



HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

R

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 24112 OF 2018 (KLR-RES)

C/W

WRIT PETITION NO. 39150 OF 2016 (KLR-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 39151 OF 2016 (KLR-RES)

WRIT PETITION NO. 24113 OF 2018 (KLR-RR/SUR)

IN WP No. 24112/2018

BETWEEN:

STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP BY THE TAHSILDAR,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK
KANDAYA BHAVAN,
BENGALURU-560 009.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. I. THARANATHA POOJARY, AAG FOR
SRI. V. SESHU, HCGP)

AND:

1. THE SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU DISTRICT,
BENGALURU – 560 009.
2. SHRI. CHIKKADODDAIAH
S/O LATE DODDAIAH, MAJOR
PILLAHALLI VILLAGE,
DASANAPURA HOBLI – 562 123.
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK





NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

SINCE DEAD REPRESENTED BY LR's

- 2(a) MR. C RAJANNA
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
- 2(b) MR. C. LAKSHMANA
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS
- 2(c) MRS. LAKSHMAMMA
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
- 2(d) MR. NAGARAJU
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS
- 2(e) MRS. NARAYANAMMA
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDING AT BADAKNAPALYA
PILLAHALLI DHAKALE, HUSKUR POST
DASANAPURA HOBLI, BANGALORE NORTH TALUK

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHAMANTH NAIK, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. UDAY HOLLA, SR. ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. S. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2(A) TO (E).

THIS WP FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE IMPUGNED
ORDER DATED 22.09.2010 PASSED BY THE SPECIAL DEPUTY
COMMISSIONER, BENGALURU DISTRICT BEARING NO.RRT(2)
(N) CR/18/2010-11 VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

IN WP NO. 39150/2016

BETWEEN:

SRINIVASMURTHY.R
S/O LATE RAMAIAH
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
R/AT HONNADANDRA VILLAGE
MATTHAHALLI POST
DASANPURA HOBLI
BANGALORE NORTH

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. UDAY HOLLA, SR. ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. S. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
TO GOVT. REVENUE DEPARTMENT
M S BUILDINGS,
BANGALORE – 560 001.
2. THE JOINT DIRECTOR OF LAND RECORDS
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
BANGALORE – 560 001.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE NORTH DISTRICT
BANGALORE – 560 002.
4. THE TAHASILDAR
BANGALORE NORTH DISTRICT
BANGALORE – 560 002.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. I. THARANATHA POOJARY, AAG FOR
SRI. V. SESHU, HCGP)



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

THIS WRIT PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE ORDER DATED 18.06.2016 BEARING NO.RRT(BN) CR 60 / 16-17 PASSED BY 3RD RESPONDENT VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.

IN WP NO. 39151/2016

BETWEEN:

1. SRI. CHIKKA DODDAIAH
S/O. LATE DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 80 YEARS
R/AT. BADAKANAPALYA,
PILLAHALLI DHAKALE, HUSKUR POST,
DADANAPURA HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK

SINCE DEAD REPRESENTED BY LR's

- 1(a) MR. C RAJANNA
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS
- 1(b) MR. C. LAKSHMANA
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
- 1(c) MRS. LAKSHMAMMA
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS
- 1(d) MR. NAGARAJU
S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
- 1(e) AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
MRS. NARAYANAMMA



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

S/O LATE CHIKKA DODDAIAH
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS

ALL ARE RESIDING AT BADAKNAPALYA
PILLAHALLI DHAKALE,
HUSKUR POST
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
BANGALORE NORTH TALUK

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SRI. UDAY HOLLA, SR. ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. S. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA
REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
M.S.BUILDING,
BANGALORE – 560 001.
2. THE JOINT DIRECTOR OF LAND RECORDS
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT
BANGALORE – 560 002.
3. THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
BANGALORE NORTH DISTRICT
BANGALORE – 560 002.
4. THE TAHASILDAR
BANGALORE NORTH DISTRICT
BANGALORE – 560 002.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. I. THARANATHA POOJARY, AAG FOR
SRI. V. SESHU, HCGP)

THIS WRIT PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND
227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH
THE ORDER DATED 18.06.2016 BEARING NO.RRT(BN) CR
60/16-17 PASSED BY 3RD RESPONDENT AT ANNEXURE-A
AND ETC.



HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

IN WP NO. 24113/2018**BETWEEN:**

STATE OF KARNATAKA
REPRESENTED BY THE TAHSILDAR,
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK
KANDAYA BHAVAN,
BENGALURU - 9.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. I. THARANATHA POOJARY, AAG FOR
SRI. V. SESHU, HCGP)

AND:

1. THE SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BENGALURU DISTRICT,
BENGALURU - 560 009.
2. SHRI. SRINIVASAMURTHY
S/O LATE RAMAIAH, MAJOR
HONNASANDRA VILLAGE,
DASANAPURA HOBLI - 562 123.
BENGALURU NORTH TALUK.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHAMANTH NAIK, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. UDAY HOLLA, SR. ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. S. CHANDRASHEKAR, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS WRIT PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND
227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO-QUASH
THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 22.09.2010 PASSED BY THE
SPECIAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, BENGALURU DISTRICT
BEARING NO.RRT(1)(N)CR/17/2010-11 WHICH IS
PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.

THESE PETITIONS, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY
HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

COMMON ORDER

Since there are two writ petitions filed by the State calling in question the orders passed by the Special Deputy Commissioner under Section 136(3) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, in respect of two sets of lands and the owners of the two sets of lands have filed writ petitions challenging the order dated 10.06.2016 bearing No.Bhu.Jam.Ne/Thaam(1)Viva/31/2015 at Annexure 'Q' in W.P.No.39150/2016 and the order dated 10.06.2016 bearing No.Bhu.Jam.Ne/Thaam (1) Viva/30/2015 at Annexure 'P' in W.P.No.39151/2016, passed by the second respondent-Joint Director of Land Records, Bengaluru Urban District, Bengaluru, these writ petitions have been clubbed, heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

2. For the sake of convenience, the private writ petitioners in W.P.No.39150/2016 and W.P.No.39151/2016, shall be referred to as 'writ petitioners'.



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

3. It would be necessary to state the brief background in which these writ petitions have been filed. It is not disputed that the names of the landowners/ writ petitioners are recorded in the revenue records and their names were continued in the computerized RTC till the impugned orders were passed by the Joint Director of Land Records and subsequently, action was taken by the Tahsildar to remove the names of the writ petitioners from the computerized RTCs. The contention of the State in both its writ petitions are that, although no grants were made in favour of the writ petitioners viz., Sri Srinivasmurthy and late Sri Chikka Doddaiiah, who is now represented by his legal representatives, several records have been created, forged, fabricated and revenue records have been created.

4. Therefore, the Tahsildar moved the Special Deputy Commissioner to initiate *suo motu* proceedings under Section 136 (3) of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for short) to delete the



HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

names of the petitioners from the revenue records and discontinue their names from the computerized RTCs. However, the Special Deputy Commissioner dropped the proceedings after having found that there is no truth in the contentions of the Tahsildar and the documents revealed otherwise. In the meanwhile, the petitioners had approached the Survey settlement authorities seeking phodi and durasth of the lands and assignment of new survey number. The Joint Director of Land Records proceeded to pass the impugned orders accepting the contention of the Tahsildar that there were no grants made in favour of the petitioners or their predecessors and directed the Tahsildar to remove the entries in the RTCs.

5. Learned Senior Counsel Sri.Udaya Holla appearing for the writ petitioners submitted that the Joint Director of Land Records had no jurisdiction to pass such an order, having regard to the fact that the petitioners had approached the Joint Director of Land Records for phodi and durasth and for assignment of new survey numbers to



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

the properties belonging to the petitioners. The Joint Director of Land Records (for short 'JDLR') had no jurisdiction in the matter of the entries found in the RTCs. The Joint Director of Land Records is only concerned with the phodi proceedings, survey settlement, assignment of new survey numbers etc. It is beyond the jurisdiction of the JDLR to have issued such directions to the Tahsildar to discontinue the names of the petitioners from the revenue records.

6. Learned Senior Counsel submitted that this Court has held in the case of ***Smt.Pyari Ma Vs. State of Karnataka and Others*** in W.P.No.22426/2021 dated 12.01.2022 that if action is sought to be initiated either *suo motu* or in exercise of power conferred under a statute, they shall be done within a reasonable time. This Court had referred to two judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Mohamad Kavi Mohamad Amin Vs. Fatmabai Ibrahim (1997) 6 SCC 71*** and ***Joint Collector Ranga Reddy District And Another Vs.***



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

D. Narsing Rao And Others (2015) 3 SCC 695 while concluding that such action, even if permissible, should be done within reasonable time. Learned Counsel submits that the wisdom behind such directions are not far to fetch. Third party rights would be created on the strength of the revenue records and if the State and its authorities are permitted to tamper with the mutation entries after 3 - 4 decades, it will have far reaching consequences on the transactions and the ownership of the properties which are in the hands of private persons.

7. Learned Senior Counsel submitted that the judgment of this Court has been upheld by the Division Bench in the case of the **The State of Karnataka and others Vs. Smt. Pyari Ma and Others** in W.A.No.284/2023 dated 24.02.2026.

8. Per contra, learned Additional Advocate General (AAG) contended that the facts and issues in both the cases are different. Although it is true that the name of Sri.Chikka Doddaiiah (W.P.No.24112/2018) is found in the



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

original Grant Register, nevertheless, it is submitted that it is clear that some part of the original Grant Register has been tampered with and interpolations have taken place and insertions are found in the original record itself. However, no such grant was in fact made in favour of Sri. Chikka Doddaiiah and taking advantage of the space available in a particular page in the darkasth register, the entries have been made. Although there were no original orders passed by the competent authority granting the lands in favour of Sri.Chikka Doddaiiah, illegal entries have been made in the Register and the writings in the particular page and the ink also differs from the other entries. However, it is not disputed that the mutation entries have been carried out from the year 1978-79 in M.R.No.11/1965-66.

9. In respect of the other matter pertaining to Sri.Srinivasmurthy, it is submitted that no such entry is found in the Grant Register. It is pointed that the Darkasth Order bearing No.LND.SR.71/1984-85 does not



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

pertain to Sri.Srinivasmurthy, it pertains to one Sri.Nanjaiah and 11 others and on the other hand, the entry as found in LND.SR.53/1983-84 is not found in the Grant Register.

10. Learned Additional Advocate General submitted that even in the mutation entries what is recorded is the grant in LND SR.No.71/1984-85 dated 04.10.1984 and that order is not pertaining to Sri.Srinivasmurthy. The subsequent mutation entries are bogus, fabricated and created at the instance of the writ petitioner with active connivance of the staff of the Taluk Office. Learned AAG would therefore submit that the matter is being investigated into by the Lokayuta Police and the original records have been referred to the experts opinion and the Forensic Science Laboratory report has been received in the office of the Lokayuktha.

11. Learned AAG would therefore submit that the public property should not be misused and the writ petitioners cannot find fault with the action taken by the



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

respondent- Tahsildar in deleting the names of the writ petitioners from the revenue records. However, learned Senior Counsel Sri.Udaya Holla, has disputed the submissions made by the learned AAG. It is pointed out from the original Grant Register that in several pages such difference in handwriting is found. This would mean that the entries have been made by different officials on different dates. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the entries are bogus or interpolations.

12. This Court has come across several such instances where the names of the private parties entered in the revenue records and maintained as such for several decades are sought to be deleted or discontinued without following due process of law. Third party rights would have been created and after lapse of several decades, at the instance of the Tahsildar, proceedings are initiated before the Deputy Commissioners or Special Deputy Commissioners, invoking *suo motu* powers under Section 136 (3) of the Act. In many such cases, this Court has



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

also found that even before the Tahsildar could approach the Deputy Commissioner or Special Deputy Commissioner, the names of the parties are deleted from the revenue records without following due process of law. However, in the present case, it is found that such an action is taken by the Tahsildar after orders are passed by the Joint Director of Land Records.

13. The next question that would arise is whether the JDLR could pass such an order directing the Tahsildar to discontinue the names of the parties from the revenue records. As rightly submitted by the learned Senior Counsel, the provisions contained in Sections 127 to 129 pertaining to the revenue entries are found in Chapter XI of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act with a heading 'Record of Rights'. The hierarchy of Officers under the said Chapter is the Tahsildar, the Assistant Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner concerned. There is no scope for the survey settlement authorities in Chapter XI which pertains to the Record of Rights. On the other hand, in



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

Chapter V of the Act, which deals with appeal and revision, the Survey Settlement Authorities viz., the Survey Officer, Assistant Director of Land Records, Deputy Director of Land Records, Joint Director of Land Records, Director of Survey Settlement etc. are found. There is a clear demarcation of the powers exercisable under Chapter XI and Chapter V. Therefore, on the face of it, the impugned orders passed by the JDLR directing the Tahsildar to remove the entries in the revenue records cannot be sustained. Moreover, no opportunity of hearing is given to the aggrieved persons before such an order could be passed by the JDLR.

14. During the course of these proceedings, this Court was constrained to call for the original records and with great difficulty the records were procured from the office of the Lokayuktha after issuing certain orders.

15. Learned Counsel Sri.Venkatesh S. Arbatti, who is appearing on behalf of Lokayukta has today filed a memo along with the original records which were in the custody



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

of the Lokayukta Police. The original records are in a sealed cover. Therefore, the learned Counsel has requested that after perusing the original records this Court may re-seal the original documents and hand it over to the learned Counsel.

16. This Court has perused the original documents and Record of Rights. This Court found that the document at Annexure-G2 in W.P.No.39150/2026 which is the RTC of the years 1988-89 to 1992-93 are found in the original Register in page number 194.

17. In the original Register of RTCs of the years 1978-79 to 1982-83, at page number 185 is the revenue entries as found at Annexure-G reflecting the name of Sri.Chikkadoddaiah S/o Doddaiiah in Survey No.52. Similarly, in the Register of RTCs of the year 1983-84 to 1987-88 at page number 144 is the document as found at Annexure-G1.

18. This Court has also perused the original Saguvali Chit Issue Register, which is handed over by the learned



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

AAG. It is not disputed that there is an entry reflecting the grant of Saguvali Chit in favour of Sri.Chikka Doddaiiah in respect of Survey No.52 measuring 2.00 Acres under Order bearing No.LND.GMF.78/1960-61. However, it is sought to be contented that the ink and the writing in which the entries are made differs from the other entries in the same page.

19. Similarly, the original Darakasth/Grant Register is also placed before this Court by the learned AAG and it is not disputed that at page number 132/133 is the entry found, where, in column number 1, entry 9/1956-57 is the name of Sri.Chikkadoddaiah S/o Doddaiiah and other 3 persons. In column number 5 is the name of the Village, Pillahalli. In column number 6 is Survey No.52 and in column number 9, is the name of Sri.Chikkadoddaiah (2.00 Acres); Sri.Chikkadyavanna (1.00 Acre); Sri.Bettadarayappa (1.00 Acre) and Sri.Ramadas (2.00 Acres).



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

20. The next page is the information regarding how the reports were received and the records are built up, etc. The information regarding the payments received towards the Kimmath is also reflected in the next page. In the last column, i.e., column number 19, the information pertaining to the dates on which the Saguvali Chits were issued in favour of the grantees. However, here too, the same contention is raised that the entry in respect of Sri.Chikkadoddaiah and others, is found in a different ink and different handwriting.

21. Insofar as, Sri.Srinivasamuthy, in W.P.No.39151/2016, is concerned, the original file containing the Official Memorandum dated 06.11.1984 as found at Annexure-C is available. The original Grant Certificate as found at Annexure-D is also available. In the original Mutation Register at page No.29 in the bottom, the entry as found at Annexure-E bearing No.5/1984-85 is visible. The original Register of RTCs for the year 1983-1984 to 1987-1988 at page No.188, the



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

RTCs as found at Annexure-G is available. Similarly, the original RTC register of the year 1988-89 to 1992- 1993, the document as found at Annexure-G1 is available. The original RTC register of year 1993-1994 to 1996-1997, at page No.189 is the document at Annexure-G2, the original is available.

22. The learned AAG however submits that it appears that all these records have been tampered with the active collusion of the staff of the Taluk Office, the fabrication of documents have happened and appropriate enquiry has been initiated against all who are responsible for the same. Learned Senior Counsel Sri.Udaya Holla, has however, disputed the contentions.

23. Having perused the original records, this Court is satisfied that the mutation entries have been carried out in the case of Sri Chikka Doddaiiah from the year 1965-66 and in the case of Sri Srinivasmurthy from the year 1984-85. Having regard to the law laid down by this Court in the case of **Smt.Pyari Ma** (supra), this Court is of the



HC-KAR

NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

considered opinion that no such proceedings could have been initiated before the Special Deputy Commissioner after lapse of more than 3-4 decades. It is also noticeable that the Tahsildars have been initiating proceedings before the Deputy Commissioners/Special Deputy Commissioners without there being any Government orders passed by the Department of Revenue. This Court has held in umpteen number of cases that it is the State alone who is the custodian of the public property. The revenue authorities are only custodians of the revenue records and they cannot initiate proceedings without there being a motion from the Department of Revenue. In spite of several such observations, no directions are forthcoming from the Revenue Department to the Tahsildars. This Court has been flooded with such cases complaining of the high-handedness of the revenue authorities. Revenue entries which have been maintained for several decades are sought to be deleted without prior notice or initiation of proceedings before the competent authority. All such



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

actions are to be deprecated and the Principal Secretary, Revenue Department is required to take note of the observations of this Court and initiate action or issue a Circular providing guidelines to the Tahsildars while initiating proceedings under Section 136(3) of the Act.

24. This Court is not concerned with the enquiry initiated by the Lokayuktha Police. Therefore, this Court precludes from making any observations on the original records perused by this Court. However, it would be beneficial to reiterate the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of **Mohamad Kavi Mohamad Amin** (supra) and **Joint Collector Ranga Reddy District** (supra) while concluding that action, even if permissible to be initiated, should be done within reasonable time. This principle applies even to cases where fraud is alleged. Paragraph No.25 and 31 of the decision in **Joint Collector** reads as follows:

"25. The legal position is fairly well settled by a long line of decisions of this Court which have laid down that even when there is no period of limitation prescribed for the exercise of any



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

power, revisional or otherwise, such power must be exercised within a reasonable period. This is so even in cases where allegations of fraud have necessitated the exercise of any corrective power. We may briefly refer to some of the decisions only to bring home the point that the absence of a stipulated period of limitation makes little or no difference insofar as the exercise of the power is concerned which ought to be permissible only when the power is invoked within a reasonable period.

.....
.....

31. To sum up, delayed exercise of revisional jurisdiction is frowned upon because if actions or transactions were to remain forever open to challenge, it will mean avoidable and endless uncertainty in human affairs, which is not the policy of law. Because, even when there is no period of limitation prescribed for exercise of such powers, the intervening delay, may have led to creation of third-party rights, that cannot be trampled by a belated exercise of a discretionary power especially when no cogent explanation for the delay is in sight. Rule of law it is said must run closely with the rule of life. Even in cases where the orders sought to be revised are fraudulent, the exercise of power must be within a reasonable period of the discovery of fraud. Simply describing an act or transaction to be fraudulent will not extend the time for its correction to infinity; for otherwise the exercise of revisional power would itself be tantamount to a fraud upon the statute that vests such power in an authority."

(Emphasis supplied)



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

25. Further, having regard to the grievances aired by petitioners in respect to the orders passed by the JDLR, this Court is of the considered opinion that such directions or orders could not have been passed by the JDLR. Discontinuation of the names of the petitioners from the revenue records can be done only in accordance with law after following the due process of law. Unless and until the appellate authority or the revisional authority passes any order in accordance with law as provided in Chapter XI, the names of the petitioners cannot be removed from the revenue records. On the other hand, the Special Deputy Commissioner has dropped the proceedings initiated under Section 136(3) of the Act, while recording a finding that the original records reflect the grant orders and mutation entries.

26. Consequently, this Court proceeds to pass the following:



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

ORDER

- i) The writ petitions in W.P.No.39150/2016 and W.P.No.39151/2016 are **allowed** while setting aside the impugned orders dated 10.06.2016 bearing No. Bhu. Jam. Ne/Thaam(1) Viva/31/2015-16 at Annexure 'Q' in W.P.No.39150/2016 and the order dated 10.06.2016 bearing No.Bhu.Jam. Ne/Thaam (1) Viva/30/ 2015-16 at Annexure 'P' in W.P.No.39151/2016 passed by the second respondent-Joint Director of Land Records, Bengaluru Urban District, Bengaluru.
- ii) The impugned communication in W.P.No.39150/2016 made by the respondent-Assistant Commissioner, Bengaluru North Sub-Division bearing No.RRT(BN)CR/60/16-17 dated 18.06.2016 and the communication of the respondent-Tahsildar, Bengaluru North Taluk bearing No.RRT(D)CR:213/2016-17 dated 18.06.2016 at Annexures 'A' and 'B' respectively are quashed and set aside.



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

- iii) The impugned communication in W.P.No.39151/2016 made by the respondent-Assistant Commissioner, Bengaluru North Sub-Division bearing No.RRT(BN)CR/61/16-17 dated 18.06.2016 and the communication of the respondent-Tahsildar, Bengaluru North Taluk bearing No. RRT (D) CR: 209/2016-17 dated 18.06.2016 at Annexures 'A' and 'B' respectively are quashed and set aside.
- iv) The respondent-Tahsildar and the Assistant Commissioner, Bengaluru North Sub-Division are hereby directed to restore the names of the khatedars as it was prior to the passing of the impugned orders. The entire exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
- v) The writ petitions filed by the State and its authorities in W.P.Nos.24112/2018 and 24113/2018 are hereby **dismissed**.



NC: 2026:KHC:17876
WP No. 24112 of 2018
C/W WP No. 39150 of 2016
WP No. 39151 of 2016
AND WP No. 24113 of 2018

Ordered accordingly.

27. The original records furnished by learned Counsel Sri Venkatesh.S.Arbatti, shall be returned to the learned Counsel after the office would cover the original records and affix the seal of the High Court.

Accordingly, pending I.As., if any stand disposed of.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

DL/KLY/JT
CT:KA