

**(2009) 02 KAR CK 0068**

**In the Karnataka High Court**

**Case No : Writ Petition No's. 9547 and 9662 of 2007**

Ganapathrao

APPELLANT

Vs

The Deputy Commissioner and Others

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision : 09-02-2009**

**Acts Referred:**

Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 — Section 135, 136 (2)

**Citation : (2010) 3 KarLJ 36**

**Hon'ble Judges : Ram Mohan Reddy, J**

**Bench : Single Bench**

**Advocate : Umadevi S. Babshetty, for the Appellant; S. Mallikarjuna Saukar, High Court Government Pleader and R.S. Sidhapurkar, for the Respondent**

---

## **Judgement**

Ram Mohan Reddy, J.—Common questions of fact and that of law arise for decision making, hence, with the consent of the learned Counsel for the parties, the petitions, are clubbed together, finally heard and are disposed of by this common order.

2. The question that arises for decision making in these petitions is whether the entries made by the revenue authorities in the revenue records relating to immovable property in question under the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964 is amenable to the writ jurisdiction? The Deputy Commissioner having passed orders exercising revisional jurisdiction under Sub-section (2) of Section 136 of the Karnataka Land Revenue Act, 1964, it is needless to state that the petitioners, if aggrieved by the said orders can resort to the remedy of filing a civil suit as permitted under the proviso to Section 135 of the Act, in the light of the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in Srimanmaharaja Niranjana Jagadguru Mallikarjuna Murugarajendra Mahaswamy Vs. Deputy Commissioner,

The writ petitions are accordingly disposed off reserving liberty to the petitioners to question the orders impugned before the Competent Civil Court having jurisdiction.