IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE K.S.HEMALEKHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 104859 OF 2021 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

SMT. MAHADEVI W/O. NINGAPPA CHIKODI
AGE: 41 YEARS, OCC: HOUSEHOLD WORK
AND AGRICULTURE, R/O. DONAWAD,
TQ: CHIKODI, DIST: BELAGAVI.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. SHIVRAJ S. BALLOLI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
VIDHAN SOUDHA,
AMBEDKAR VEEDHI
BANGALURU-560001.

2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
BELAGAVI, D.C. COMPOUND, BELAGAVI.

3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
CHIKODI SUB-DIVISION,
CHIKODI, BELAGAVI.

4. THE TAHSILDAR RAIBAG
TQ: RAIBAG, DIST: BELAGAVI.

5. SHRI. PARIS KEDARI KHICHADE
AGE: 66 YEARS, OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O. RAIBAG, TQ: RAIBAG, DIST: BELAGAVI.

6. SHRI. SURESH @ RAJU PARIS KHICHADE
AGE: 65 YEARS, OCC: AGRICULTURE,

R/O. KHATAKABHAVI, TAL: RAIBAG,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

7. THE VILLAGE ACCOUTANT
RAIBAG TQ: RAIBAG, DIST: BELAGAVI.

8. THE REVENUE INSPECTOR RAIBAG
TQ: RAIBAG, DIST: BELAGAVI.

9. SHRI. GANGAPPA RAMAPPA GHANTI
AGE: 40 YEARS, OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O. BEKKERI, TQ: RAIBAG,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

10. SHRI. RAMESH RAMAPPA GHANTI
AGE: MAJOR, OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O. BEKKERI, TQ: RAIBAG,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

11. SHRI. LAGAMANNA RAMAPPA GHANTI
AGE: MAJOR, OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O. BEKKERI, TQ: RAIBAG,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

12. SHRI. VITHAL RAMAPPA GHANTI
AGE: MAJOR, OCC: AGRICULTURE,
R/O. BEKKERI, TQ: RAIBAG,
DIST: BELAGAVI.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. NANDINI B. SOMAPUR, AGA FOR R1 TO R4, R7 AND R8;
SRI. BAHUBALI DANAWADE AND SRI. I.Y. PATIL, ADVOCATES
FOR C/R9 TO R12)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI OR OF ANY OTHER NATURE QUASHING THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 16/09/2021 PASSED BY RESPONDENT NO.2/DEPUTY COMMISSIONER IN RB/RTA.NO.149/2014-15 VIDE ANNEXURE-L; AND ETC.

THIS WRIT PETITION IS COMING ON FOR ORDER 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 16.09.2021, passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Belgavi under Section 136 (3) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1961 ('Act' for short), whereby the revision petition filed by the respondent Nos.9 to 12 came to be allowed and mutation entries were directed to be effected in their names based on a registered sale deed dated 12.11.2010.

2. During the pendency of the present writ petition, the petitioner filed a memo seeking disposal of the writ petition on the ground that R.S.A.No.6150/2010 and the connected M.S.A were compromised between the petitioner and respondent Nos.5 and 6 and therefore mutation entry ought to stand annulled.

3. Respondent Nos.9 to 12, who are the purchasers under the registered sale deed have opposed the memo contending that they are not parties to the compromise proceedings and the compromise decree cannot bind them.

It is further contended that the mutations are rightly ordered on the basis of the registered sale deed and that the revenue authorities are bound to reflect such conveyance in the revenue record.

4. It is placed on record that when a matter was listed for further hearing, an attempt was made on behalf of the petitioner to engage another counsel and to file a fresh vakalath. This Court did not permit such filing, at that stage, since the matter had already been heard substantially and the arguments were concluded and this Court deemed it inappropriate to reopen the matter or allow substitution of a counsel so as to alter the course of proceedings. The request was therefore not entertained and the matter has been disposed of on the basis of the submission already advanced.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order of the Deputy Commissioner is illegal and without jurisdiction. It is submitted that in view of the

compromise in R.S.A.No.6150/2010 and connected MSA, between the petitioner and respondent Nos.5 and 6, the writ petition needs to be disposed of in terms of the memo filed. It is further contended that the mutations ought not to have been directed in favour of respondent Nos.9 to 12 as civil disputes were pending.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent Nos.9 to 12 contended that they are the *bona fide* purchasers under registered sale deed dated 12.11.2010. The compromise decree relied upon by the petitioners are entered into between the petitioner and respondent Nos.5 and 6 and that they are not parties to the said proceedings and cannot affect the rights of the purchasers. It is submitted that the revenue authorities are bound to mutate entries based on a registered sale deed and cannot adjudicate title. It is further submitted that suit filed by respondent No.5 has already been dismissed and civil proceedings relied upon by the petitioner do not invalidate the registered sale deed.

7. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the material on record.

8. The compromise in R.S.A.No.6150/2010 and connected MSA are entered into between the petitioner and respondent Nos.5 and 6. Admittedly, respondent Nos.9 to 12 were not parties to the said proceedings and the compromise decree operates only between the parties who have entered into it and cannot bind third parties and hence the contention of the petitioner that the writ petition has to be disposed of on the basis of the memo relying upon such compromise cannot be accepted.

9. The mutation entry in favour of respondent Nos.9 to 12 is based on a registered sale deed dated 12.11.2010. The revenue authorities are required to reflect transactions evidenced by a registered conveyance. The suit proceeding initiated by respondent No.5 has also been dismissed. The compromise subsequently entered into between certain parties does not invalidate the registered sale deed, nor

does it nullify the mutation affected pursuant thereto. The Deputy Commissioner has rightly interfered with the order of the Assistant Commissioner and directed mutation based on the registered instrument. No jurisdictional error or perversity is demonstrated.

10. For the foregoing reasons, this Court holds that the impugned order passed by the Deputy Commissioner dated 16.09.2021 does not warrant any interference. Accordingly, this Court pass the following:

ORDER

The writ petition is hereby ***dismissed***.

Pending applications and memos do not survive for consideration.

Sd/-

JUSTICE K.S.HEMALEKHA

AT
CT:VH
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 46