



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026

**BEFORE
THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE K.S.HEMALEKHA**

WRIT PETITION NO.109473 OF 2025 (LB-RES)

BETWEEN:

1. BALAKRISHNA PANDURANGA NAYAK
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,
OCC: AGRICULTURE AND BUSINESS,
R/O. HADIBAVI GALLI, YELLAPUR-581359,
UTTARA KANNADA DISTRICT.
2. SAI RAM S/O. SHRINIVASRAO JASTI
AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCC: SERVICE,
3. AMRUTA W/O. SAI RAM JASTI
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS, OCC: SERVICE,

BOTH ARE R/O. #4-95/6B, NTR STREET,
NAVEENA RESTAURANT, NARAKODURU,
GUNTUR, ANDHRA PRADESH.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. ARUNACHAL P.HEGDE JANMANE, ADVOCATE)

AND:

CHIEF OFFICER
PATTAN PANCHAYAT,
YELLAPUR-581359, U.K.DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. DINESH M.KULKARNI, ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227
OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO QUASH THE
IMPUGNED ENDORSEMENT BEARING NO.ಪ.ಪಂ.ಯ:ತೆವಿ:ವಿವ:ವಿವ:2025-





26/207 DATED 13.06.2025 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT (ANNEXURE-D) AND TO DIRECT RESPONDENT TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE REGISTERED SALE DEED DATED 23.03.2025 AND ENTER THE NAME OF PURCHASERS IN FORM NO.3 PERTAINING TO P.I.D.NO.24-530-212 SITUATED IN KALMATH AREA OF YELLAPUR PATTAN PANCHYAT, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

The petitioners have called in question the impugned endorsement dated 13.06.2025 (Annexure-D) issued by the respondent-Pattan Panchayat, Yellapur, whereby the request made by the petitioner Nos.2 and 3 entering their names in Form No.3 pertaining to P.I.D. No.24-530-212, situated in the Kalmath area, Yellapur Pattan Panchayat, is rejected on the ground that a civil dispute is pending in O.S. No.15/2025 and F.D.P.No.5/2019.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner Nos.2 and 3 have purchased the schedule property from petitioner No.1 under a registered sale deed



dated 23.03.2025 in Form No.3. Pursuant thereto, an application was filed seeking to mutation/entry of their names in revenue records, the said application came to be rejected on the sole ground that a civil suit and a Final Decree Proceedings (FDP) are pending adjudication. It is contended that the rejection is untenable, particularly when O.S.No.15/2025 was instituted subsequent to the execution of the registered sale deed and therefore could not have a valid ground to refuse entry.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent seeks to justify the endorsement by contending that since a civil dispute is pending *inter se* between parties, the authorities were justified to enter the name of the purchaser as any such entry would be subject to the outcome of the civil proceedings.

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



5. It is not in dispute that petitioner Nos.2 and 3 have purchased the schedule property under a registered sale deed dated 23.03.2025. It is also not in dispute that the civil suit in O.S. No.15/2025 has been instituted after execution of the said sale deed. The Competent authority cannot refuse to act upon registered documents. Mutation entry in Form No.3 is essentially a fiscal and administrative act which neither confers nor extinguishes title, and such entry would invariably remained subject to the final outcome of the civil proceedings.

6. The endorsement impugned herein therefore, cannot be sustained.

7. Accordingly, this Court pass the following:

ORDER

- i. The writ petition is ***allowed***.



- ii. The impugned endorsement dated 13.06.2025 issued by respondent (Annexure-D), is hereby ***quashed.***

- iii. The respondent is directed to enter the names of petitioner Nos.2 and 3 in Form No.3 pursuant to the registered sale deed dated 23.03.2025 in respect of the schedule property, and it is made clear that such entry shall be subject to the final outcome of O.S. No.15/2025.

**Sd/-
JUSTICE K.S.HEMALEKHA**

AM/-
Ct:VH
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 47