

(2026) 08 KAR CK 2263

In the Karnataka High Court, Bengaluru Bench

Case No : Writ Petition No.23422 of 2026 (KLR-RR/SUR)

Sri B. N. Venkateshaiah

APPELLANT

Vs

The State Of Karnataka & Ors.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-08-2026

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India — Articles 226 and 227

Citation : (2026) 08 KAR CK 2263

Hon'ble Judges : E.S.Indiresh, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Smt. S. Susheela, Sr. Advocate, Sri Ramesh T. R., Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N.

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Learned High Court Government Pleader accepts notice for the respondents.

2. In this writ petition, petitioner is assailing the endorsement dated 30.04.2026 passed by the respondent No.6, *interalia* sought for direction to the respondent authorities to conduct phodi and durasth in respect of the land in question.

3. Heard Smt. S.Susheela, learned Senior Counsel for Sri Ramesha.T.R, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri. Spoorthy Hegde N, learned High Court Government Pleader appearing for the respondent - State.

4. It is contended by the learned Senior Counsel, Smt. S.Susheela, appearing on behalf of the petitioner that, the impugned endorsement requires to be interfered with, as the land in question has been granted to the petitioner and saguvali chit has been issued in favour of the grantee/petitioner and in that view of the matter the reasons assigned in the endorsement dated 30.04.2026 (Annexure-A) requires to be interfered.

5. Per contra, Sri Spoorthy Hegde.N, learned High Court Government Pleader sought to justify the impugned endorsement.

6. In the light of the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on careful consideration of the impugned endorsement, would indicate that land in question has been granted in favour of the petitioner and accordingly saguvali chit has been issued in favour of the petitioner as per Annexure- B. In that view of the matter, the observation made by the respondent No.6 is incorrect and requires to be set aside in this petition. It is also noted by this Court, the language employed by the respondent No.6 in the last paragraph of the impugned endorsement which requires to, and such, the clarification made by the respondent No.6 that he will follow the order dated 31.07.2025. passed by this Court in W.P. No.20349/2025 after getting approval/order from respondent No.4, is incorrect and this Court would warn respondent No.6 to use the appropriate words while issuing endorsement regarding the same.

7. In that view of the matter, it is open for the petitioner to make necessary application to respondents No.5 and 6 through online as well as by filing physical application seeking phodi and durasth in respect of the land in question. If such an application is made by the petitioner within two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order, same shall be considered by the authorities expeditiously.

With these observations, the writ petition is ***disposed of***.