



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF APRIL 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.M.SHYAM PRASAD

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR

CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION NO.100416 OF 2025

C/W

WRIT APPEAL NO.100376 OF 2025 (KLR-RES)

IN CCC NO.100416/2025:

BETWEEN:

VALLURI SATYANARAYANA S/O. SURYARAO
AGE: 66 YEARS, OCC: RETD. EMPLOYEE
AND AGRICULTURIST,
R/O. FLAT NO.201, REDDY SURYA RESIDENCY,
NEAR BOBBA VIJAYALAXMI HOSPITAL,
ALAMUT ROAD MANDAPATA TOWNM
EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT,
ANDHRA PRADESH-533308.
(NOW AT C/O. T.SHRIDHAR, PIONEER LAKE,
DEW RESIDENCY, PLOT NO.67, GATTAHALLI,
SARJAPUR TALUKA, BENGALURU-560099)

...COMPLAINANT

(BY SRI. M.L.VANTI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MR. PRAMOD P
THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
OFFICE OF ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
BELLARI-583101.





2. MR. MANJUNATH NAYAK,
THE TAHASILDAR,
OFFICE OF TAHASILDAR,
KAMPLI-583201.

3. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
PRO-FORMA PORTS, REPTD. BY H.G.C.P.,
DHARWAD-580022.

...ACCUSED

(BY SRI. SHARAD V.MAGADUM, AGA)

THIS CIVIL CONTEMPT PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTIONS 11 AND 12 OF THE CONTEMPT OF COURTS ACT, 1971, R/W. ARTICLE 215 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, 1950, PLEASED TO, SECURE THE PRESENCE OF THE ACCUSED, INITIATE CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AND PUNISH THEM FOR HAVING COMMITTED CONTEMPT OF THE ORDER DATED 21/08/2025 PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN W.P. NO.106012/2025 PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE; AND ETC.

IN WA NO.100376 OF 2025:

BETWEEN:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S.BUILDING, BENGALURU-560009.

2. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER,
HOSAPETE-583201.

3. THE TAHASILDAR
OFFICE OF THE TAHASILDAR,
HOSAPETE-583201.



4. THE TAHASILDAR
OFFICE OF THE TAHASILDAR,
KAMPLI-583132.

...APPELLANTS

(BY SRI. SHARAD V.MAGADUM, AGA)

AND:

SRI. VALLURI SATYANARAYANA
S/O. SURYARAO,
AGE: 65 YEARS, OCC: RTD. EMPLOYEE
AND AGRICULTURIST,
R/O. SRIYA RESIDENCE, FLAT NO.201,
REDDY SURYA RAO NAGAR,
NEAR BOBBA VIJAYALAKSHMI HOSPITAL,
ALAMUR ROAD MANDAPETE TOWN,
EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT,
ANDRA PRADESH-533308.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. M.L.VANTI, ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED U/S.4 OF KARNATAKA
HIGH COURT ACT, 1961, PRAYING THIS HON'BLE
COURT TO, CALL FOR RECORDS; SET ASIDE THE
JUDGMENT DATED 09.03.2021 PASSED BY THE
LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN W.P.NO.100863/2021
(KLR-RES), AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.M.SHYAM PRASAD
AND
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR



ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.M.SHYAM PRASAD)

The complainant is successful in his writ petition in WP No.100863 of 2021, which is filed as against the second appellants' Order dated 24.04.2020 under the erstwhile provisions of Sections 79A and 79B of the Karnataka Land Reforms Act, 1961 [*Act' for short*]. The appellants, in compliance with the Order dated 09.03.2021, will have to restore the revenue entries for the following lands in favour of the complainant.

Sl. No.	Sy. Numbers	Extent of the properties
1.	Sy.No.99/*/1	Measuring 1 acre 48 cents
1.	Sy.No.99/*/2	Measuring 1 acre 96 cents
3.	Sy.No.99/*/A	Measuring 1 acre 48 cents
4.	Sy.No.99/*/B	Measuring 1 acre 96 cents
5.	Sy.No.99/*/3	Measuring 33 cents
6.	Sy.No.99/*/D	Measuring 33 cents
7.	Sy.No.97/*/A	Measuring 9 cents
8.	Sy.No.98/*/A	Measuring 30 cents as per registered sale deed dated 10.06.2016 situated at Aralihali



		village Kampli Circle, Kampli Taluk, Ballary District.
--	--	--

2. The complainant alleges deliberate disobedience in refusal to restore the revenue entries for these subject properties. The appellants are aggrieved by the writ Court's directions to restore the revenue entries for the subject lands based on the opinion that the appellant will have the benefit of the omission of Sections 79A, 79B and 79C of the Act. The appellant proposes to assert that the Complainant had not called in question the Assistant Commissioner's Order dated 24.04.2020 as of the date of the omission [*within 13.07.2020*].

3. Sri Sharad V. Magadum, a learned Additional Government Advocate, submits that this Court must intervene with the writ Court's Order because the complainant cannot be extended the benefit of the omission unless he had called in question the Assistant Commissioner's Order dated



24.04.2020 and such statutory appeal was pending as of the date of the omission. The learned Additional Government Advocate also seeks to elaborate on the reasons for condonation of delay in filing the appeal.

4. However, this Court is not persuaded on the merits because, it would be open to the complainant to demonstrate that the statutory appeal remedy was not foreclosed because the Assistant Commissioner's Order is dated 24.04.2020 and that the appellant would be entitled to seek exclusion of the time taken by the Office of the Assistant Commissioner in furnishing the certified copies and also show cause if there were to be any short delay. The window of time is only between 24.04.2020 and 13.07.2020. This Court concludes that the outcome in favour of the complainant is not unjust or unreasonable in the circumstances. As such, the writ appeal along with the application for condonation of delay [and other applications] must be disposed of.



5. Insofar as the complaint of deliberate disobedience, it would suffice for this Court to observe that the authorities must have reasonable time to ensure the revenue entries for the subject properties are restored consequent to this Court's Order in the appeal before there could be any allegations of deliberate disobedience with the appellants having called in question the writ Court's directions. Hence, the following:

ORDER

The writ appeal and all the pending applications are ***rejected*** and the complaint stands ***disposed of*** reserving liberty to the complainant to file a certified copy of this Order with the fourth and second respondents within a period of four [4] weeks from the date of the receipt of a certified copy calling upon the afore respondents to ensure that the revenue entries are restored in favour of the



appellant for the subject lands within the next three [3] months.

It is needless to observe that with this specific direction, if there is any failure, the complainant will have to file a fresh complaint.

Sd/-
(B.M.SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR)
JUDGE