
R/O. SHIGGAON, TQ: SHIGGAON,
DIST: HAVERI-581205/581110.
4. MALLAMMA @ MALLAVVA
W/O. NINGAPNA MALLADAD,
AGE: 65 YEARS, OCC: HOUSEWIFE,





R/O. SHIGGAON, TQ: SHIGGAON,
DIST: HAVERI-581205/581110.

5. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER SAVANUR
SUB-DIVISION SAVANUR,
TQ: SHIGGAON,
DIST: HAVERI-581110.
6. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER HAVERI
TQ: HAVERI,
DIST: HAVERI-581110.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. NANDINI B.SOMAPUR, AGA FOR R5 AND R6)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI, QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.6-DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, HAVERI, IN RTS RA CR BEARING NO.25/2023-24 DATED 05.06.2024 VIDE ANNEXURE-A, AND ALLOW THE APPEAL FILED BY THE PETITIONER BY SETTING ASIDE ORDER PASSED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.5/ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER SAVANUR IN RTS AP:SR-16/2009-10 DATED 03.07.2023, VIDE ANNEXURE-G AND ETC.

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

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE K.S.HEMALEKHA



ORAL ORDER

The petitioner has called in question the order dated 05.06.2024 passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Haveri, in RTS RA CR bearing No.25/2023-24, whereby the revision preferred by the petitioner came to be dismissed, confirming the order dated 03.07.2023 passed by the Assistant Commissioner, Savanur, relating to the Mutation Entry No.157/2008-09 in respect of the land bearing RS Nos.224/3A and 224/3B of Shiggaon Taluk.

2. **Brief facts;**

The dispute pertains to a Mutation Entry No.157/2008-09 standing in the names of respondent Nos.1 to 3. The said mutation is based on a registered sale deed executed in their favour. The petitioner claims possession and asserts that the sale deed and the GPA relied upon by respondent Nos.1 to 3 are bogus and do not confer any right.

3. Earlier, the Assistant Commissioner had set aside the mutation entry. However, upon remand by the Deputy Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioner after reconsideration, confirmed the mutation entry by order dated 03.07.2023. The



revision petition filed by the petitioner against the said order was dismissed by the Deputy Commissioner on 05.06.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has approached this Court in this writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the mutation entry in favour of respondent Nos.1 to 3 is based on a bogus sale deed and a GPA, which do not relate to the survey numbers in question. It is submitted that the authorities have failed to consider the compromise decree passed in RA No.178/2017, wherein the parties have settled the dispute. It is contended that the revenue authorities have exceeded their jurisdiction by recognizing rights of respondent Nos.1 to 3, despite the serious dispute raised by the petitioner regarding the title. It is contended that the impugned orders are arbitrary and liable to be quashed.

5. Learned Additional Government Advocate for respondents-State submits that the revenue authorities are justified in maintaining the mutation pursuant to a registered sale deed until the document of title is set aside by a competent Court.



6. This Court has carefully considered the contentions urged and perused the material on records.

7. It is not in dispute that the entry of the names of respondent Nos.1 to 3 in the revenue records is based on a registered sale deed. Though, the petitioner vehemently contends that the said sale deed and GPA are bogus, the undisputed fact remains that neither the said sale deed, nor the GPA has been set aside by any competent Civil Court.

8. It is well settled that the revenue authorities cannot adjudicate upon the validity of a registered document of title. As long as a registered instrument subsists, the mutation entry flowing from such document cannot be faulted, unless the same is annulled in appropriate civil proceedings. The reliance placed by the petitioner on the compromise decree in RA No.178/2017 also does not advance the case of the petitioner. A careful reading of the compromise decree makes it clear that the proceedings arose out of an injunction suit, wherein the parties merely agreed for mutual non-interference in possession, such compromise does not conclusively determine ownership or title of the property. The decree neither declares a title in favour of



the petitioner nor invalidates the sale deed relied upon by respondent Nos.1 to 3.

9. In view of the matter, the revenue authorities were justified in holding that the compromise decree cannot be the basis to unsettle a mutation entry supported by a registered document. The Deputy Commissioner has rightly observed that the scope and proceedings under the Karnataka Land Revenue Act is limited and does not extend to the adjudication of title disputes. Therefore, this Court finds that the impugned orders do not suffer from illegality, perversity or jurisdictional error warranting any interference.

10. In the absence of any declaration by a competent Civil Court, setting aside the sale deed or the GPA relied upon by the respondent Nos.1 to 3, no grounds have been made out to interfere with the impugned orders. Accordingly, writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
JUSTICE K.S.HEMALEKHA