



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

WRIT PETITION NO. 2201 OF 2026 (KLR-RR/SUR)

BETWEEN:

SMT. JAYAMMA,
AGED 65 YEARS,
D/O. PUTTAMADASETTY,
W/O. LATE D.NANJUNDASETTY,
R/O. REVENUE BLOCK,
ALANAHALLI ROAD,
MYSURU DISTRICT 570 028.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI.M.B.CHANDRA SHOOD, ADVOCAT FOR
SRI. HIEMATH N S.,ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY ITS SECRETARY
TO THE GOVERNMENT,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
M.S.BUILDING,
DR. AMBEDKAR VEEDHI,
BENGALURU-560 001
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
MYSURU DISTRICT, MYSURU-570001
3. THE TAHASILDAR,
MYSURU TALUK, MYSURU-570001





...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.K.P.YOGANNA, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO-DIRECT THE RESPONDENT NO.3 TO CONSIDER THE REPRESENTATIONS IONS DATED 7.8.2000 AND 9.6.2024 TO CERTIFY NAME OF THE PETITIONER IN RESPECT OF THE LAND BEARING SY.NO.4 MEASURING 30 ACRES OF LAND SITUATED AT KURUBARAHALLI VILLAGE, KASABA HOBLI, MYSORE TALUK VIDE ANNEXURE-G AND H WITHIN THE TIME BOUND PERIOD.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R DEVDAS

ORAL ORDER

Learned Additional Government Advocate is directed to take notice for all respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the petitioner's father late Sri Puttamadasetty had approached this Court in Writ Petition No.35674/1999 which was clubbed with another writ petition and this Court heard the grievance of the petitioner that though his name was entered in the revenue records pursuant to the



gift deed executed by the then Maharaja of Mysuru as the petitioner and others had rendered service in the palace of the then Maharaja, however, the name of the petitioners were discontinued from the revenue records. This Court disposed of the writ petition granting liberty to the petitioners to give a representation to the respondent authorities namely the Deputy Commissioner of Mysuru District and the Tahsildar, Mysore Taluk who were also directed to consider such a representation to re-enter the name of the petitioners in the revenue records.

3. Learned counsel submits that no action was taken by the respondents. However, after the demise of the petitioner's father in year 2005, the petitioner has given several representations but respondents No.2 and 3 have failed to consider the representations.

4. Learned Additional Government Advocate submits that the petitioner has never given a representation and therefore the question of considering



the representation given by the petitioner's father in the year 2002 will not arise.

5. Consequently, writ petition stands ***disposed of*** reserving liberty to the petitioner to give a fresh representation to respondents No.2 and 3 to consider the grievance of the petitioner, peruse the records and thereafter pass necessary orders. Respondents No.2 and 3 are also hereby directed to consider such a representation as and when given by the petitioner and verify the records to find out about the genuineness of the claim of the petitioner. If the records reveal the fact that the petitioner's father's name was earlier entered in the revenue records and mutation orders have already been passed, there is no reason why the name of the petitioner or the legal heirs of late Sri Puttamadashetty should not be continued in the revenue records. The entire exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible and at any rate within a period of two months from the date when the



application is given by the petitioner to respondents No.2
and 3.

Sd/-
(R DEVDAS)
JUDGE

RJ
List No.: 1 SI No.: 12